In ancient India, the theories of the origin of state were in fact the theories about the origin of kingship. But clear indications as to when and how it originated are shrouded in mystery. Probably its first allusions are made in the Brahmanas which tell us how the Devas, being without a king, were defeated again and again by the Asuras. Thereafter they decided to have a king. Having thus made up their minds, they, as told to us by the Aitareya Brahmana, appointed Indra as their king, thinking that he was the most vigorous, most strong, most valiant and most perfect who carried the work best. In another version preserved in the Tattiriya Brahmana, the Brajapati appointed Indra as the king of the gods. Having got a king to lead in war, the gods ultimately succeeded in defeating the demons. Thus, Beni Prasad has rightly remarked that the state in India originated in a state of war.

The origin of the state as a result of a social contract is best alluded to in the Dīrghaṇīkāya, an ancient Buddhist work which tells us: - In the distant past, the human beings were made of mind and were self-luminated; gradually their self-lumination vanished away and the sun, the moon, the stars, night and day, months, seasons and air became manifest; evil and immoral customs became ripe; some beings of greedy disposition stole and made use of what
belonged to others; theft, lie, revile and assault made their appearance; thereupon, those beings gathered themselves together and after taking counsel selected the most handsome, gracious and capable man from amongst themselves addressing him thus - "Come now, good being! do punish us —— we will contribute to you a portion of our rice." He consented to do so.¹

Now, certain points emerge from the above quotation -

1. Ancient Indians were familiar with some golden age in the hoary past, when they had no state and yet could manage their affairs by virtue of their intrinsic moral values.

2. With the passage of time the golden age deteriorated, giving place to a state of anarchy on account of greed and violence of the people.

3. When conditions became intolerable, the people on their own accord selected out of themselves a king and entered with him into a bilateral contract, according to which they, out of their own free will, surrendered their liberty of action and undertook to obey the king and pay him taxes.

4. They did so in the firm belief that the king will give them protection. Their obedience and payment of taxes to the king were clearly conditioned by the
discharge of king’s obligation to protect them.
If the king failed to fulfil his obligation, the contract was clearly terminable.

Thus, the king was not conceived of as an absolute king under the theory of social contract as propounded by the Dīrghāṃkāra.

A near approach to the same theory is found in the Mahābhārata also, which has an account of the origin of kingship as follows:

In the days of yore people, being without a king, met with destruction by devouring one another like (the stronger) fishes devouring the weaker ones in water. The people gathered and made compacts to cast off those who became harsh in speech and violent in temper or who seduced and abducted others' wives or who robbed the wealth that belonged to others. Everyone tried to behave accordingly in order to instil confidence in the minds of people of all the four Varnas; but even then they were not happy, being unable to abide by the compacts. Then, they approached God Brahmā and submitted to him that they were perishing because of not being governed by a king. They requested Him to appoint a king for them and promised to worship him in return for protection. Consequent upon that, Brahmā appointed Manu for kingship. Manu, at first, refused to accept the responsibility sensing the cruelty involved in
the task and the great difficulty of ruling over men who were deceitful. But the people told Manu not to be afraid, and explained that the sinners would be punished by their own sins without involving him. They pledged to contribute $1/5$ of their livestock and cash and $1/10$ of their crops for maintaining the treasure. The prominent men were also promised to guard him from all sides. Thus, increasing his strength and making him invincible for his enemies, they told him further that the people would be happy under his wise administration following their respective duty, and that he would receive $1/4$ part of the merit from the good deeds of the people.---5

Kantilva, giving an account of the origin of kingship, says that people overwhelmed by the law of fishes made Manu the son of Vaivasvat their king and assigned $1/6$ of the grain, $1/10$ of the commodities and money as his share; maintained by that kings bring about well being and security of subjects. Those who do not pay the fines and taxes take on themselves the sins of those (kings) and (kings) who do not bring about well being and security (take on themselves the sins) of subjects.6

Kantilva, being in favour of powerful monarchy, could not make his king absolutely subservient to the people; therefore, he desisted from describing the theory of social contrast in detail. But from whatever little he has said,
we can safely infer that he, too, was aware of a kingless state which was characterised by Matsyavatya. According to him also, it was under those intolerable conditions that kingship was created. It is another matter that he does not explicitly tell us that it was created by the people's will. But by stating that the king was expected to give protection to the people and that the latter were under obligation to pay him taxes, he clearly implies a bilateral contract between the king and the people.

Kāmandaka also refers to the chaotic conditions of the pre-political society when he says that abstaining from the use of coercive force (Danda) causes Matsyavatya (law of fishes), and that such a conduct on the part of the king is for the destruction of subjects and the world submerges in Śrīlaṁba Naraka because of lust and greed. The king, according to Kāmandaka, only saves it by his Danda; this world is by nature afflicted with lust for others' women and money, but it keeps to the right path for fear of Danda.7

Rūmāyana also manifests its view on the kingless society. The Ayodhyakūpa alludes to the pre-government conditions described by Kauṭilya and others when Mārkaṇḍeya says that without a king the country would encounter disaster, and goes on further to describe the hostile conditions which can prevail in a kingless country. On the basis of Mārkaṇḍeya's above account, it can be said that according to Vālmīki also the conditions before the origin of kingship were chaotic.
In the Mātavanyāva conditions, the people did not obey their elders; their wealth and women were not safe as nothing could be claimed to be one's own; there was no welfare or justice and every one ate another like the fishes in water.

The idea, however, has not been elaborated further to indicate as to how the state originated, although it is considered by the poet to be an off-shoot of the chaotic conditions of Mātavanyāva in the distant past.

The Rāmāyaṇa also has allusions to some kind of a contract having been executed between the king and the people before the latter surrendered their rights to the former and installed him on the throne to rule. In the Araṇyaśāstra, the sages tell Rāma that it is a great sin on the part of a king who takes 1/6 part of the earning of his people as Bali and does not protect them like his own son. They also tell him that a king who protects his people dutifully receives 1/4 part of the merit of their good deeds. In the Avadhvākāśa also, it is clearly said that a king who does not protect his people after extracting 1/6 part of their earning as Bali (tax) earns a great sin; on the other hand, it is said that if people betray the king who protects them like his own sons, they also earn a sin.

The above references clearly prescribe bonds of duties for both the sides. Thus, it is as near an approach
to the contract theory as found in the other works referred to above. It is, however, remarkable that in the Mahābhārata, only the people surrender their rights to Manu and make promises to provide him with tax and men to guard, in return for his protection and administration, without clearly extracting a promise from the latter or making him liable to earning some kind of sin for dereliction of his duties. But in the Rāmāyaṇa the case is different; here the supposed contract sounds more bilateral. It is in fact more akin to the idea expressed in the Arthaśāstra. The duties of the people described in the Rāmāyaṇa are to obey the king who rightly performs his dharma - which are same as taken upon themselves by the subjects while requesting Manu in the Mahābhārata to be the king - and of the king is to protect his people like his own sons. The Rāmāyaṇa, thus, seems to be conceding the idea that the first king took upon himself the duty to provide complete protection to all the people from all sorts of fears (bhava), and that the people agreed to pay him 1/6 of their earnings and share with him the merit of their good deeds, allowing 1/4 of it for the king.

We find another account of the origin of kingship in the Mahābhārata which says - In the days of yore, namely in Satyavuga, there was neither the king nor the kingdom; there was no Deśa or Deśadharma; the people protected each other by the rule of righteousness alone. Later, the people became victims of Moha (infatuation) and lost reason, because
of which they lost sight of righteousness also. All became greedy and yearned for things they did not have; therefore, they were afflicted by another vice, namely Kāma, which was followed by passion. So under the yoke of passion, they lost the sense of discrimination between good and bad, and due to that crisis of Dharma the Vedas also vanished. That caused a great panic among the gods and they went to Brahmā to find a way out. Thereupon Brahmā prepared His archetypal work on the science of polity (Dāndaniti). The gods then addressed to Viṣṇu and requested Him to ordain someone who deserved the highest place among men; the great God appointed His mind-begotten son Viraja for the place. Viraja, his son and grandson, we read, were ascetics who naturally neglected their duty to protect the people as imposed upon them by God. However, the fourth lineal descendant was a true ruler, expert in Dāndaniti; but the fifth, though versed in polity, was self-indulgent while the sixth, Vena, was swayed by passions of anger and hatred, and was unrighteous towards his subjects. Therefore, the sages learned in the Vedas killed Vena. To have a new king they churned Vena's right arm whence cameforth Pṛthu, fully armed and versed in the Vedas and their auxiliaries, i.e. the art of war and the science of polity. Pṛthu desired to be instructed in the directions to which he might apply his keen intellect, and the gods and the sages together imposed upon him a number of obligations and a solemn oath. It was after Pṛthu had given his assent to the conditions
that the demigods and the sages agreed to become his ministers and assistants. Viṣṇu and Brahmā along with the lesser gods headed by Indra and the sages joined in his coronation; Viṣṇu Himself fixed the status of the king so that no one else could surpass him, and entered into the king's person by means of his power.  

The main features of the above account are as follows:

1) Dāpaññāti was created by the great God Brahmā expressly for the guidance of kings, but it sat loosely upon the first few generations of the divine rulers; while it failed to impress itself upon the earlier rulers, its restraints were broken loose by the later ones. The Dāpaññāti in this account is considered divine.

2) The king has also been described as of divine origin.

3) The divinity of the king does not make him absolute; he is made to accept a number of obligations and take a solemn oath before being coronated.

4) The institution of ministers has been imparted semi-divinity.

Manu visualizes a pre-political society where there was no respite for the people; they ran here and there in fear (of the stronger). According to him, the king was created by God by taking a measure from each of the eight Dīkṣālas, and was made the most illustrious of all the
beings. The king according to this theory has a divine origin for the protection of the people. Manu, thus, propounds the theory of divine origin of the king.

In the Ramayana, there are some references which also allude to the divine origin of the king. In the Balakanda, Prajapati is stated as the first king who ruled the earth. In another verse, Manu has been referred to as the first Prajapati in the lineage of Brahma-Marici-Kasyapa- and Vivasvan. Manu has been remembered also as the Dandadhara who ruled in the Krtavaca and gave the earth to Ikshvaku; he has been referred to as Raja in verse in the Avodhyakanda.

The Ramayana again manifests in the divine origin of kingship: Vaivasvata Manu, Manu or Svayambhu Manu has been referred to as the first king of the earth. He was fifth in the lineage of Brahma. He has been called as the first Dandadhara who passed on the rule to Ikshvaku.

Moreover, the king in the epic has been addressed also as Nararaja, Dharma, Living, Lokapala, one fourth measure of Indra, Parasiva, Manya and Guru. In a verse in the Avodhyakanda, it is said - A king has divinity though he is considered to be a human being. In the Kiskindhakanda, it has been unambiguously said that kings are the gods living on this earth in the form of human beings and, therefore, they should not be attacked or spoken harshly to by the people.
Thus, the above references leave no doubt in the mind of the reader that the Rāmāyana believes only in the divine origin of the king.\textsuperscript{23} The allusion to some sort of contract having been entered into by the king and the people points to the fact that there were well defined Dharmas for the king and the people to abide by.

But the idea of the divine origin of kingship was never pushed to any absurd extremes in India, as we find in the west. In the Mahābhārata, an oath is extracted of Pṛthu Vaiśya immediately before he is coronated. Many while describing the circumstances of the creation of kingship implies that the king was meant for the protection and welfare of the people. The Rāmāyana, too, does not concede that a king can do whatever he likes; he has to follow the dictates of Dharma. His powers are limited. He can be deposed, disobeyed or killed if he does not follow the dictates of Dharma.

According to Manu, a king who harasses his subjects loses his life, family and kingdom.\textsuperscript{24} Narada says, "On account of his majesty and sanctity, a king or a Brahmana is not to be abused if they do not swerve from the right path; one should not treat him with contempt or scold the king, one should abide by his order since death may follow from violating it."\textsuperscript{25} Thus, Narada's view has tremendous similarity with what has been said in the epic, and Manu, too, does not differ. As already cited above, a king
according to the Rāmāyaṇa should not be treated with contempt or spoken harshly to. This, however, held good as long as he stayed on the right path since the epic propounds that belittles kill a king who does not protect his people. 26 We learn from the epic that a king who went astray from the path of Dharma could be openly accused, scolded, imprisoned, banished or even killed. In the Uttarākānda, we read that the Brāhmaṇa whose son died young accused Rāma openly of having done some unrighteous deed; 27 the sages of Dandākāranya spoke to Rāma of not being provided protection even after extracting 1/6 part of earning of the subjects in the form of Ṛeli 28; Vibhīṣana 29 and Kumbhakarṇa 30 scolded Rāvana for being indiscreet and unrighteous.

Satruṅgha proclaimed that a king who took the unrighteous path should be imprisoned after considering his case on merit: 31 Asmañjasa, the eldest son of king Sa grand, was sent into exile for tormenting the subjects; 32 king Daṇḍa was annihilated along with his kingdom by sage Bhārgava for molesting latter's daughter, Bhārgavi. 33

Thus, the epic does not recommend absolute power for the king although it concedes that he is a god himself living on this earth in human form. Here, the duty and obedience on the part of the people are not based on the divine origin of kingship, and the doctrine propounded in the epic does not lead to the requirement of a total submission and non-resistance to a wicked king.
Other Important Features of the State:

In ancient India, the state was tribal in character for a long time. Apart from having frequent references to Vîşapatis and Janapatis, the Râveda refers to specific tribes like the Yadus, the Auras, the Amus, the Turvasus, etc. Vîşâmîtra's prayers are said to have protected Bharatas. In the Râjâmya sacrifice, the king was anointed as the ruler of the Bharatas or the Kuru-Pâñcalas and not as the sovereign of a particular province or kingdom. The Râstra-State notion evolved gradually in the later Vedic period, and we find it clearly referred to in the Atharvaveda. The Râmyâna-state was also a Râstra state having a particular territory for a permanent settlement and population, etc.

The evidence of the epic shows that India of those times was covered with a network of states mostly governed by kings. These states generally comprised a capital city (prâja), possibly some towns and a number of agricultural and pastoral (ghosa) villages. A vast empire extending from sea to sea was unknown. In fact, we find that large states were divided into small ones. For example, Râma divided Kosala into two parts, ruled from different seats by his sons, and Bharata divided the Ghandarva country, won by him, into two parts, appointing his two sons to rule each of them. Similarly, the sons of
'Satrughna' and 'Lakṣmaṇa' were given a state each to rule, dividing the larger states among them. The Āyavṣedha sacrifices were no doubt common, but they were performed in the Rāmāyana period primarily for religious motives. Annexation of territories belonging to other kings for the expansion of state was not considered worthwhile. The kings were normally contented by mere subjugation of the neighbouring rulers; and there is nothing in the Rāmāyana which may indicate that an Āyavṣedha sacrifice meant annexation of other territories.

The royal court of Ayodhyā has been described as being attended by Śrāmantas (subordinate kings). In the Bālakāndada, they have been referred to as having been in the capital to pay tributes to king Dāsaratha. In the Ayodhyākāndada, many subordinate kings have been described as seated in the court of the Kosala king, keeping their heads bowed in respect for the sovereign. But the impression formed by Rāma's assertion that the whole earth belonged to the Ikṣvākuś does not sustain when we find that Rāma, while going to forest, could reach the boundary of the state within a day or so by travelling in a chariot;

and that independent Kekaya and Videha kingdoms existed in the north-west and north-east respectively while there was the Vatsa kingdom adjoining its boundaries towards the south. The military expeditions against the Gandharvas and Lavaṇa, under the leaderships of Bharata and 'Satrughna, also speak otherwise.
The occurrences of words like राजाला, कास्याल, यामद्धार्या do indicate that imperialistic ideas were in the air. But, from what we understand from the रामायण, the use of the last two words seems figurative and unjustified. That the feudatories existed in that period is evident from the above quoted references; they did not enjoy sovereignty and their foreign policy, army and treasure were subordinate to the sovereign called सार्वभूमिक, an epithet used for the कालिकवत्र kings.

Elements of State:

According to almost all the ancient इंदौ authorities, the state (रा) is constituted of seven elements. The महाभारत, काँतिल्य, नाम, the यामद्धार्यात, यात्रावल्ल्य, कांगनिक, and गौतमत्व (quoted in सरस्वतिलाख) all agree that these seven elements are स्वामित्व, अमाय, जनपोदा (or राष्ट्र or जन), दुर्ग (or पुरा), दानिय and मित्र. The credit of clearly defining the state for the first time, however, goes to कार्यतिल्य, and it is considered to be his unique contribution to the history of political thought. The सरस्वतिलाख, a text of the 16th century A.D., ascribes the seven element definition to Gautama from where it quotes; but it cannot be traced in his law book which has been much tempered with and, therefore, considered a work of later date.

The रामायण does not give us any clear definition of state nor it refers to the सांख्य theory propounded
by Mahābhārata and others. But that should not lead anyone to believe that the Rāmāyaṇa is ignorant of the idea as all the seven elements of the state have been referred to in the epic together, giving a clear indication that they were believed to be the elements of the state in the times of the Rāmāyaṇa. In various other contexts, all the seven elements of the state enumerated in the books on polity occur again and again in the epic-text in groups of twos, threes, fours and fives. We will endeavour in the ensuing discussion to prove that the Rāmāyaṇa is conversant with the Sampāḷa theory of state.

In the books on polity, the seven elements are called Aṅgas or Prakṛtis. The use of word Prakṛti is very common in the Rāmāyaṇa, but a writer believes that it has been employed in the sense of the subjects or for the ministers and state officials and nowhere in the sense of constituents of state. However, it cannot be denied that the word Prakṛti has many a time been used in the epic to mean some of the elements of the state. In the Ayodhyākhaṇḍa, for example, the word has been used thrice in the context of Bharata being offered kingship. In the first and second references, the word has been evidently used to mean the Pārīśad which comprised the Amśīyas, Pārajà (represented by Naigamas and Pauras), Mitras (allied kings and subordinate kings) and Balādhyakṣas. The use of word Prakṛti-pradhāna (heads of the Prakṛtis) also does indicate that Prakṛti in
the Rāmāyaṇa means 'element'. In the above context Śvēmi was present in the Pariṣad while the elements like Durga and kāśa must have been represented by their chief officers. Besides that, an Ayodhyākāṇḍa reference proves it beyond doubt that the term Prakṛti has been used in the epic to mean the elements of the state, in addition to meaning people in general. So this word though not always used in the Rāmāyaṇa strictly in the sense of elements of state, yet at times it denotes some of the elements of state.

It has already been said above that all the seven elements of state have not only been discussed in the Rāmāyaṇa at one place, but there are several other verses wherein two, three, four and five constituents have been mentioned. Thus, in a passage in the Kīśkindhākāṇḍa as many as four elements have been referred to saying that a king who controls these elements effectively enjoys a big kingdom. The Amātya, too, were considered an indispensable element of state as is evident from numerous references in the epic. An example can be found in the Ayodhyākāṇḍa wherein Bharata is described being advised by Rāma to take counsel with wise Amātyas, Suhṛda (Mitrās) and Mantrīs.

In the Ayodhyākāṇḍa itself, all the seven elements of state have been referred to, pointing at the same time to the importance the author assigns to each of them for the welfare and existence of the state.
Hi grata, we read, went to the forest to bring back Rāma to rule the country; Rāma did not know Bharata's intention and, therefore, out of his anxiety aroused at the sight of his brother coming with a large army and the members of the royal family, enquired of him whether all was well at Ayodhya. The enquiries made by Rāma concerned King Daśaratha (Śvetā), the Aṇorhita, Mantrīs and Amātyyas (Anālayas), the Senāpati, the Mukhyas (chiefs) and the army (Bala), the forts (Dūrga), treasure (Kosā) and the country (Janapada). In addition to these, the seventh element, namely Mitra, may also be traced in the speech of Rāma referred to above: he hoped that Bharata spent his treasure for the sake of warriors, in the form of their salaries, and for the allies (Mitragava). Spending for the sake of allies was justified because allies in those days were costly presents as have been referred to in the epic at various places. The term Amātya in the Rāmāyaṇa includes important functionaries called Aṇorhita, Upādhyāya, śīvij, Amātya and Mantrī as we find in Kautālīya and Kauṭālā. The Senāpati (Commander-in-chief), it can be seen, has been mentioned along with the Mukhyas and the soldiers and, therefore, stands covered by the term Bala. The order of occurrence of the elements in the Rāmāyaṇa is - Śvetā, Amātya, Bala, Janapada, Dūrga, Kosā and Mitra.

Regarding the relative importance of the each element, we read in the Mahābhārata the same what has been said
later by *Meni in different words saying, "Yet in the state having seven Āṅgas (elements)—there is no element more important than the other by reason of the importance of the qualities of each for the others; each part is particularly qualified for accomplishing certain jobs, and thus each one is important for the particular purpose which is achieved through its means."81 Thus, Kane has rightly observed that the Mahābhārata and *Meni both believe in there being an organic unity in the several elements of Rājya.82 To Kautilya king is the state.83 But prior to this statement he makes himself clear by saying that it is the king who appoints ministers, servants and superintendents, who takes measures of relief (in case the calamities hit other Prakṛtis) and measures of prosperity; it is the king who appoints new ministers when those already working are afflicted by calamities; if the ruler is prosperous, he transmits prosperity to his Prakṛtis.84 So when Kautilya says that king is the state, he does not mean that the other elements are not important. Kauśāntika who follows Kautilya like a pupil removes all doubts when he says that all the elements are complimentary to one another; if the state is defective in one out of the seven elements, it does not pull well.85 The Śukravāsi, no doubt, remarks that the king is the head of the Śautāṅga body-state.86

Nevertheless, the sequence in which the elements are placed on the list by various authorities is more important
as it manifests the order of importance attached to every one of the elements, although it is proclaimed that no element is more important. The preceding element is evidently considered more important than the following. Svāmī, who is placed at the top of the list, is thus the most important element.

The Rāmāyaṇa also considers all limbs of the state important, and that is why Rāma is found enquiring about the well being of every one of them. But the king to the epic also is the most important of all and has been placed first. The sequence of placement of the elements on the list in the Rāmāyaṇa varies from other works since we find that Bala has been given precedence over Janapada, Durga, and Kośa which precede it in the list given in the Arthasastra. This change can be attributed to the political conditions of the epic-period in which the Aryas were in control of the northern parts of India only, and were constantly fighting the formidable Rākṣasas for the sake of survival.

The Rāmāyaṇa does not conceive of a kingless state; that is why it considers such an extermination of a king a heinous sin as may render a state kingless. Thus, it was obligatory for the conqueror to appoint a new king in place of the one who had been eliminated. Vālmīki seems to believe that there could not be a state without a king; a country without king, according to the epic, is just a forest being governed by the law of jungle.
Qualities of the Elements:

Many writers on polity have given disquisition on the subject of qualities required in every element of state. These can be discussed as follows, comparing them at the same time with those which have been enumerated in the Rāmāyaṇa.

Svāmī

Svāmī according to the Mahābhārata should have a number of good qualities, namely character, self-control, politeness and righteousness; he should be good-tempered, should have a smiling face and should be selfless, wise, liberal, mild and industrious. According to Kautilya, he should have (1) Abhisamākṣagara vis. high birth, good fortune, intelligence, spirit, reverence (towards elders), righteousness and truthfulness (2) Pratīṣṭhāna like attention, power to retain, thorough understanding, consideration, etc (3) Utsāhaguna like bravery, resentment, agility, dexterity and personal excellences like eloquence, boldness, memory, intellect, strength etc. Besides others, have also expressed their views on the subject in the same manner and on the same lines.

The qualities which according to the epic Svāmī should have are enumerated best in the Ayodhyākānda on the occasion of the selection of a Crown-Prince of Ayodhyā.
the subordinate kings and the Paurā-jānapadās describe Rāma's qualities in the following words:

"Rāma is truth-speaking, truth-abiding, and noble. He has established Dharma with dignity and in true sense. He equals the moon and the earth by providing happiness to the people and by his forbearance. In wisdom and valour he is like Brhaspati and Indra. He is well versed in Dharma, true to his promise, good natured, grateful, self-controlled, mild, resolute and sweet spoken. He is very learned and sits near the Brāhmaṇas. He is expert in arms and properly educated in the Vedas and their Aṅgas. In music he is the best on the earth. He is a source of welfare. His nature is like that of Sadhus and liberal. He is very wise and has been taught by the best teachers in exercising Dharma and Artha. When he goes out for a battle, he never returns without achieving victory. Every day he enquires of the people about their sons, wives and Agnis as he would of his own relatives. He protects the subjects by his valour and his senses are not instilled with passion. He is the beloved of the people, and by his qualities he augments their happiness."  

Earlier, in the same kanda, there is another description of Rāma's qualities by virtue of which he was considered the most suitable candidate for the throne. According to these references, Rāma had the following qualities:
He was always composed, sweet speaking, grateful, ready to learn from elders, of noble family, noble, bold, truthful in speech, mild, trained by those learned in Dharma and Artha, learned in Dharma and Artha, endowed with power to retain, intelligent, expert in worldly conduct, learned in scriptures, bestowed with understanding of human beings, just in punishment and favour, resourceful in measures of income and informed of approved ways of expenditure, well versed in all the sciences whether in Sanskrit or other languages, learned in all the five arts (Vaidyikāsila), riding and training horses and elephants, the best in science of war (Dhanuvyeda), expert in army-affairs vis. attack and strike, unenvious and bereft of anger, arrogance and jealousy.

Thus, the excellences of Sva śa envisaged in the Raśāyana in the above references and in other verses are the same as prescribed in the books on polity.

Aśāya:

The Mahabharata, the Arthasastra, Napū, the Vipraudharmottaramūrya, the Matyayurupāna and Sūkra (as also the other polity writers) all say that it is impossible for a person to accomplish even an ordinary task single handed, what to talk of the government which has a great good of the people as its aim. Therefore they advise the king to appoint Ašāyas. The Rāśāyana, we see, also considers Aśāyas as most essential for the prosperity and well being of the state.
For this second constituent of state, the polity writers as well as the Rāmāyana use three terms viz. Śacīva, Amātya and Mantri. Kaśīviva uses the term Amātya for the administrative cadre in general and Mantri for the counsellors. Hamps uses the term Śacīva to denote a counsellor and Amātya for an administrator. Kaśīviva also takes these words for different senses. According to him, an Amātya should know what is lying where and the fruition, and should determine what is to be done and not to be done. For Śacīvas he says that they should be able to keep Mantra (secret of discussions). Thus, by Śacīva he means a counsellor and by Amātya an executive or administrator. The Amarkośa makes the position clear by explaining that an Amātya, who is a Bhīṣmācīva, is called Mantri (Counsellor) while Amātayas other than Mantris are called Karmasacīvas (executives). But Kane opines that Śacīva and Amātya appear to have been used as synonyms.

In the Rāmāyana, we find that all the three terms have been used frequently. Besides, another term, Kattisacīva, has also been employed. The epic seems to be confusing the meaning of these terms as it employs all the three (at different places) for the same functionary of the state. But at other places it makes itself very clear. It separates Mantri from Amātya by prescribing separate sets of qualifications for each of them and by placing them separately in the same verse, and at another place,
In the same context, later, it makes it clear vide description of Rāvana sitting with his Mantrīs, drawing his comparison with Indra surrounded by his Śacivas, that the terms Śaciva and Mantrī have been used as synonyms.

We further understand from the Rāmāyana that an Amātya could be appointed as a Mantrī or Śaciva in accordance with the job assignment as is proved by the examples of Hammān, Brahmata, and Sumantra. But some of the Mantrīs at Ayodhya, viz. Markandeya etc. are never called Śacivas or Amātys; such Mantrīs were only counsellors and they appear in the epic in the court of Ayodhya only. Thus, the term Amātya seems to be taken by Vālmiki for the cadre from which Mantrīs, the superior functionaries, could be selected. Mantrī according to Kautilya also is a higher grade than Amātya in general. The Rāmāyana discriminates between Mantrī and Amātya and, like Kautilya, places Mantrī above. It is also clear from the Rāmāyana that a non-Amātya Mantrī was only a counsellor while an Amātya-Mantrī was required to perform executive duties also.

The 'Sāntipāra enumerates fourteen qualities of the minister at one place and some more at another. The Arthaśāstra says - he should be a native of the country, high-born, easy to handle, trained in arts, intelligent, persevering, dexterous, eloquent, bold, endowed with a ready wit, energetic, powerful and possessing the eye (of polity).
He should be able to bear hardships and should be upright, friendly, firmly devoted, good-natured, healthy and spirited.\textsuperscript{124} Manu advises the king to appoint Sakivas whose families have been in royal service since many generations. The other qualities described by him are more or less the same as prescribed by Kautilya.\textsuperscript{125} Kesharaka also enumerates similar qualities to be possessed by a Sakiva.\textsuperscript{126}

Amātya is considered a very important constituent of the state by the Rāmayana as already shown above. We come across this word in the epic first in the Bālakanda where eight Amāyas of king Daśaratha, besides his Purohitas, Rtvij and six other Mantrīs, have been introduced.\textsuperscript{127} The qualities of Amāya are given in detail here and again in the Ayodhyākanda.\textsuperscript{128} The qualities given in the Bālakanda are mainly politeness, modesty, illustriousness, proficiency, self-control, high-spirit, expertise in the science of arms, firm-valour, fame, carefulness, obedience, brilliance, forbearance, sweet-speech, truthfulness in all circumstances, ability to know internal and external affairs, expertise in Vyavahāra (dealings), impartiality in distributing justice, ability to augment treasure (Kośa) and army (Bala), bravery, energy, complete knowledge of the science of polity, ability to provide good and efficient administration for the protection of citizens, purity, amiability, watchfulness (with diplomatic eye), knowledge of time and place, ability
to keep secrets and expertise in diplomacy. In the Avadhākārya's kaccitsarga, the qualities are briefly given as intelligence, bravery, expertise learning, family tradition of royal service; parity. From among the Āmātyas who were well tested, those who were very brave, learned and had control over their sense-organs, who were born of good families and had the ability to understand from gestures and signs, we learn, were made counsellors.

It has been opined that Kautilya excludes the priest from the list of elements, and this is his distinct service to the cause of political theory. It is true that not only Kautilya but Kama, Kāmandaka and others also do not include Purohitā in the list of seven elements; but the fact is that they do not, in any way, diminish his importance for the state. Kautilya, in fact, wants the king to follow the priest like a pupil, a son and a servant and further says, "The Kṣatriya power, which has been increased by the Brāhmaṇa, sanctified by the spells in the form of counsellor's counsel and armed by the compliance of the science (of polity), triumphs and remains unconquered." Kama also makes it clearly obligatory on the king to appoint a Purohitā and a Rtvij. Kautilya and Kāmandaka both enlist the qualities required in the priest just after by the term Āmātya. In the Rāmāyana also, we find the priest mentioned just after Āmātyas, and it is very clearly indicated that the priest (Purohitā) commanded more respect than Āmātyas and Mantrīs.
Janapada:

Janapada is mentioned as Rastra in the post-Mauryan texts. The Sāntiparvā uses the term Janapada while defining the Sāntāṇa state. But in other contexts, where all the other six elements appear, the term Rastra has been preferred. Kāmandaka has also used Rastra occasionally while Vaiśnavalkya mentions it simply as Jana.

In the Arthaśāstra, Janapada is intended to mean territory and population both. The territory, according to Kautilya, should have a good climate, pastures, and a fertile soil. It should be inhabited by industrious peasants who are able to bear the burden of taxes. It should also have intelligent masters, be predominantly populated by the members of lower classes and its people should be loyal and devoted. The Agnipurāṇa states that the king should live in a country inhabited by Vaiyās and Śūiras, a few Brāhmaṇas and many hired labourers. Kāmandaka amplifies only what has been said by Kautilya.

In the Rāmāyaṇa, Janapada, Rastra, Viṣaya and Deśa are the words used to denote Janapada of the list. These are taken in the sense of territory and people collectively and separately. For example, the word Rastra means the people and the territory when Daśaratha says, "You choose that Bharata may become the king of Rastra." But it means territory or countryside only, when Rama says, "I leave the Rau, the Rastra and the earth for Bharata."
Similarly, Viṣaya means territory and people in the statement "As far as is Daṇḍa's Viṣaya", and territory or countryside only in the statement made by Vālī, "When did I commit a sin in your Viṣaya or Pura."  

The qualities of Janapada described in the Ayodhya-Māndya are that it should have a thick population, water-reservoirs, enough animals (to plough fields), irrigation facilities and beauty. Further, it should have no fear from bad elements in the society and wild animals. From among the inhabitants, those who live by cattle and agriculture, namely Vaiśyas, are considered important from the point of view of prosperity of the state. The Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas should live in the city in a large number, according to the epic, and they have priority over other castes; there are instructions that the state officials should not use force for collecting tax from them.  

Thus, the population pattern in Janapada in the age of the Rāmāyaṇa seems to be similar to the one advised later by Kaṇṭhilva, who prefers populating the countryside with people belonging to lower castes. In the epic we find that the cities were with thousands of Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas while the rural areas had population mostly comprising Vaiśyas and Sūdras.

Pura  

The Mahābhārata refers to it as Pura. It is called Pura by Manu also and occupies the third place in his list
of the elements. Thus, Pura is a synonym of Durga and
should be understood in the sense of a fortified city,
which meaning can also be inferred from the two independent
sections, Durgyavāhāna and Purannayāna provided by Kautilya.
The Rāma is a synonym of Durga eM
sense of a fortified city,
which meaning can also be inferred from the two independent
sections, Ayodhya and Kiskindha. The Ramayana employs the term Durga for a fortified city
as well as a fort: the descriptions of Ayodhya and Kiskindha and Lanka are those of fortified cities, but Rama's
enquiries from Hanuman indicate that the term means a
fort also.

In the Mahābhārata, Bhīma describes six types of
forts and so do Yama, Katava, Agni, Visvāhāmanottara, and Śukra. These are: (1) Dharmavāna which
is built like a bow and is waterless five Yojanas around
a raised plain, (2) Mahādurgā (land-fort) which is surrounded
by a wall built with stones or burnt bricks at least twelve
feet high and twentyfour feet wide, (3) Jala or Adhura
(waterfort) which has water on all sides, (4) Vārkaśadurgā
(tree-fort) which is surrounded by thorny tall trees, creepers
and bushes upto one Yojana, (5) Ardura (Men-fort) that has
a large army of four sections guarding, (6) Giridurgā
(mountain-fort) which has a difficult climb with only one
narrow access. According to the Mahābhārata, Haradurgā (or
Maruvadurgā) is the most difficult to conquer, but Manu
says that the mountain-fortress is the best.

Kautilya speaks of four kinds of fort, namely Audaka,
Pārvata, Dhanyana and Yana. The first two according to him
The Rāmāyana also tells us about four types of forts but these are (1) Ṛṣideva (River-fort), (2) Parvata (Mountain-fort), (3) Yama (Forest-fort) and (4) Kṛṣṇa (Man-made). Thus, the epic is acquainted with three types out of the four enlisted in the Arthashastra and four out of the six enumerated by other writers quoted above. It clearly means the man-made type of forts by the term Kṛṣṇa, but does not prescribe the Bhava fort mentioned by the Mahābhārata, Manu and Keśilva.

As for the qualities of Durga, Kāmandaka following Keśilva wants it to be built on a large piece of land, provided with deep moats, a high wall with gates.* According to him, it should be near a city, a mountain, a river or a deep forest and should have enough water, food-grain and wealth to sustain for a long time. He, however, does not seem to be talking about a fortified city; he has only a fort in his mind when he says that it should be near a city.

Durga, according to the Rāmāyana, should have a large number of elephants, chariots and warriors; it should also have very strong gates with thick latches and machines above; it should be provided with a very high wall all around, and outside that with very big and deep moats filled with water having man-eating aquatic animals; it should have bridges...
which can be removed by means of machines; its gates should be protected by thousands of warriors and it should have also an establishment of soldiers in the centre.\textsuperscript{173} Earlier in the \textit{Ayodhyākāṇḍa}, the most essential qualities of Durga were referred to as provision of sufficient wealth, food-grain, water, weapons, machines and efficient archers. According to \textit{Bālakūpā} also, Durga should have big gates, lots of arms and efficient archers, very extensive area, hundreds of Satāgnīs, a rampart and moats difficult to cross.\textsuperscript{175}

Thus, the \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} prescribes such qualities for Durga as may make it very strong and able to guard against attacks for long time, with provisions to inflict losses on the enemy while protecting the people inside.

\textbf{Kośa:}

The \textit{Mahābhārata} has a eulogy\textsuperscript{176} for Kośa and also says, "Kings depend upon Kośa; therefore Kośa should be guarded well."\textsuperscript{177} Kaśyapa rightly remarks that all undertakings depend upon Kośa; therefore the king must pay his first attention to Kośa.\textsuperscript{178} Kanda explains it further by saying that king should protect Kośa in order to provide for the servants, Dharma and Artha and to bear calamities.\textsuperscript{179} The \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} also fully acknowledges the importance of Kośa and says that a king who has equal control over Kośa, Bala, self and Mitra enjoys a large kingdom.\textsuperscript{180} King Daśaratha's
ministers, we read, were always busy in augmenting his Kosa,181 and Bharata reported to Rama that he had made his Kosa ten-times richer during latter's period of exile.182

The Arthasastra recommends that Kosa should be augmented righteously.183 Gautama,184 Manu,185 and Vijnudharasutra186 declare that the king may ordinarily take the sixth part of the grain-crop or produce of the soil. But the Mahabharata,187 Kautilya188 and Manu189 permit taking even one third or one fourth part of crop in times of distress. The Mahabharata,190 Manu190A as well as others, however, warn against over-taxing and advise that the king must draw from his kingdom annual taxes little by little just as the leech, the calf and the bee take their sustenance. The Ramayana advises collection of tax (Bali) without any violence or coercion;191 it recommends a uniform taxation amounting to one sixth part of produce or earning. Everywhere in the epic the tax is described as Sabhagali.192

The qualities of Kosa, according to Kautilya, are that it should be acquired lawfully by one's ancestors or by oneself, should consist of mostly gold, silver, various kinds of gems and cash and should be able to withstand a calamity for a long time even when there is no income.193 The Ramayana does not talk of the other qualities but says that Kosa should have a large income and less expenditure, and that its contents should never go to the undeserving ones.194
Bala is the sixth important element of state. Kautilya and Manu use the term Bala while Kamandaka prefers Sana for army. The Rāmayana employs many words, viz. Senā, Yāhinī, Sainya, Bala, Anikānī and Cevī to denote the army. The Mahābhārata refers to the army consisting of eight organs, namely elephants, horses, chariots, infantry, navy, forced labour, hereditary soldiers and hired soldiers (Apṭāgabala). In the Rāmayana, however, it has been described having four organs (Catuvṛga), namely elephants, horses, chariots and foot-soldiers, although there are a few references to the existence of navy also.

The Arthasastra opines that Kṣatriyas make the most excellent soldiers. Manu allows Brāhmaṇas and Vaiśyas also to bear arms in times of emergency. The Rāmayana concedes the right of bearing arms for the protection of people to Kṣatriyas only, as can be inferred from various references.

The Arthasastra enumerates six types of Bala, viz. hereditary, hired, forest, corporate, ally and enemy forces. The Rāmayana exhibits its knowledge of five types of Bala only, that is to say Mitra (ally), Āśavī (forest), Manu (hereditary), Bhṛtya (hired) and Drīgasad (enemy) Bala. The word 'Srenī does occur in the epic
but there is no allusion to their having independent forces. Thus, it can be safely concluded that the Āśrama in the Rāmāyaṇa period did not possess armies, which could be depended upon by the sovereign in case of conflict with neighbouring states. The hereditary army (Maulahala) is considered the most dependable by the polity writers. The Rāmāyaṇa considers all the forces acceptable but the enemy force. This is typical of it because the Arthasastra does not hesitate in advising the use of enemy-force, too.

The Rāmāyaṇa's state, evidently, had a standing army which has been referred to as Maulahala and which we find accompanying king Daśaratha to Mithila and Harata to the forest. Daśaratha's Amātyas, we read, were always busy in recruiting soldiers and, thereby, augmenting the army. The soldiers were paid stipulated pay and allowances. The Bala in Rāmāyaṇa times was headed by a Senapati who was assisted by Mukhyas and others.

Describing the qualities of Daṇḍa, Kautilya says: "It should be hereditary standing and obedient, should have soldiers with contented sons and wives, should be unobstructed anywhere and able to put-up with hardships, should have experience of many battles and skill in the science of war, should not have a separate interest because of prosperity or adversity shared with the king and should consist mostly of Kṣatriyas. Kaṇandaka appears to be discussing the qualities of the army-chief when describing army's qualities."
The Rāmāyaṇa prescribes the qualities of Senāpata, Mukhyas and Bala separately. Senāpata (Commander-in-chief), according to it, should be contented, brave, wise, patient, pious, high-born, devoted and expert in warfare. The Mukhyas (chiefs), it says, should have expertise in warfare, strength, valour and experience. About the soldiers, the epic has the undertones that they should be hereditary and belonging to Kṣatriya caste, and says that they should be brave, skilled in the use of arms, valour, able and contented. Vālmīki warns the king against annoying the soldiers by delaying payment of salary to them as it can cause a great misfortune to him.

**Mitra**

Mitra is the seventh and the last element of state in the list. Kaṇṭilīya acknowledges two kinds of Mitras (a llies), vis. Sahāja (natural) and Krītā (acquired). Sahaimitra is the one who is in alliance from the times of his ancestors and who is close to his territory; Krītā or the acquired ally is the one who becomes a friend for the sake of protection of wealth or life. The Mahābhārata has four types of Mitra, namely Sahārtha (ally with an aim), Bhāṣimana (hereditary ally), Sahāja (near relation), and Krītā (acquired ally). Kāmānaka expands further the idea given by Kaṇṭilīya by explaining the gains of friendship.
The Rāmāyana does not indicate clearly the various types of allies it is acquainted with. We, however, see alliances being actually executed, namely those between Rāma and Sugrīva, Rāma and Vibhīṣaṇa, and some references to hereditary allies. In the alliance between Rāma and Sugrīva, the latter extends his hand of friendship which is held by Rāma, and then they go round the fire marking the establishment of their friendship without, of course, setting forth any particular aim before the alliance is made. The second alliance is made to provide protection to Vibhīṣaṇa. In this alliance Rāma pledges to make Vibhīṣaṇa the king of Letha and Vibhīṣaṇa vows to help Rāma to the best of his ability. Romapāda of Ahga and Janaka of Mithilā, however, can be termed as Sahajamitras of the epic, while Sugrīva and Vibhīṣaṇa, as also those other who have been described making alliances, can be treated as acquired friends.

The importance of ally as an element of state is well established in the Rāmāyana. Hanumān propounds it unambiguously when he says to Sugrīva, "Now when you have got kingdom, fame and enhanced the ancestral 'Sri (fortune), what remains is having an ally." He further says, "One who has the time sense in one's relation towards allies and behaves with them without malice increases fame, power and empire." According to the epic, the one who has equal control over self, Mitra, Daṇḍa and Kośa rules over a big kingdom.
Regarding Mitra's qualities, Kāmanda says: "He should be selfless, learned, strong, sweet-speaking, far-sighted and of noble family." The epic visualises three main qualities of the ally, namely gratefulness, helpfulness and truthfulness, which are further explained as making effort for friends' cause and abiding by true Dharma.

The ally is referred to in the epic as Mitra, Śukra and Sakhat. The one who is busy in collecting friends and exterminating enemies receives, according to the Rāmāyana, the fruit of Dharma.

The Calamities Affecting Seven Elements:

Inversion or absence of excellences, a great defect, addiction or affliction, according to Kautilya, constitute a calamity. This, in his view, is either of divine origin or man-made i.e., springing from an ill-fate or a wrong policy. The calamity befalling the preceding element is considered more serious by him. The Aṣṭāṅga also discusses various calamities affecting the elements of state to a large extent, but the space devoted is much less than that in the Arthaśāstra. Manu and Kāmanda both, however, take the position that calamity of every element is equally serious. The Rāmāyana also seems to be giving equal importance to the calamity of every one of the elements, an inference drawn from Rāma's enquiries about all the elements.
Kantilya describes the calamities affecting different elements of state as follows:

Svāmi may be addicted to wine drinking, gambling and women, and thus fall a prey to the moral diseases. Weakness of the country lies in its being mainly populated by armed forces and that of the capital having mainly population of agriculturists. Finance may be undermined by natural calamities such as drought and famine, and man-made calamities such as oppression by the collectors, allowance of remission of taxes in favour of leaders and false accounts of revenue. The army may be weakened by disloyal and treacherous elements or by those who are not paid and are, therefore, guided by their wives. The ally may be purchased by others or may be indifferent to the fate of the friend.

The Rāmāyana also believes that the inversion of qualities is the cause of calamity of every element of state. According to it, the calamity which can weaken or destroy the king is caused by the application of Dharma and Artha in life in a way that they do not compliment each other, and by allowing Kīma to obstruct application of both Dharma and Artha. The calamity of Janapada springs, according to it, from disproportionate population of different Varnas in rural and urban areas, i.e. the capital having more Vaisya and Śūdra population than of Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas or vice versa, besides total dependence on rains for irrigation, unrestrained bad elements and wild animals. The cause of
army's calamity is said to be non-payment of dues on time and the unqualified leader. The distressing factor for Kośa is explained as the expenditure surpassing the income and pilferage of collections. The weaknesses of Amātya causing calamity has not been discussed by Kautilya, who in the case of Durga also does not provide a detailed discussion. The Arthasastra seems to be covering these elements by the statement that inversion of excellences causes calamity to the elements. In the Rāmāyaṇa also, the calamity of Amātya is considered to be generated by lack of proper qualities like ability to keep secret, purity of conduct, just application of Dāśa, etc. The calamity of Durga is seen in the lack of sufficient stock of food-grain, water, machines, wealth and soldiers. Mitra's calamity is considered by the epic in selfishness, untruthfulness, ungratefulness and, of course, addiction to drinking wine and to women.

The remedy suggested by Kautilya in some of the cases seems to give a general impression that the king should be on guard against the weaknesses; he should try to understand the nature of the calamities hitting elements of state. Thus, Kautilya's solution is characteristic of the exalted position he assigns to his king in the whole system. The Rāmāyaṇa also has the same remedy; it commands the king to remain very vigilant, to keep his diplomatic eye open and to see that every organ of the state remains without the weaknesses. The epic lays great stress on exemplary personal conduct of the kings.
The *Rāmāyaṇa* which came into existence centuries before the *Arthaśāstra* allot a very high place to personal righteousness and conduct of the king and his men. With this favourable point, it projects such views on the origin and elements of the state as are not much different from those expressed by the other writers on polity. The state is regarded by the epic as an essentially beneficent institution evolved in historic times for the efficient protection of human life and for the better realisation of the higher ideals. The idea that it is a necessary evil to be tolerated as there is no alternative is not subscribed to by Vālmīki. In the *Rāmāyaṇa*'s state, there is no suffering of any sort but happiness and contentment for all the citizens.\(^9\)
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     Deva mānaṛuṣena caṛantyete mahītaṁ. Rām. IV.18.38.
     The above verse refutes Jayaswal's contention (Hindu Relity pp. 34-37) that the theory of divine rights of kings was later on propounded by the Manusmṛti to support the Brāhmaṇa empire of Rṣyvaṁitra.
23. The story of the origin of king Kuśa (referred to above) has a clear divine origin of kingship. Since it has not been included in the critical edition, it cannot be treated as a genuine part of the Rāmāyaṇa.
24. Manus. VII. 111-112.
26. Rām. I. 60.7.
27. Rāmasya duṣktam kincimahadasti na sarṣayāh,
     Yathā hi viṣyastheṇāṁ bālāṁ marṣyagataḥ. Rām. VII.64.9.
31. Purvaeva tu vigrāhyah samavekṣyā naṇānayam,
     Utpathem tu samārūdho nāryā rājā vaṣam gatah.
     Rām. II.72.4.

34. *Rgveda,* III. 53.2.


36. *Atharvaveda,* XX.127. 9-10; XIX. 30. 3-4; III.4.2; VII.98.2.

37. In the *Uttarakāṇḍa* we do find a reference to Gandharvas ruling beyond Sindhu, who were defeated by Bharata; their territory was annexed and distributed between his two sons (*Rām.* VII.91-92). The Gandharvas are not described as having a king and, therefore, their states seem to be having an oligarchy.

38. Kosala nāma muditaḥ sphito janapado mahān,
Nīvīṣṭāḥ Saryutīre prabhāśadhanadhānyavān.
Ayodhya nāma nagari tatrāśītlokaśīrūtā,
Manuśā mānarendraṃ yā purī nīrmitā svayam. *Rām.* I.5.5-6.


41. Sṛṅvanavācō mamasyoṃ sa grāmānviṣṭasāman. *Rām.* II.43.4
and Grāmāṅgaḥ samahattarāḥ, *Rām.* II. 77.15.

42. *Rām.* VII.98. 3-4.

43. *Rām.* VII.91.

44. *Rām.* VII.98.9.


46. The discussion between Rāma and his brothers proves the point (*Rām.* VII. 74-81). Bharata pleads that other kings should not be annihilated by performing a Rājasūya sacrifice, and says:
Sa tveṣevaṁ vidhām yajñāṁḥahārtāsī kathaṁ nṛpa,
Pythivāṁ rājanavānāṁ vināśo yatra dṛṣṭate.

Rām.VII.74.12.

47. Sāmantarājjasamghaścā balikarabhīrāvṛtāṁ,

48. Atha rājavistīrṇeṣu vividheṣvāsaneṣu ca,
Rājānāmevābhimukhā niṣedunyātā nṛpāḥ. Rām.II.1.36.

49. Ikṣvākuṁrāśyaḥ būmiḥ Saśālavanakāmanāḥ, Rām.IV.18.6.

50. Viśālāṅkaśalānśayāṇyātvā lekṣaṇapūrvajāḥ, Rām.III.44.1.


(Rām.V.21.18.)

52. Cakravartikule jāteḥ, Rām.V.29.2.

53. Ahimaupayākī bhūryā tasyaiva vasudhāpayateḥ, Rām.V.19.16.

54. Sūrvabhadramakule jāteḥ, Rām.II.32.16.

55. Atmaṁātyāṣa kośāśca daṇḍo mitraḥ caiva hi,
Tathā janapadaścaiva puraṁ ca kurunandana,
Etatsaptātmakas rājyaṁ paripāyaṁ prayatnateḥ.

(Mbh. XII.69.62-63.

56. Svāyamātyajana-padaudrī-gkoṣadalpaṁmitrāṇi prakṛtyayā,
Arthaśāstra, VI.1.

57. Svāyamātyāṣu puraṁ rāṣṭrāṅ kośadalpaṁ suhṛttatathā,
Saptapraṅkṛtyo hystāḥ saptāṅgaṁ rājyaṁucyate. Manu.IX.294.

58. Svāyamātyadurgakośadāṇḍastraṁmitrāṇi prakṛtyah.
Vignadhamsastra, III.33.

59. Svāyamātyā jano durgāḥ kośo daṇḍastathaiva ca,
Mitrāṇyutāḥ prakṛtya rājyaṁ saptāṅgaṁucyate.
Yājñavālīka, I.353.
60. Kāmandaka, I.16.
61. Svāmyamātya suhṛddurgakośaṁdrenjanāḥ, Gautamāsūtra quoted in Sarasvativilaśa, p.45.
63. See foot-note 61 above.
64. Rāma, II. 94.
65. Rājanāstu prakṛtīṁ sarvāḥ samagraḥ prakṣaya dharmavit, 
Ideaṁ purhito vāyam Bharatam mrdu cābravīt. Rāma,II.76.3.
Tah prabhūṭāṁ prakṛtayo balāḍhyakṣaṁ balasya ca,
'Srutvā yātṛm samājñaptāṁ rāghavasya nivartena.'
Rāma, II.76.22.
Sa Sūtaputro Bharateva Samyagāṇāpitaṁ samaripūrya
kāmaṁ, 'Saśāsa sarvāṁ prakṛtipredhānaṁbalasya
mukhyāṁśa subhijanaṁ ca.' Rāma, II.76.29.
66. Sa labdhamānavitisnavavittairmpaṁ purālayair
jāmpadaśca mānavaṁ, Rāma, II.1.37.
These are later referred to as Pariaśad (II.2.1);
indicating that they were also called Prakṛtis.
67. The Pariaśad convened to offer kingship to Bharata
included the Balāḍhyakṣas. (See II.76.29).
68. Rāma, II.76.29.
69A. Amātya prabhṛtiṁ sarvāṁ prakṛtiścāmurāṇijyaṁ. Rāma, II.3.27.
69. Yasya kośāśca daṇḍāśca mitrāṇyātmā ca bhūmipa,
Samānyetāṁ sarvāṁ sa rājyaṁ mahadaṁute. Rāma, IV.28.11.
70. Amātyaisca Suhrdbhīsca buddhimadbhīsca mantrabhīh,
Sarvakāryāṇi Saṁmāṇtrayā Suvahāntyapī kāraya.
    Raṁ .II.104.17.

71. Kacciddaśaratho rājā kuśāḥ satyasaṅgaraḥ,
Rājasuyāśvedhānāmahartā dharmaniscaḥyā. Raṁ .II.94.4.1.

72. Kaccidvinayasaṁ paṁah kulaṅgutro bahuśrutah,
Anasūyuramudraṁsatākṛtaste Ruchitaḥ. Raṁ .II.94.7.

73. Kacciddātmasamah śūrah śrutavanto jītendriyāḥ,
Kulīnācēngitajānāsca kṛtaste tāta mantrineḥ. Raṁ .II.94.10.
Ekopiyātyo medhāvi ūrdo daksō vaivaśyāḥ,
Rājaṁāṣa rājamāyate prāpayemahātīṁ sriyate.
    Raṁ .II.94.19.

Balvantaḥca kaccittasukhyā yuddhaviśāradāḥ,
    Raṁ .II.94.25.
Kaccidbalasya bhaktam ca vetanam ca yathocitar,
    Raṁ .II.94.26.

Ayastevipulah kaccittavinayakapataro vyayaḥ,
Apaṭreṣu na te kaccitkosa gacchati Rāghava. Raṁ .II.94.95.

76. Kaccidvinayasaṁ paṁah senāpati kṛtaḥ. Raṁ .II.94.95.
Kaccidvinayasaṁ paṁah senāpati kṛtaḥ. Raṁ .II.94.39.

Raṁśraya Sharma (A Socio Political Study of the
Vālmīki Raṁśaṁpa, p.287) quotes a verse and enumerates
as many as six elements of state too; but the verse
is not found in the critical edition (Baroda) and
cannot be considered as genuine.
77. Yodheṣu mitravargṣu kaccidgacchati te yasyaḥ.  

78. Arthasastra, VI.1.
81. Saptāṅgaṣyaḥa rājyaṣya viśabdhasya tridāṇḍavat,  
Anyonya gūṇavaiśeṣyaṁma kṣipcitiricayate.  
Teṣu teṣu tu kṛtyoṣu tattadāṃgasya viśisyate,  
Yena yatsādhyate karma taśminstaschreṣṭhāmucyate.  

Manu, IX. 296-97.
83. Rājārajaṃiti prakṛtisamaktapaḥ, Arthasastra, VII.2.
84. Śvāmi ca sappannaḥ svasānpadbhīḥ prakṛtiḥ sampūdanati,  
Arthasastra, VII.1.
85. Parasparopakāraṣaṁ saptāṅgaḥ rājyaṃucyate.  

Kāmandaκa, IV.1(also see IV.2)
86. Saptāṅgaṃucyate rājyaḥ tatra mūrdhā nyāpah saṁtaḥ,  
Sukraśīrṣ, I.61.
87. Yo hi vamām samutpātya pārthivasya puneḥ kaṣyate,  
Na vidhatte nyāpah tatra narakam sa nigacchati.  

Rām. VII.54-58.
88. Nyāpah vinā rājyaṃaraṇaḥ bhūteṣ, Rām. II.61.25.
89. Mbh., XII.77.
90. Mahākulīṇo daivabuddhisattvasaṃpanno---  
Arthasastra, VI.1.2-6.
91. Manu, VII. 88-103.
92. Yājñvalkya, I.353.
93. Kāmāndaka, IV. 9-11.

94. The word Svāmī actually occurs in the epic in the sense of king; Cf. Na hi preṣayitā tāta Svāmī preṣayah.
Kathāśācana, Rām. IV. 64.22.

95. Rām. II. 19-29.

96. Rām. II. 15-25.

97. Na rājyamāṇātayaṇa 'sakyam 'saṣṭumamitrāhanā
Mbh. XII. 107.11.

98. Sahāyaśādhyam rājatvam cakravatam na vartate,
Kurvita sacivam stamātthēgam ca āṣṛṣuṣyamataṁ.
Arthaśāstra, I. 6.

99. Manu, VII. 55.

100. Viśṇudharmottara, p. II. 24. 2-3.


102. 'Sukra, II. 1.

103. Eko/ṣyaṃtyo medhāvi śūro dakṣo viścāṇah,
Rājānaṃ rājamātraṃ va prāpatenmahatiṃ śriyām.
Rām. II. 94. 19.

104. Chaudhry, Radhakrishna, op. cit. p. 93.

105. Cf. Maulānīśāstra vidhāsūraśubdhakhālaṇkāludgatān,
Saṣṭivaṣṭoṣa cāṣṭaṃ va Prakurvita Parikṣitān.
Teṣāṁ svāṁ svāṁ abhāvābhyām parīṣṭhaka prīṣṭhaka,
Samastānā ca kūryaḥ Vidyādyādhīhitāvatmanāḥ.
Manu, VII. 54. 77.

and also:
Anyānapi prakurvita 'sucinprajānayavasthitān,
Seṣyagārthasaṃhārtyāṃ prajāmatyāṃ suparikṣitān.
Manu, VII. 60.
107. Ibid. IV.30.
108. Mantri dhisaivo/mātyonya karmaśacivāstataḥ, 
   Amarakośa, kṣatariyavarga.
110. Ahaṃ hi mātisācivyam karisyanti, Rām. III.67.17.
111. Hanumān has been referred to as Saśiva (IV.36.1; 
   V.32.37 etc.) as Amātya (V.29.12.) and as Mantri 
   (V.45.16). Again Janaka's Saśivas have been referred to 
   as Mantris (I.66.3 and 5).
112. Cf. Kaccidāmasamaḥ āurāh ārutavanto jītenāriyath, 
   Kulīnācengitajānāśca kṛtāste tātā mantriṁcāḥ. 
   Rām.II.94.10.
   Susamvṛto mantradharāiramātyaiḥ 'śastrakovidaiḥ. 
   Rām.II.94.11.
   Eko/pysmātyo medhāvi 'a uro dakṣo vicaksanāḥ, 
   Rām.II.94.19.
113. Amātyaiśca Suhrdbhiśca buddhimadbhiśca mantribhiḥ, 
   Rām.II.104.17.
114. See Bālakānda (Sarga(?)) wherein Mārkaṇḍeya etc. have 
   been separated from Amātya.
115. Mantrihirmatrataattvajñairmyaiśca 'su$hbdhībhiḥ, 
   Anvāsyamanam Saśivaḥ Surairivavesāvaram. 
   Rām.V.47.13.

These terms have again been used as synonyms in 
the Kumbhakarna speaking to Rāvaṇa: he uses the term 
Saśiva(VI.51.7,8,12,13 & 18) and Mantrin (VI.51.17) 
for the same functionary.
This rejects Kane's observation (cited above) that the terms Sācīva and Amāṭya are synonyms.

Prahasta has been referred to as Mantrīsattana (V.48.12) and Amāṭya (V.42.19).

See, Rām. I.7.2 and I.8.4.

Vide, Mantriyurchitasakha---- Arthaśāstra, I.9.

See Ayodhyākāṇḍa (Sarga 94); here Mantrin has been placed before Amāṭya who has executive duties also.

As is clear from the two groups of ministers at Ayodhya, Mārkaṇḍeya etc. were counsellors only while Samaṇtra and others were executives as well as Mantris.

Even rājā matimātā viditā 'sīlaśucatām,

Ārjavam prakṛtim sattvam kūmāram vṛttam 'arutam daveṃ.

Amucroṣam balam vīryam bhūvam saṃprāsman kṣamam,

Bṛtyā ye yatra yogyā syāstatra sthāpyaḥ saśāktātāh.

Mbh.XII.118. 2-3.

The Agnipurāṇa (239.11-15) has also similar account of Amāṭya qualifications.


Arthaśāstra, I.7-8.

Manu, VII. 94-60.

Kāmanda, IV. 28-31

Pitrpaścāmabhānsucīn, Rām. II.94.21.
131. \textit{Kaccid â'tasameha} 'sūrah 'srutavanto jiten disty^\textit{ha},
Kulīnaçcengitajñāscac arthāste tātamantrinbh.
\textit{Rā�,II. 94.10.}

132. \textit{Sharma, R. S. op. cit. p.23.}

133. Tāmūcāryam śiśyā, pitarām putro, bhṛtyah svāminmiva
čūnevateta. \textit{Arthaśāstra, I.8.}

134. \textit{Brahmapenaśīhitam Kṣatriyam mantrimaṇtramahāmantrītām,
Jayasyajitamatyantām 'śāstrīgaṇamāṇastrītām.}
\textit{Arthaśāstra, I.8.}

135. \textit{Rāma, I.7.}

136. Cf. \textit{Arjukasyātmasamasya Rāgava Bhāsputah 'Sakra}
ivāmañāhinah,
śiśyā pāigau prthagāsane 'subbe saheiva
tenopaviveśa vīryavān. \textit{Rāma VI.115.51.}

137. \textit{Mbh., XII. 69. 62-63.}

138. \textit{op.cit., XII. 60. 3-4.}

139. \textit{Kāmanda ka, IV. 50.}

140. \textit{Yajñavalkya, I. 353.}

141. \textit{Madhve cānte ca sthāna-vānātmasadhāraṇaḥ ---dāṇḍakarasaḥah}
karmaśilakarṣako/baliśasvāpyavara-varnaprāyo bhaṅka-
śucimaṇḍya iti janapadasappat. \textit{Arthaśāstra, VI.1.}

142. \textit{Agnipurāṇa, 239.26}

\textit{J.L. Shastri quotes also from Matsya and}
\textit{Vigvadharmottara to indicate the same view (Political}
thought in the Purāṇas, pp. 11 and 139).}

143. \textit{Kāmanda ka, IV. 43-56.}

144. \textit{Kosalo nāma mudito sphīto janapadi mahān, Rāma I.5.5.}
175. **Rām. I.5. 10-14** (vide description of the formidability of Ayodhya) 177. **Mahābhārata, XII.133.**

176. **Mahābhārata, XII.133.**

177. **Kośamulāh hi rājānāh kośo vṛddhirakaro bhava,**

**Mbh. XII.119.16.**

178. **Kośamulāh kośapūrvāh sarvāraṃbhāe Tammūt pūrveḥ kośamavekṣet. Arthāśāstra, II.8.**

179. **Kāmandaṇa, VI. 64.**

180. **Yasya kośaśca daṇḍaśca mitrānyetāḥ ca bhūmipy, Samānyetāni sarvānī sa rājayān mahādaśānte. Rām. IV.28.11.**

181. **Kośasagārahane yuktāḥ, Rām. I.7.11.**

182. **Avekṣataṁ bhavatām kośam —— kṛtam dasagunam maya, Rām.VI.115.45.**

183. **Dharmādhigataḥ pūrvaiḥ svayāṃ vā hemarūpyaprāyācitrā- sthūlaratānaihiraqyo dirghāvapayapadamanāyatiḥ,**

**Arthāśāstra VI.1.**

184. **As quoted in Kane, op.cit. p.185.**

185. **Manu, VII.130.**

186. **Vishnudharmasūtra, III. 22-23.**

187. **Mbh. XII.88.**

188. **Arthāśāstra, V.2.**

189. **Manu, X.118.**

190. **Mbh.XII.89 ff (Cf. Madhudoham duhedātram.... etc).**

190A. **Yathādālpaṃsadantyādyam vāryokvatsasatpadāḥ,**

**Tathādālpaṃ grhitavyo rāśtrādrajānābehdhikāḥ karah,**

**Manu, VII. 129.**
131. Kaccidātmasaṇah 'sūrāh 'srutavanto jitenriyah,
Kulīnācēngitajñāca kṛtāste tātāmantrīnaḥ.
Rām.II. 94.10.

132. Sharma, R.S. op. cit. p.23.

133. Tamūcāryam āgyaḥ, pitaram putro, bhṛtyah svāminmiva
cūmavavatta. Arthaśāstra, I.8.

134. Brahmaṃpahdhitam Kṣatrāṃ santrīmantraḥsantrītaṃ,
Jayatya jitaratyaṃtaṃ 'sātraṃgamaṃsastraītaṃ.
Arthaśāstra, I.8.


136. Cf. Raurahasyātmasamasyā Rāgraḥo Brhaṃapateh 'Sakra
ivāmācāhirāh,
Nipādaṃ pādau pūthagāsana 'subbe saheiva
tenopaviveṣa vīryavān. Rām.VI.115.51.

138. op.cit., XII. 60. 3-4.
139. Kāmamākha, IV. 50.
140. Yajñavalkya, I. 353.

141. Madhye cānte ca sthānāvānātvadhārasyah —dāyakarasaḥ
karmāsilakarṣako/balīsāvagyevaravarna-prīyo bhaktas-
āśucimahṣya iti janapadasappat. Arthaśāstra, VI.1.

142. Agnipurāṇa, 239.26

J.L. Shastri quotes also from Matsya and
Vigumadhamottara to indicate the same view (Political
thought in the Purāṇas, pp. 11 and 139).

143. Kāmamākha, IV. 94-96.
144. Kosala rāma munito sphīto janapado mahan, Rām.I.5.5.
145. Labho janasyasya yadeśasarmām prāpatsyate rāstrāmidam.
   Rām. II. 14.25.

146. Dandasya viśayō yāvat, Rām. VII. 72.10.

147. Sa hi rāja prabhūsa caiva deśasya ca kulasya ca.
   Rām. II. 23.31.


149. Puraṃ ca rāstrāṃ ca māḥ ca kevalā, Rām. II. 31.31.

150. Quoted above.

151. Viśaye vā pure vā te, Rām. IV. 7.20.

152. Kaccicaityasačatairjuṣṭah sunivīṣṭajanakulaḥ
   Devasthānaiḥ prapābhīṣa taḍāgaiscopaśobhitāḥ.
   Praharśṭanaranārīkaḥ samājotsavasobhītāḥ,
   Sukṛṣṭasimā pāsumanήṃsabhīrabbhivarjitaḥ,
   Adevamātro ramyāḥ 'svapadaḥ parivarjitaḥ,
   Kaccijjanapadaḥ spītāḥ sukham vasati Rāghava,
   Kaccitē dayitaḥ sarve kṛṣigorakṣajīvīnāḥ,
   Vārtāyāṃ sāṃrītastāta lokā hi sukhamedhate.
   Rām. II. 94.37-40.


154. Rām. II. 94. 40-41.

155. Mah. XII. 69.63.

156. Svēmyamātyaṃ pura----, Manu, IX. 294.


   Tām satyanāmāṃ drhdhatoranārgalāṃ, Rām. I. 6.28.
159. Tatāste haryāḥ sarve prākāraparīkṣāntarāt,
Niśkranyodagraśattvāstup tastmūrāvīṣkṛtām tadaa.
Rām. IV. 30. 27.

160. Rām. V. 2.

161. Kati durgāṇi durgayāḥ, Rām. VI. 3. 3.

162. Durgesu ca mahāraja satasa ye śāstraṁcitāh,
Mbh. XII. 56. 35.

Dhanavārgaṁ mahīdurgāṁ girīdurgāṁ tathāvaśca,
Manuṣyadurgāmahīdurgāṁ vaṁsaṁva sa tānisaṭ.
Mbh. XII. 87. 5.

163. Manu, VII. 70.

164. Matsya, 217. 6-7.

165. Agni, 222. 4-5.

166. Viṣṇudharmottara, II. 26. 6-9.

167. 'Sukra, IV. 6.

168. Sarvesaṁ teṣaṁ manyaṁ naṛdurgāṁ sañcāstaṁ.
Mbh. XII. 56. 35.

169. Manu, VII. 71.

170. Arthaśāstra, II. 3-4.

171. Lāṅkapūri nirālabā devadhūrā bhayāvāhā,
Nādeyam pārvataṁ vānyam kṛtrīmam ca caturvīdhem.
Rām. VI. 3. 19.


174. Kacicidurgāṇi sarvanṛ dhanadhānyāyudodakaṁ,
Yantrasya iva paripūrṇani tathā śilpadhanurdhaṁ.
Rām. II. 94. 44.
175. *R̄m. I.5. 10-14 (vide description of the formidable
of Ayodhya) 177. Mahābhārata, XII.133.
176. Mahābhārata, XII.133.
177. Kośamūlāḥ hi rājānaḥ koḍo vṛddhikaro bhava,
   Mbh. XII.119.16.
178. Kośamūlāḥ kośapūrvāḥ sarvāraṣṭhā. Tasmāt pūrvaṁ
   kośasvaśvet. Arthaśāstra, II.3.
179. Kāmandaka, VI. 64.
180. Yasya kośaścā daṇḍaścā mitrāṇyātā ca bhūmīpa,
   Samāṇyātāni sarvāni sa rājaṁ mahadāśmave. *R̄m. IV.28.11.
181. Kośaśaṃgaḥaṇa yuktah, *R̄m. I.7.11.
182. Avekṣatām bhavatām kośeḥ —— kṛtām dasagunām maya,
   *R̄m.VI.115.45.
183. Dharmadīghataḥ pūrvaiḥ svayam vā hemarūpyaprāyaścitra-
   sthūlaśatāṁnahirapyo dhīrghāpyapadamanāyastīḥ,
   Arthaśāstra, VI.1.
184. As quoted in *Kan., op.cit. p.185.
185. Manu, VII.130.
186. Vīṣṇudharmasūtra, III. 22-23.
188. Arthaśāstra, V.2.
189. Manu, X.118.
190. *Mbh.XII.89 ff (Cf. Madhodheṣa duhedṛstraḥ... etc).
190A. Yathālāpallamadantyādyam vāryokvatsasatpadaḥ,
   Tathālāpalo grhītvayo rāṣṭrādṛujnābhdikaḥ karaḥ,
   Manu, VII. 129.
191. Kaccit tvām nāvajānanti yājakāh patitas yathā,
Ugrapratigrahitārām kāmayānamiva striyāh. Rūm. II.9.22.

192. Yo hared baliṣajābhāgaḥ, Rūm. III.6.11 (etc.)

193. Arthaśāstra, VI.1.10.

194. Āyaste vipullāḥ kaccit kaccidalpataro vyayaḥ,
Apūtreṣu nate kaccitkośo gacchatā Rāghava. Rūm. II.9.45.

195. Dharmadigataḥ—dīrghamapādamanāyaḥ atītām saheteti,
Artha. VI.1.

196. Manu, VII.294.
(Yājñavalkya (I.353) Viṣṇudharmasūtra, Gautamasūtra
also use Daṇḍa).

197. Kāmandaka, I.16.

198. Senā (IV.36.26), Vahini (V.38.9; VI.31.46), Sainya
(IV.39.7) Bala (I.68.3; VI.3.32; VI.3.4), Anikēni
(VI.32.6), Cemū (V.17.12). The Rāmāyaṇa, thus, prefers
these words to Daṇḍa.

199. Hastināśvā rathāḥ pattirnave vististhaivas,
Daśikācārakaśaiva tadāṇṭaṁ balas smrtām.
Mbh. XII.121.43.

200. Rāmāyaṇa, I.68.3 I.69.61 VI.33.43.

201. Imanyaśvahastaraṇi catvāri puruṣārṣabha,
Rathaṁ dhv sahaṁre dve gajānāṁ 'satayeva ca.
Rūm. VII.56.2

The above reference does not contain any word for
the foot-soldiers; but it is understood that they also
marched on Lavaṇa with 'Satruṅha's army.
202. Nāvāṁ 'sataṁ paṇcāṁ kaivartaṁ 'sataṁ 'sataṁ, 
Samaddhāṁ ātthā yūnaṁ tiṣṭhantvityabhyaścayaḥ.

Rām. II.78.7.

203. Pitṛpaitamahoh—ksatrapaśyay iti dāñcisaṃpate.
Arthaśāstra, VI.1.

204. Manu, VIII. 348.

205. Cf. Kṣatriyairdharyate cēpo nūrtāsādbhahavediti,
Rām. III.103.

206. Tatra maubhṛtaśreṇīmitrāśvibalaṁ—Amitrāśvi
balaṁ vā vyavahitāsakālaṁ. Arthaśāstra, VII.8.

207. Ibid.

208. Vasanaśca narendrasya sa senā caturāṅgini, Rām.I.69.6.

209. Rām. II.76.

210. Yuktā balasya parigrāhe, Rām.1.7.11.

211. Rām. II.94 26-27.

212. Rām. II. 94. 24-25.

213. See Chapter VI.

214. Pitṛpaitamahoh nitya vāyastuṣṭahbhṛtstrapradārah
pravāśavisampūddhatāh Sarvatrapratihato duḥkhasah
bhavyuddhaḥ—Arthaśāstra, VI.1.


216. Kaccid dhṛṣṭāṁca 'surasca dhṛṣṭāṁ ca matimaṁ chucih,
Kulīnaścāmṛuktaṁca daksah senapati kṛtaḥ.

Rām.II.94.24.
217. Balavantaśca kaccitte mukhyā yuddhaviśāradāh,
  ārātāpadānā vikrāntāstvyā satkṛtya mūnitaḥ.
  Rām.II. 94.25.

218. Ime 'sūrāśca vikrāntā bhṛtyā me/sraviśāradāh,
  Yogyā rakṣogamairuddhum na rāmaṃ netumaḥsa.
  Rām.I. 19.4.


220. Ibid.

221. Pitrapitāmaḥas nityam vaśyamadvaidhyam mahallaghusmutan-
thasiti mitrasmāt. Arthaśāstra, VI.1.12.

222. Caturvidhāni mitrāṇi rājām rājabhavasyuta,
  sahartho bhajamāṇāśca Sahajā kṛtramasthā.
  Bhā. XII.81.3.

223. Kamandaka, IV. 70 and 75.

224. Rāmāyaṇa, IV.5.

225. Rāmāyaṇa, VI. 11-12.

226. Rāma says: Ahaṁ Rāvaṇam saśkhye saputrajanābhūdhave,
  Ayodhyāṃ na pravekṣyāmi tribhistairghrā-
  Vibhīṣaṇa says: Rākṣasāṇāṃ vadhe sāhyam Laiśkāyaśca
  pradharṣaṇe,
  Karṣyāmi yathāprāṇam pravekṣyāmi ca vāhinīm.
  Rām.VI.19.23.

227. Rājyaṃ prōptam yaśasāsva kaundī 'ṣrīrābhivardhītā,
  mitrāṇāṃ samgrahaḥ 'seśastad bhavān kartumarhati.
  Rām.IV.28.8.

228. Yo hi mitreṣu kālajñā satataṃ sādhu vartate,
  Tasyarājyaṃ ca kīrtiśca pratāpaścāpi vardhate.
  Rām.IV.28.9.
229. Yasya kośāsca dandaśa ca mitrānyātma, Rām. IV. 28. 10.
230. Kāmanda, IV. 70-75.
231. Vide: Yastu rājā sthito/dharme mitrāṇaśupakārīnām,
     Mithyā pratijñāṁ kurute ko nṛsāmṣatsarastataḥ.
     Rām. IV. 33. 8.
     Purvopakaraṁ smarta kṛtaṁ viśeṣataḥ,
     Rām. IV. 31. 20.
232. Amīrāṇaṁ vadhe yukto mitrāṇāṁ saṣgraha tathā,
     Rām. IV. 31. 20.
233. Guṇapratilokamśabbhavah pradoṣaḥ prasāngah pūde vā
     vyasanam. Arthāśāstra, VIII. 1. 3.
233A. Daivaṁ māmah vā prakrtivyasanamanyāpanayābhyaṁ
     sambhayati. Arthāśāstra, VIII. 1. 2.
234. Svāmyātāyajanaśa dadvāsaśadandaśmitrasyasannānāṁ
     pūrveḥ pūrveḥ gatiya ityāsāryāḥ, Arth. VI. 1. 4.
236. Ramu, IX. 295.
238. Rāmayana, II. 94.
239. Arthāśāstra, VIII. 1-5.
240. Vide, kaccītarthena vā dharmārtho dharmena vā punah,
     Ubhau vā pritilobhena kāmena ma vibdhase.
     Rām. II. 94. 53.
241. Rām. II. 94. 33-41.
242. Rām. II. 94. 24-27.
244. Vide, Kaccitsarvāni durgād---Rām. II. 94.44.
245. Sa tvan grānyeṣu bhogesu sakto mithyāparisvavah.
   Rām. IV. 33.15.

   and vide Sugrīva's case (Rām. IV. 34. 8-9).

246. Sharma, R.S. op. cit. p.25.


248. Rajadāśaivvipadyanto prajā hyavidhipatitāḥ,
   Rām. VII. 64.12.

249. Rāmāyaṇa, VI. 116. 84-90.