The size of the state increased considerably during the times of the later Samhitas and the Brāhmaṇas. Many kings of this period styled themselves as Mahārāja and Samrāṭ. A number of them were great conquerors and celebrated their victories by performing sacrifices like Vājapeya and Aśvamedha. The state of the Rāmāyana period was much similar to the above.

The king of the epic period performed Rājasūya, Paṇḍarīka, Aśvamedha and Vājapeya sacrifices. He claimed his authority over the whole earth, including its mountains, forests and gardens; and over men, animals and birds living on it. He claimed also the authority to do good to anyone according to his own sweet will. Nevertheless, the kingdom was not very extensive, and its boundaries could be reached in a couple of days travelling by a chariot.

The organisation of the kingdom into provinces or districts is conspicuous by its absence in the Rāmāyana. Even when Rāma extended boundaries of his paternal kingdom by new conquests, he did not create any provinces or districts in it. He preferred to put the newly acquired territories as additional principalities under his brother and the sons of his brothers. Thus, the non-provincialisation clearly states the unitary character of the kingdom.

CHAPTER VII
ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL SET-UP
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A kingdom in the epic period was known variously such as Deśa, Janapada, Viṣāya, and Rastra. All these terms were used as synonyms, yet the use of these terms was not always for a uniform sense. In certain references we find that the term Deśa was used to denote simply an area. But such usages are only exceptional.

The kingdom kept in view by Kaṇṭilīva while describing its divisions and subdivisions was very large compared to the kingdom of the epic. He says, "The king should cause villages to be settled consisting mostly of Śūdrakṣyaṅ̄gas with a minimum of 100 and maximum of 500 families, with boundaries extending over one kroṣa or two kroṣas."

He calls a group of ten villages as Saṅgraha, of two hundred villages as Karavatika, of 400 villages as Dronamukha and of 800 villages as Śthāniya. In the middle of each Śthāniya, he advises a fortress or a chief town.

Kṣem in the same context observes that the king should establish a Gula in the middle of two, three or five villages and a Saṅgraha in the middle of one hundred villages. The units suggested by the Mahābhārata and by Kṣem for administrative purposes comprised one, ten, twenty, hundred and thousand villages. śāstra divides the country into units of ten, hundred and thousand villages. In the Rāmāyaṇa, the kingdom is divided into two main divisions, namely Pura and Janapada, Pura being the seat of government.
was fortified and, therefore, known as *Durga*. The book I and book VI have nice descriptions of fortified cities of Ayodhya and Lanka. There are references to the existence of other forts in Kosala country, besides the fortified city of Ayodhya. Further, there are the references to *Nagara*, *Grama*, *Swayana*, *Ghosa* and *Pattana* in the Janapada. The existence of more than one city in a state whether in Kosala or in any other state is, however, not warranted, because the epic does not tell us any more than making a couple of references. If there were more than one city, it can be argued, we should know from the epic about their administrative set-up. But we do not. We are told only that Rama went on to the forest listening to dialogues of the dwellers of the *Grama* and *Swayana*, and that Sita asked Rama about the towns and villages on the way. The fact remains that Ayodhya was the only city (*Nagara* or *Nagri*) in the Kosala country and the Ramayana kingdom comprised the capital city and the country-side with big and small villages.

The *Grama* were larger villages than *Swayana*. The *Ghosa* were the pastoral villages and the *Pattana* were perhaps ports on river-banks. It has been opined by a contemporary writer that the terms *Grama* and *Ghosa* in the Ramayana refer to the territorial units or the political units of the village-organisation.

The *Kalahatarota* and *Manu* advise the king to appoint *Achhipati* over one, ten, twenty, hundred and thousand villages,
who should report to the next superior officer. *Sukra*\(^3^3\) refers to the officer of one thousand villages as *Sūmantā*, of one hundred villages as *Amaśūmantā*, and of ten villages as *Nāyaka*. In the *Rāmāyana*, we hear of *Gṛāmāṇi*\(^3^6\) whom we know as an important functionary of the Vedic state. \(^{3^7}\) We read that Rāma was praised by the gods saying inter alia that he was *Senāṇī* and *Gṛāmāṇī*. \(^{3^5}\) But the *Gṛāmāṇī* in the epic does not seem to be a functionary of the state connected with the village administration. There was a functionary referred to as *Mahāttara*\(^3^6\) who seems to have been responsible for the administration of the villages; the *Mahāttaras* of villages went with Bharata to bring back Rāma. \(^{3^7}\) The details about the nature of their functions and their appointment is not known, but it can be safely assumed that they were responsible for maintaining peace and assisting the king in administration of the country-side. They were invited to the state functions and allowed to participate in discussions involving matters of national importance.

\(^{3^8}\) *Kaṇḍāya* says that the king should appoint those men in the whole kingdom, who are wise, clever and unsluggish. Those who are brave, clever, of good families and pious should be appointed to work in mines and collection of grain, and those having fear of Dharma should be employed in the harem. *Kaṇṭilīya* advises that those who are qualified for the post of *Anātyya* should be appointed in various departments, according
to their ability. The *Mahabharata*, which is older than
the above two, says that those who are highly devoted to
Dharma should be appointed in the departments of justice and
religion. The king, according to it, should employ the brave
ones in military work, the skilled ones in revenue work and
the very trustworthy ones in mines. *Kamandiaka* also advises
on the same lines. In the *Ramayana*, it is said that the
officers should be appointed according to their ability after
giving them proper tests. According to the epic, the best
should be employed in high jobs, the average in lower jobs
and the ordinary in the lowest jobs. It is further said that
the Amatya who have a tradition of royal service and who are
pious and best qualified should be engaged for high jobs.

That proves the existence of an officialdom comprising three
grades of officers, but unfortunately the details about the
working of these officers, their subordinates in various
departments and the functioning of the departments are not
known to us from the epic.

*Kautilya* exhaustively deals with the administration of
provinces as well as of various departments. His Provincial
heads are called *Samharta* who were directly in charge of
*Thanika*, *Pradeepa* and other offices. The heads of
various departments have been referred to as *Abhakaka*. In
the *Ramayana*, as already said, there is no reference to a
provincial government as the states were small and had a
limited role to play. Moreover, it did not require many officers and departments as the Mauryan state needed. The government was run with the help of the eighteen Tirthas given by Kautilya, who according to the two commentators were as under:

(1) Mantri, Aurohita, Yuvaraja, Senapati, Dvarapala, Antarveśika, Karagaradhyaka, Kosadhyaaka, Sativa, Pradeṣa, Nagaradhyaka, Karyanirnānakartā, Dharmadhyaka, Sahadhyaaka, Dandapala, Raśtrasimapala and Vanarakṣaka.

(2) Mantri, Aurohita, Yuvaraja, Senapati, Dvarapala, Antahpuradhyaka, Karagaradhyaka, Dhanadhyaaka, the one who tells the work to servants, one who enquires of the Vedi and the Prativedi, Bṛhadvyaka, Dharmasaṃdhikā, Vyavaharaścarya, Sabhya, the one who distributes pay, Nagaradhyaaka, Raśtraśimapala and Vanarakṣaka.

We have already discussed seven Tirthas from each of the above lists; besides them, we have also discussed Antahpala i.e. the officer incharge of the area within the wall of the city. The names of other Tirthas do not occur in the Rāmāyaṇa, but the existence of some of them is alluded to in various references as we shall discuss hereunder.

The officer called Karyanirnānakartā is alluded to by the employment of a large number of workers connected with construction work. The construction force described in the
epic included not only the labourers but also the experts in soil or geographers, experts in measurements, mechanics, surveyors, experts in bamboo-structures etc. Their activities involved construction of buildings, bridges, dams, roads and camps.

Regarding road-construction we are told that the land was levelled, trees shrubs etc. were cut and cleared and the road was built with small stones and lime. These roads were provided with trees on both sides. Some roads were known as Rājagṛha and Mahārāja, which exhibits an advanced knowledge of road-building.

The verse which advises the king to give pay to the soldiers on time alludes to the existence of the Tirtha employed for the job. The verse which highlights the role of the king as Chastiser shows that there was a strong police force, under the Nāgarādhyakṣa perhaps, which saw to it that the noble ones were not tormented by the evil men and that the sinners and criminals were properly punished. Since the criminals were required to be kept in jails, the employment of an officer for jail (Kāraṇādhyakṣa) in the times of the epic cannot be ruled out. The Vanaraśakṣa was also important and essential as the forests were the state-property and provided wood, herbs and other valuable articles, which formed a source of income. The Tithas connected with the judicature are alluded to in some other references which
enjoin the king to see that justice was not denied. It can also be seen that the king had a large herd of cows in the times of the Ramayana. It is, therefore, possible that an officer designated as Govikartana (Kautilya’s Cudhyaka) or with some other designation was employed by the king for the administration of his cattle.

Thus, the information regarding central administration of the country in the times of the epic is very meagre. But we come to know a little bit more from the epic about the palace and military administration.

The palace-complex where the king and his family lived was called Rājkula, Prāśāda and Haraya. The palace administration was under the charge of two officers, namely Dvāradhyaka and Stryadhvaka. The Dvāradhya, who can be safely taken as the precursor of the later Dvārārika, was the officer in charge of the general administration of the palace besides the supervision of entries to the palace. The Stryadhvaka was in charge of the Antepura. These officers were assisted by a number of junior officers.

There were the Upāśayinuḥ who slept near the king while he was asleep; they were armed for the protection of the master. When the king was awake, there were the male guards who carried various types of arms and remained ever-vigilant; they were the men who were loyal to the king.
The king was bathed in the morning by beautiful women who were experts in the make-up work with various kinds of Angurāgas, Candrañas, garlands and ornaments; they helped him in wearing garments also. The girls who were allowed to go near the king brought such things as were considered auspicious to touch in the morning.

It is interesting that the polity writers also advise that women who live by their beauty should live near the king in his harem. Kāmandaka, for example, says, "Wearing holy garlands, having washed themselves and after changing clothes women who live by their beauty should live with the king in his harem. They should not be allowed to contact such outsiders as may have matted hair or shaven heads, are crooked and be the servants." In the Rāmāyaṇa we find lots of women attendants who attended upon the king and the queens. The women who attended upon the queens were called Vyāsakāraṇās.

The number of attendants in the harems of the king has not been definitely mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa, but it must have been fairly large. Kāmandaka in the same context states that the number of attendants in the harem should be eighty men and 50 women, including those who sweep.

The palace building housing the king was divided into three parts, namely Antahpura, Madhyakasa and Sahā. Outside the gates of Antahpura there was the śravadhāvakas along with his assistants. One could enter the first door only with
his permission. Then there were learned old Brāhmaṇas, who were obviously the men of proven character and who showered blessings on the king, the princes and others, besides performing the śvetāśāna. They sat in the second apartment inside the harem. In the third apartment, there were the young and old women who were to inform the queen about the visitor and to usher him after taking permission. The other attendants referred to in the Rāmāyana were old men, children, Śaivaśāvaras (eunuchs), kimkaras, Dāsikas and Dāsis.

Vaidya was another employee of the palace who, it can be deduced, checked the articles which were meant for the use of the king, besides treating the inmates when suffering from some ailment. In addition to him, there was a good number of musicians, singers and those who sang (or recited) praises of the king, namely Sūtas, Māgadhas and Bandījanas, who are referred to in the epic at many places.

The palace was protected by a large force consisted of foot-soldiers and contingents of soldiers on horses and elephants under the charge of the Antāmpala.

Kāmaṇḍaka speaks about the necessity of a uniform for the palace employees and says: "The king should never see his employees without uniform, except during their illness." In the Rāmāyana we read that the Sṛṣṭiḥyakṣas wore clothes
which were of red (kaśva) colour.\textsuperscript{31} It appears to have been the uniform of the officer. Another officer, namely Kaśyuka wore Kaśyukā (cloak) and Upāśa (turban) as uniform, as we have already stated.\textsuperscript{32}

Bala (army) was a very important constituent of the state in ancient India. We have discussed about it in detail in various contexts. We shall now see how much information we find about its administration during the epic period.

Kautilya provides a long list of officers for the administration of the army. Those prominent among them are Prajñāpañci, Saṇḍhātha, Nāyaka and Pedika. His Nāyaka stands for the Commander-Chief.\textsuperscript{33} The organisation work is left to the Adhyakṣa.\textsuperscript{34a} In the Rāmāyaṇa, we hear of only two high officers of the army, precisely Saṇḍhātha\textsuperscript{34} and Mukhya\textsuperscript{85} (they were known by other names, too). The duties of the Saṇḍhātha prescribed by Kautilya such as training the troops and leading them craftily during a battle\textsuperscript{86} were not unknown in the epic period and, therefore, revealed by the description of the activities of the Commander-in-Chief in various references in the Rāmāyaṇa.\textsuperscript{87}

The army has been referred to in the Rāmāyaṇa as Caturmāni is having four organs, namely chariots, elephants, horses and foot-soldiers, although the fifth organ in navy also existed. Kautilya speaks of Camel and ass divisions\textsuperscript{88};
the readers of the Rāmāyaṇa are familiar with the war-asses which were yoked to the chariots of the Rākṣasas.

The army's needs for chariots, horses and elephants besides arms, made it imperative for the state to have the arrangement for their procurement. The epic admittedly does not inform us about the existence of such an arrangement. Nevertheless, the epic exhibits a fair knowledge of various types of horses and elephants; we are told that Ayodhya was full of horses belonging to Kusūra, Bahlika, forests and rivers, which were as good as the horse of Indra. The above reference shows that excellent war-horses were procured from other states, besides rearing them in the state-owned forests. The epic further tells us that the Kosala capital had elephants belonging to the Vindhyas and the Himalayas, and of the breeds named Anjana, Vāvana, Bhadra-Mandra, Bhadra-Māra and Myga-Mandra. The wide range of arms described in the Rāmāyaṇa also alludes that the state had made arrangement for their procurement and storage. Kautilya refers to an officer named Ayudhārādhy-ākṣa. It is assumable that such an officer existed in the times of the epic also.

Regarding the recruitment of the soldiers, we learn from the epic that Amatyas of king Dasašratha were always busy in augmenting the army by enrolling more and more men. The soldiers were properly trained by the Commander-in-Chief, with the help of his subordinates, and the king took a special interest in its regular inspection.
There was a labour force and the corps of engineers also for making arrangements. Kautilya advises such a force as an advance-party for a march, and in the Ramayana we find the same going ahead of the army. The arrangement for provisions was left to the traders.

The army of the epic period was well looked after and kept in a ready-to-fight condition. The importance of the welfare of the soldiers was well known to the king who understood the fact that a loyal and well-kept army would stand by him in distress, better than friends and relatives. The soldiers received a fixed salary and allowance. It was ensured that the emoluments were distributed to them without any delay, to avoid resentment among them.

When the soldiers were required to assemble, musical instruments such as Shera and Shrutakara were sounded. The cause of call was not explained immediately, that was left for the king or the Senapati.

Natas and Nartakas accompanied the army for their entertainment. But it is not known whether they were in the regular service of the state to perform the job.

We do not know much about the cities of the Vedic period or their administration. The civilization was mostly rural, and towns and cities did not form its important features. Very little is known about the urban life of the period of
the later Sanshitas and the Brähmana also. Kautilya describes the local administration in detail vide the duties of Nāgarika. But the Rāmāyaṇa has very little information to offer about the administrative set-up of the capital during the times of the events described in it. All that we can do is drawing certain inferences on the basis of the available material.

The cities of the epic period were laid to a set plan. They had broad roads which were cleaned and sprinkled with water. There were well planned road-crossings, which had lounges with four pillars. The roads were provided with shops on both the sides, which were settled according to a plan, too. There were streets and substreets with houses densely built in lines. We are further told that the houses at Taksasila were painted with a uniform colour.

The cities were provided with parks for the recreation of the citizens. They were nicely decorated on important occasions with the help of Raurus, and lamp-tress were erected on the sides of the roads.

All the above facts lead one to believe that some sort of municipal administration existed in the epic period, although the Rāmāyaṇa does not shed any clear light on its character and the extent.
The term *Pura-Kār̥ya* in the Rāmāyaṇa generally means administration.\textsuperscript{112} It is very clear that the *Pura-Kāryaas* performed by Rāma were such activities as were useful and dear to the people. It, therefore, cannot mean legal-business as suggested by a contemporary writer.\textsuperscript{113} It is more likely that the term means the public utility services, which meant jobs performed by an administrator.

P.C. Dharma has concluded laying her sole credence on the solitary interpretation of *Sramantikaas* as *Vidūrābhānas* by Govindarāja that the town of Ayodhyā was divided into wards and that each ward was supervised by a Ward Councillor or a City-Father.\textsuperscript{114} But such an interpretation is neither supported by the scriptures nor by any epigraphic evidence.\textsuperscript{115}

We have another term in the Rāmāyaṇa, namely *Puraśrađhānas*,\textsuperscript{116} They went to Citrākūta with Bharata and his Mantrīs. The epic does not tell us more about them, but Kanē tells us that there was a board of elders to perform municipal administration in ancient India, who were called *Puraśrađhānas* or *Puraśrađhhānas*. The *Puraśrađhānas* can possibly be identified with the *Puraśrađhhānas* and *Puraśrađhānas*. They performed jobs connected with municipal administration of the city in the times of the Rāmāyaṇa. The procedure of their selection or election is, however, not known from the epic.

The jobs performed by the *Puraśrađhānas* perhaps included

\begin{enumerate}
\item the maintenance of and cleanliness of the roads and the
\end{enumerate}
city (ii) supervision of markets and (iii) maintenance of parks and Sabhās.

It seems that the city-elders worked under the prince or some other officer appointed by the king to take care of the municipal administration. The officer in charge of the municipal administration participated in the various ceremonies performed by the people such as marriages, sacrifices etc.117

The Rāmāyana provides very little information about the administration, too. The villages, as already said, were known as Grāma, Sārya and Ghoṣa. The ancient Indian literature tells us that Grāmanī was the name of the village headman. In the Ṛgveda Manu is styled as Grāmanī.118 In the Teitīrya Sūtrā it is said, "The prosperous are three indeed viz. the learned, the village headman (Grāmanī) and the Rājanya."119 Later, he was known also as Grāmika and Grāmanaṇāti.120 The epic also uses the term Grāmanī but as an epithet of Viṣṇu.121 It is, therefore, doubtful whether Grāmanī was the village-headman in the times of the Rāmāyana and was responsible for village administration. But, as already shown, there was the village-headman in the epic period, who was known as Grāmanahattara and Ghoṣamahattara, depending on the type of the village. That establishes the existence of the institution of the village-headman in the epic period.

It is well known that the government in ancient India did not interfere with the life of people except in the matters
of tax, protection against invasion, exercise of general control and supervision of Dharma. The village was, therefore, a miniature state in itself and was not much interested in the government matters.\textsuperscript{122} In the \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} period, too, the village seems to be enjoying much independence in its internal matters as long as there was no violation of Dharma and the accepted norms, besides the collection of state-dues.

The smaller settlements of sages were governed internally by \textit{kulapatī}, one of whom we read telling Rāma that he would like to move because of the Rākṣas-menace.\textsuperscript{123}

\section*{Judicial Set-up}

Administration of justice is no doubt one of the most important functions of the state, according to modern notion also. The average citizen becomes conscious of the existence of the state and of its coercive power, when he sees the courts functioning and their decisions enforced both in civil and criminal cases.\textsuperscript{124} The \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} acknowledges this truth and says, "In a kingless country there is nothing one can claim as one's own and men eat one another every day like fishes. But under the coercive power of the king even those who are unrestrained atheists and have no fear (of Dharma) become sober."\textsuperscript{125} The epic depicts a very dismal picture of the society without a king to use his coercive power and, thereby, highlights the importance of the judicature.\textsuperscript{126}
We do not find any reference to a judicial set-up in the Vedic literature. The Vedas and the other related works nowhere refer to the king as a judge either in a civil or a criminal court. Altekar thereby surmises that the king in the Vedic age never functioned as a judge in private disputes. But it is unbelievable that the king of the Vedic times, who had the authority to wage wars, could not use his coercive power even to a limited extent to decide disputes among his own people.

The scriptures and the works on polity reveal to us a more or less full fledged and well developed judiciary. In the case of the Rāmāyana, it can be said on the basis of evidence of the text that it also alludes to a well developed judicial system, which is not strange even from the point of the age generally allotted to its completion.

The king was deemed to be the fountain of justice. He was to see that nobody did anything that was not proper (Ayukti) and to use his power against such persons as violated Dharma to protect others; because if he did not do so, there was the fear of death and other calamities befalling the people of the state.

Kautilya prescribes the routine for the king to look into disputes of the citizens and the rural people during the second part of day for a proper administration of justice.
Manu opines that a king who is desirous of dealing with the disputes of his people should go to the Sabha along with his Samivas and Brāhmaṇas, and there he, either sitting or standing with his right hand raised and wearing a sober dress, should give judgment on cases between the plaintiffs and the defendants.¹³⁰ In the Raṃayana we find that the king performed the sacred duty during the first half of day, which he devoted to public functions and distribution of justice.¹³¹ Sukra says that the administration of justice should be the personal concern of the king.¹³² In the Raṃayana, the poet expresses surprise as to how a king who partakes 1/6 of the people's earning can fail to protect them, the tax-payers.¹³³

Manu considers the impartial administration of justice as Dharma incarnate.¹³⁴ Vaiśeṣika declares that the unbiased distribution of justice yields the same reward as a Vedic sacrifice.¹³⁵ Vālsāki opines that the king who administers fair justice performs the ultimate Dharma in this world.¹³⁶ According to him, the king who punishes the offenders in a righteous manner becomes worthy of a place in heaven;¹³⁷ but if he does not punish those who deserve punishment, he goes to hell.¹³⁸

Thus, the epic king, too, considered the administration of justice as his foremost and most sacred duty. He believed that both the punisher and the punished would not suffer because they accomplished what should be done (kārva) and what
should be received (Karana). The sinner, it was believed, went to heaven like the noble ones after being punished, thus, becoming sinless. But if the king failed in his duty to punish the sinners, he received all their sins. He was not allowed to be arbitrary, as Rama admitted before Vali. It was also believed by the king that he should have to undertake atonement (Pravasmita) if he were to show any dereliction in using his coercive power judiciously. Such an atonement has been prescribed by the Yagishta Dharmasutra, one day's fast for the king and three days' fast for the Aushita.

Thus, the king of the epic period was very much aware of his duty regarding distribution of justice. It is interesting to note that the violator of Dharma stood absolved of his sins, whether he was punished or left unpunished by the king.

The king could not use his coercive power indiscriminately. All the scriptures and the polity writers are unanimous on this point, and so is the Ramayana. The king had to punish the one who deserved punishment and save the one who did not deserve it. Kantilva is of the view that the king who inflicts unjust punishment goes to hell. Many says that the king who punishes those who do not deserve punishment incurs great obloquy and goes to hell. In the Ramayana we find that the king was ordained to protect the people by using his power, but using it with reason. Punishing anyone without a proper cause was forbidden, and it was believed that the tears that
fell from the eyes of those punished wrongfully were effective enough to kill the sons and cattle of the ruler who punished showing partiality. \(^{146}\) Kautilya in this connection says stressing upon the importance of impartiality: "It is punishment alone that guards this world and the other world, when evenly meted out by the king to his son and enemy according to the offences." \(^{148}\) The king in the epic period understood this aspect of the administration of justice well and was always impartial while deciding the cases. \(^{149}\) He saw to it also that his ministers were unbiased, too, and gave judgements without considering the social status of the litigants. \(^{150}\) Besides, he was to watch out that the proven culprits were not let off for the greed of money and the noble ones were not punished without being properly tried. \(^{151}\)

The king of the epic period believed that his own conduct in exercising punishment and giving rewards was limited by the accepted and established norms. He knew that he could not afford to behave according to his own will. \(^{152}\) His firm faith in impartial justice is manifest by the fact that Sagara expelled his own son Asanabhāsa because he was accused of drowning children of the citizens \(^{153}\) and Rāma disowned Laksmana for disobeying his order. \(^{154}\)

The frequently mouthed slogan in modern times is 'justice delayed is justice denied'. This maxim was not unknown to the ancient Indians. The Mahābhārata says that if a king intent
on pleasure does not show himself to the litigants who approach him for decision, he suffers like king Nrga.\textsuperscript{155} Kautilya gives the advice that, when in the court, the king should not cause petitioners to wait for long at the door for when a king makes himself inaccessible those who are near him create confusion about what should or should not be done, whereby the king engenders disaffection among his subjects and makes himself a prey to his foes.\textsuperscript{156} In the Ramayana period, Rama's own prompt action in deciding the matter concerning the death of a Brahmana's son\textsuperscript{157} shows that the king believed in quick dispensation of justice.

Kautilya\textquotesingle s courts can be termed as Dharmaśīla and Kaśyapaśodhana. The judges of the former court were the Dharmaśāhas,\textsuperscript{158} and the court-room was technically known as Dharmaśīkaraṇa. Menu has referred to the court-room as Sabha\textsuperscript{159} and the seat of the judge as Dharmaśāna.\textsuperscript{160} In the Rāmāyaṇa, too, the court-room has been called 'Sabhā'.\textsuperscript{161} The king sat in the Sabha along with his Pārīśads and distributed justice. The counsellors who sat with him in the court were from amongst his Mantrīs, brothers (or relations) and his Naigas.\textsuperscript{162}

The above court of the Rāmāyaṇa has been described sitting on various occasions. It decided the case of Brahmāṇa with a dead boy, the fate of Sīta and the punishment for Laksmaṇa.\textsuperscript{163}
The Rāmāyana gives indications that there were subordinate courts in its times, besides the king's court. In these courts, various matters were considered by judges of the rank of ministers, who were learned in the scriptures and well aware of the law. They decided the subjudice matters purely on the basis of merit, without considering the position of the parties involved and without showing any greed for financial benefits.164

Kauṭilya prescribes three magistrates for the Kantakaśodhana court165 and three Dharmasthas for the Dharmaśīla court.166 Manu does not specify the number of Maṅtris and Brāhmaṇas for forming the bench of the court of the king,167 but says that when the king has to be away from the court, a learned Brāhmaṇa should be appointed to consider the cases along with three Sabhysas.168 In the Rāmāyana, the number of the members of the Nyāya-Paripād of the king has not been given; it simply informs us that the king, his brothers and relations, Maṅtris and Naigamās were present in the king's court.169

The judicial procedure has been given the term 'Vyavahāra' by the Śāstras, which covered both the criminal offences and civil disputes. Kauṭilya, however, separates criminal cases from the civil disputes and advises separate courts for them, comprising magistrates and Dharmasthas respectively, as already stated.
The term *Vyavahāra* occurs in the epic also, but the solitary use of the term in the context of ministers dispensing justice does not seem to have the same connotation as it developed later in the form of 'judicial procedure' or 'written agreement'. In the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the word carries the simple meaning - 'behaviour'.

In another reference the epic uses the term *Vyasana* for dispute between two parties. It seems to suggest that the civil disputes between two parties were known as *Vyasana* in the times of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. It uses such terms as *Adharma*, *Pāpe* and *Aparādha* to denote crime.

*Manu* enumerates 18 *Vyavahāranāda* (offences) and *Kautilya* has mentioned sixteen subjects, besides discussing several offences under the head *Kanṭakāndhana*. *Nārada* also names 18 subjects but *Śrīhamsapati* has given a list of 19 items. The *Rāmāyaṇa* has not given a list of all the offences and the subjects of litigation in its times but refers to many of them in scattered references. Thus, there are references to such offences as theft, violence, adultery, promise breaking, non-payment of dues to workers (*Vetanādāna* of *Manu*), violation of *Varnārasa dharmā*, setting something on fire (*Śūhāsa*), abortion, treason, wine-drinking, *Rājādāsa* (offending the king) and ungratefulness. Some of the offences were considered simply as violation of the ethical norms and perhaps did not invite any severe punishment. Such violations comprised
acts like excretion while facing the sun and kicking a cow.

Murder of a Brāhmaṇa, wine-drinking, theft and defiling guru's bed are considered by Manu as great sins (Meñantakas). In the epic the offences considered most heinous are given as murder of a king or a Brāhmaṇa, killing a cow, theft, marital relations with younger brother's wife, back-biting, defiling guru's bed, greed. Adultery meant having sexual relations with someone's wife, guru's wife or younger brother's wife. Promise breaking included non-payment of Daksina in the form of money, cow, horse etc. Himsa comprised all kinds of violence, of which killing of Brāhmaṇa, a king, a woman, a child or an old man was considered more serious.

The punishments prescribed by the Smritis and the Arthasastra are very severe. But those imposed in the times of the Rāmāyaṇa were severer. For example, Manu prescribes fine for non-payment of dues to workers after taking work from them, but the Rāmāyaṇa puts it in the category of treason and killing a king or a woman. For stealing one could receive the death-punishment or be sent into exile in the times of Rāmāyaṇa. The guilty persons were punished by mutilating and deforming also, besides the death punishment and exile. The various punishments described under the above categories in the epic are Yatrūya (tearing of nose, ears etc.) Kaśčāta.
(flogging or lashing), Kautilya (shaving of head), Lakṣaṇaśāstras (branding). Kautilya, we know, also prescribes branding of criminals and flogging.\footnote{194}

Parading the criminals was also known to the times of the Rāmāyaṇa. We read that the criminals paraded with the beating of drums and blowing of conches and Bheris, informing the people about their offences.\footnote{195} This is agreed to by Nāyika also who advises that those who are punished should be made to work on roads or public places so that there was a deterrent effect.\footnote{196}

Kautilya and Nāyika describe the law as having four legs, namely Dharmas, Vyavahāras, Caritrās and Raajasanas; they declare the superiority of the state-laws over other sources.\footnote{197} In the Rāmāyaṇa period, we have already said, the king was not a source of law; Dharmas, Lakṣaṇaśātras and Caritrās were the guides for deciding cases and prescribing punishments.

The Vyavahāras of the Sautpita is said to be of four stages which, according to Nāyika, mean the plaint, the reply, the proof and the decision.\footnote{198} Obviously he takes the Vyavahāras for a law-suit. In the Rāmāyaṇa we are informed of the four steps of the law suit. In the case of a person accused of theft we read that there were four stages for reaching the decision: (i) arrest (Gṛhaṇa), (ii) interrogation (Pratīca), (iii) witness or proof (Kaala-jīvanamāvatā) and (iv) decision (Na-mucyate).\footnote{199} An accused person was to be
punished only if he was arrested while committing the offence
(or perhaps on the basis of a complaint, too), had been
interrogated by those who were proficient in the scriptures
('Sastrakusālas'), had been seen by someone while committing
the crime and had left a proof of the offence. This
procedure, it seems, was followed by the courts for deciding
the cases of all types of criminals. The stages for reaching
a decision in civil suits have not been indicated directly
in the epic. It could have been a little different from the
criminal suits because civil suits do not normally require
pre-arrests. It is important to note that the interrogation
of the accused by learned judges was accorded a prime importance
in the age of the Rāmāyana.

Kanva prescribed torture during investigation,
besides the interrogation; these included caning, lashing,
suspension from above and the water-tube; they could be
administered repeatedly to make one confess his crime. The
epic also reveals its knowledge of lashing of the culprit
but as a punishment and not torture for investigation.

Maṇḍapa has an exhaustive discussion on the qualifications
and credibility of the witness for a case under consideration
of the court, and he distinguishes between an acceptable and
unacceptable witness. Besides, he prescribes punishment for
the false witness. He advises the king to generate the
fear of Dharma to deter the witness from telling a lie. In
the Rāmāyana, it has been said that the one who gives a false witness eats his own flesh in the next world. Vālmīki as a witness is found assuring the Pāṇini that he was born of a good family and that he had never told a lie in whole of his life.²⁰⁵ It shows that in the period of the epic a person was acceptable as a witness only if he was of a good family, a high caste and pure conduct. He had to say on an oath that he would speak the truth, which is interestingly similar to the modern practice in our courts.

The Sūtras permit to establish the truth by an ordeal if no evidence were available. Yājñavalkya enumerates five types of ordeals, namely Tulā (balance), Agni (fire), Jala (water), Viṣa (poison) and Kopa (treasure).²⁰⁶ The procedure of fire-ordeal prescribed by him is as follows:

The undertrial should rub his hands with paddy-husk; then his palms should be marked with some colour after watching for black moles; after that seven leaves of Ayvattha tree should be placed in the hollow of his palms with seven rounds of thread; he should then pray to Fire to protect him if he was innocent; thereafter, a red-hot ball of iron should be placed on the leaves asking the undertrial to take seven rounds; if his hands are not burnt during the purity test, he should be considered innocent.²⁰⁷

The fire ordeal was prescribed for a Kṣatriya only. Any ordeal could be undertaken only when the other party was ready to accept the result.
In the times of the Rāmāyana also some ordeals were allowed to prove one's innocence when there was no other way. Sītā, for example, took two purity tests to prove that she was pure, first at Lankā and then at Ayodhyā in the presence of large gatherings. But the fire ordeal described in the epic is quite different from that of Yājñavalkya in the sense that instead of holding a red-hot iron ball, Sītā jumped into fire itself, after praying to the god to protect her if she was pure. In the other ordeal, she prayed to the goddess Earth to give her a place in her lap if she was pure. The oath is, however, taken in a similar manner and sense.

Yājñavalkya prescribes ordeals in the case of a Kshāthrya only. In the Rāmāyana we find that the ordeals were allowed to Sītā after she had been accused of impurity. The ordeals were undertaken by her to give proof (Pratyaya) of her innocence. After the first successful ordeal, Rāma accepted her as his wife; but after the second ordeal, we know, Sītā did not exist as she went underground.

The punishment was decided by judges taking into account the nature of the crime, besides the motive, the age and the social status of the accused. Manusmriti, we read, prescribes different punishments for different people on the basis of castes, age and sex; he says that a Kshatriya, a Vaiśya and a 'Sūdra should be put to death if they repeatedly commit crimes, but a Brāhmaṇa though he may commit all the crimes should never be given death punishment; he should be turned out of
the country after taking all his wealth or his head should be shaved, which is as bad for him as death. Similarly, he prescribes different punishments for women, children, old and ailing persons than those recommended for others. Kautilya who is otherwise secular in his approach also suggests that punishment should be fixed after taking into account the person, the offence, the motive, the seriousness or lightness of the offence, the consequences, the present effect, the place and the time. The Rāmāyaṇa says on this aspect of the judicature that punishment should be according to the offence and severe but in accordance with the capacity of the culprit to tolerate. The court took into consideration the status of the accused, too. For instance, Aśava was only sent into exile by his father for killing the children of his citizens. In the case of Laksmana, too, Rāma altered the death punishment into banishment saying that banishment was as bad for a noble one as death. Thus, in the Rāmāyaṇa period also the punishments for the noble ones and the hardened criminals were not the same. In general the punishments advised were mild if the offence was not intentional. The financial status of the accused as well as the litigants was not taken notice of while deciding the cases; justice was distributed alike to the poor and the rich.

The king in ancient India was the supreme court as well as the appellate tribunal. But the Śāstras and the digests insist that the king cannot dispense justice by himself alone.
and that he must do so with the help of others. Menu and 
Vaiśnavakya provide, as stated above, that he should enter 
the court-room along with learned Brāhmaṇas and ministers 
proficient in state craft. The Mitakṣara adds that the king 
who examines disputes in the presence of his judges, ministers, 
learned Brāhmaṇas, Arochita and Sbhayas attains heaven. 218
According to Sūkra also, the king must not decide any case all 
by himself; he should follow the advice of his judges. 219
According to the Rāmāyana, the king normally decided the cases 
in consultation with his Mantrīs and Nāigamas. We have two 
clear instances of the court sitting: the cases of the Brāhmaṇa 
with a dead son and Lākaṇṇa, when the decisions were taken 
in consultation with the Mantrīs and other members of the 
court. It can be said that Rāma punished Vaiśravaṇa without 
considering the matter with his court. 220 In Sīta's case, 
too, one can blame Rāma of taking a decision all by himself. 
These instances only show that the king was entitled to take 
decisions regarding the nature of punishment even without 
consulting others, while remaining on the righteous path.

Nārada says that the king has to abide by the views 
of the judges. But the king of the Rāmāyana could certainly 
overrule the judgement of others in the court, as is clear 
from the case of Lākaṇṇa. 221 The king in the age of the 
Rāmāyana was, thus, the final authority in the administration 
of justice. 222
The king of the Rāmāyana had the power to reopen a case after listening to fresh arguments or finding new facts. In the case of Sītā, Rāma ordered his messengers to go to Valmīki and request to allow Sītā to establish her purity, after he had listened to the recitation of the Rāmāyana and known that the two reciters were his own sons from his exiled wife.²²³

The qualifications of judges are set in the law books as well as in the Arthasastra and the Rāmāyana. The Āṇustamba Dharmaśītra prescribes that the judge for a law-suit should be of a good family, learned, aged, clever and aware of Dharma.²²⁴ Norāda ordains that judges should be proficient in the texts on the eighteen titles of law, its 8000 subheads and in logic; he should also have mastered the Vedas and the Sūtras.²²⁵ Kantīlīya is of the view that judges should have the same qualifications as the minister. In the days of the Rāmāyana, the judges were of the rank of Amātya and, therefore, possessed all the qualities of minister, besides being well versed in scriptures (Sātrākāmāla) and highly learned (Sahajgruta).²²⁶

The Naigamas also sat in the court²²⁷ and gave their opinion on the matters under consideration. They were perhaps the jurors of the age and, therefore, the precursors of the Sābhayas suggested by Māra. The presence of Naigamas in the court establishes the antiquity of the institution of jurors in India.
Thus, we can conclude that the judicature in the times of the Rāmāyana was fairly developed. The laws were well defined. The distribution of justice was prompt and considerate, fair and effective. The king considered it as his foremost duty to protect the people from those who were unrestrained and used his coercive force to make the people abide by the rules of Dharma for respective castes and stages of life. The state did not hesitate to punish those who were led astray and, unlike Manu of the Mahābhārata, had not the fear that the use of coercive power would be a sin. On the contrary, it was believed that sparing the use of Danda reserved for the king a place in hell, while prescribing punishment in a righteous manner absolved him as well as the sinner; the latter for receiving the deserved punishment and the former for performing his duty without showing any dereliction. The Mahāmantra for Valmiki's king was, "Protect the people by exercising Danda but Danda must not be unreasonable and indiscriminate."228
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      निर्माणव स्वर्गसेयांति सांताह सुकृतिनो यथाः।
      रूप. IV. 18.30. and ff.

141. वद्धो वनारसार्दुः नावस्म स्वासेेश्तिना
      रूप. IV. 13.33.

142. प्रयासितत् सा कुर्वति तेन ताक्षमयते राजाः।
      रूप. IV. 16.32.

143. वा० दधधर्मपरसूत्रा, IX. 40-43.

144. राजनाः स्वधर्माः स्वर्गाया प्राण धर्मेना रक्षितोह्,
      अर्थसास्त्रा, III. 1

145. कृत्वा, VIII 128.

146. दन्तेना सा प्राण रक्षा मा दन्तसाकारणे, रूप. VII 70.8

147. यमिष्ठवाह्यस्तनां पतंत्यार्धापि राधाभा,
      तुषिष्ठपापसूचिन्ति प्रियारधामानु-सासाहः।
      रूप. II. 94.30.

148. दन्तो हि कावलो लोकं प्रान नाना तत्सा का रक्षति,
      राजनाः पुत्रेः सा सत्रायु स्माः सहास्त्रेन 
      समा धर्मेन।
      अर्थसास्त्रा, III. 1

149. विदेः प्राप्तकालम् यथा दन्तेः धर्मेऽऽएव अवस्थितपि।
      रूप. I 7.7.

150. व्यासे केक्कषािस्वाय दुर्गतास्या राधाभा,
      अर्थात् विरागः प्रायंति तवामुन्तः भक्तिरुतहः।
      रूप. II. 94.49.

151. गृहीतास्वय प्राप्तस्का कालो द्रष्ठाः सकोणाः
      केक्किन्नस्य वधव द्रष्ठाः वधवायम् दा०ा वार्षाः
      केक्किन्नर्व्यो विवधभाषाः कशिस्तांकरामे
      अप्राप्ताः सास्त्राशालान्त्या लोभ्यद्भक्तये सुचिः।
      रूप. II. 94.48 & 47
152. Rajavruttaḥ sanātkarnaḥ na nyayaḥ kṣaṇavruttasyaḥ. Āme. IV.17.28

The story of king Nṛga appears in the other editions of the Rāmāyana, and he is said to have been cursed by two litigant Brāhmaṇas quarrelling over the right to possess a cow (Citāpress ed. VII. 53-54). The story of king Nimi also stresses the same point (Citāpress ed. VII.55).

158. Dharmaśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstraśāstra śatyaḥ — — Arthaśāstra, III.1.
159. Vyavaharāndidrīkṣu brāhmaṇaiḥ saha pārthivāh, Mantraajñairmantrribhiscaiva viniṭṭhaḥ praviśeṣaḥsabhaḥ.
Nam, VIII.23.
160. Dharmaśānabadhiṣṭhāya, Nam, VIII.23.
161. Since the Parīśad met in the 'Sabha' — as have discussed already — and considered cases requiring judgment, the court-room, it is deduced, was named as 'Sabha' in the epic period, too.
162. Rām. VII.65.
163. Rām. VII.96.
165. Pṛdesṭārastrayo/mātyāḥ kṣaṭakaśodhanam kuryaḥ,
Arthasastra, III.1

166. Dharmasthābhrayo/mātyāḥ — Arthasastra, III.1


168. Ṛṣabha svayam na kuryaṁ na rṣāṁ kṣaṭakaśodhanaṁ,
Tadā niyujyāvivaśaṁ brahmaṁ kuryaṁ darśane.
So/aṁ kuryāṁ samasyātyāreṇa vatraṁbhirvratvāṁ,
Sabḥeva praviśyāvāyāvāsinaṁ sthita iva vā.

Kanu, VIII. 9-10.

169. Rām. VII.69, VII. 96.


171. Rām. II. 94.49.

172. Rām. II. 69.16.

173. Rām. II.69.16,19; IV.18.31, 32.

174. Aparādhuṁ yo darde —— Rām.VII.70.9.

and Rājadūsa parānāstāstāsthante nāparādhibhāḥ.

Rām.VI.20.10.

175. See Kanu, (op.cit. p.249) for a table of the Vyavahāras
enumerated by these writers.

176. Vide: kaccima brahmādhanam hṛtām Rāmeṇa kasyacit,
kaccimādhyo daridro vā tēmasapo vihitāḥ.
Kaccima parārāmāvā rajapurto/bhigayute,
Kasmātā Dāṇḍakāraṁye bhrūnāhava vivāsītāḥ.

Rām.II.56. 37-38.

178. Brahmaghne surāpe ca core bhagnavrate tathā,
Nigadyutvihitā satbhīḥ krtagnāḥ nāsti niguktih.

Ram. IV. 33.12.

179. Ram. VI. 20. 10.

180. Kṛtaghnāḥ sarvabhūtanām sa vadhyaḥ plavagesvare.

Ram. IV. 33.10.

181. Ram. II. 69. 15.

182. bantu pādena gah suptaḥ ------Ram. II. 69.15.

183. Manu, IX. 235.

184. Ram. IV. 17.32.


186. Tadetatkaranaḥ pesya yadartham tvaḥ mayahataḥ,
Bhruravartaṇā bhāvyayam tyaktvā. Ram. IV. 18.18.

187. Vide: Ram. II. 69. 19; IV. 33.9 and 12.

188. Vide: Ram. II. 69.24.

189. Manu, VII. 214-17.

190. Kāryitaṃ mahatkarma bhartarāhṛtyamanarthakam,
Acharme yo/sya ------ Ram. II. 69.16.

191. Baddhasya vadhyaśa yathā niṣante rjaśparādhvāda
taskarasya. (Ram. V.26.7 (also see IV. 33.12).

192. Vide: Vairūpyambaṇaḥ ------ Ram. V. 50.7.


194. Śad dandaḥ, saptakaśaḥ ------ Arthaśāstra, IV.3.

195. Ram. V. 51.

196. Bandhananī ca sarvāni raja marge nivesayet,
Duṣkhitā yatra drṣyeranvikṛtāh papakārīnāḥ.

Manu, IX.228.
197. See Chapter III.

198. Tatalddhau saiddhiyapnoti viparītasatamyathā,

    Caturśādvyāvahareṇa vivādeṣu pradasitāḥ. Yājñā.II.8

199. Rām.II.94.48.

200. Rām.II.94.47.

201. Ibid.


203. Rām.V.50.7.

204. Manu, VIII.66-123.

205. Prācetaso/nehd dasamaḥ putro Rāghavanaṇandana,

    Na smarāṣṭāṃ vākyāṃ tathēmāu tava putraṃ,
    Behuvṛgasaahāraṇi tapasārāṃ sayaṁ kṛtā,
    Tasyāḥ phalamupāsāṁśapāī saithiliyathā. Rām.VII.87.17-18

206. Tulāghāpo vīpasya kośo divyāṁ hi viśuddhayey,

    Mahūbhīyogesvetāni āśrakasthebhīyoktari. Yājñā. II.97.

207. Yājñā. II. 105-109.

208. Evamuktvā tu vaiḍēhi parikṣavya hatānem,

    Vivesā ājvalanāṃ dīptāṃ niḥsaṅgemantaṁtāṇa.

    Rām.VI.104.25.

209. Upāsarpatā Vaiḍēhi dīpyanāṃ hatānem,

    Pranasya devatābhyaśa brahmaṇabhyasā ca Maithili,
    Baddhājaliṣṭe cedamuvācagnisamanipataḥ.

    Yathā me hṛdayaṃ nityaṃ nēpasapati Rāghavāt,
    Tathā lokasya sākṣīśa saṁ sarvataḥ pātū pāvakaḥ.

    Rām.VII.104. 22-24.
210. Yathāham Rāghavādanyāṃ menasūpi na cintye,
Tathā me Mādhavī devī vivarṣāj datumarhati. Rām.VII.88.10

211. Naunyāṇāṃ prāṇāntiko dandō brahmaṇasya vidhiyate,
Itareṣāntu varṇāṇāṃ danḍaḥ prāṇāntiko bhavet.
Na jātu brahmaṇāṃ hanyātsarvapāpyavavasthitam,
Rājstrādeṇaḥ bahūḥ kuryātsemagramagradhanamakṣataṃ.

Arthasāstra,IV.10.


213. Puruṣaḥ cāparādham ca kāranaḥ gurulāghaṃv,
Annubandham tadātvam ca deśakālaṃ samāgya ca.
Uttamaṃ mahābhikṣavāṃ praigṣēṣa daṇḍakarmāṇi,
Rājāsca prakṛtināṃ ca kalpayedanta sthitīḥ.

Vide, Rām.II. 58.21.


215. Vistaraye tvam smuṭite ma bhuddharmaviparyayah,
Tyāgo vadhoh vā vihitah Sādhunasmabhayaṃ sanam.

Rām.VII.96.13.

216. We have already stated above that in the Rāmāyaṇa period there were the courts which were presided over by

217. Amātyas.

218. Mitākṣara on Yajñ, II.2.

219. Naikhe paśyerekanāryāṇi ——— 'Sukra, IV.5.6

220. Rām.IV.18.

221. Sa tvam puruṣasārdūla trailokyānyabhipalat,
Lakṣaṃaṇaṣya vadhenaṣya jagatsvasthaṃ kuruṣya ha.

Rām.VII.96.11.
222. Rām. VII.96.
223. Tasya parisado madhya Rāmāḥ vacanamabrahvīt,
Madvaco brūta gacchadhvanito bhagavato/ntikem.
Yadi śuddhaśamacāra yadi va vitakalmaṣa,
Karotviḥātmanāḥ śuddhimānmanyā mahāsūraṁ. Rām. VII.86.34.
224. Āp. Dharmaśūtra, II.11.29.5.
226. Rām. II.94.47 and 49.
228. Daṇḍen ca praṇā rakṣa ma ca daṇḍamakāraṇa,
Rām. VII.70.3.