KING - HIS POWERS AND FUNCTIONS

Monarchy is the only form of government recognised by the Rāmāyana as beneficent. Annihilation of a royal family is, therefore, considered by Vālmīki as a great sin leading to hell, if a new king is not appointed. According to him, a kingdom, where there is no king to rule and to use the coercive force for restraining the unrestrained ones, is nothing but a forest.

It has been generally conceded by our political thinkers that only a Kṣatriya should be the king. King Arthu in the Mahābhārata has been called Kṣatriya. Kauṭilya also subscribes to this view when he says that the Kṣatriya power augmented by the Purohita remains unconquered. Narāyaṇa remarks that a Kṣatriya, who has undergone investiture with the sacred thread, should afford protection to the people. In yet another reference the Mahābhārata has to add that whosoever protects the people from the hordes of Daṇḍin and wields coercive power must be considered the king. Naru also says that a Brāhmaṇa learned in the Vedas deserves to be made a king. But the Mahābhārata seems to be suggesting an emergency arrangement only and Naru's view emphasises the importance of learning the Vedas.

The caste-system had firmly established by the times of the Rāmāyana and the Kṣatriyas alone were considered fit to rule. We find that in all the Aryan states the kings
were invariably from the warrior class. Among the non-Aryans, however, we find the Rākṣasa rulers, the Vānarā rulers, the Nīśāda king, the Maleccha kings, the forest kings and the hill kings. 8

Kingship had become hereditary before the Rāmāyaṇa came into existence. The  Sātapaṭha Brāhmaṇa mentions a king, named Dvātarita Paumāṇa, who was expelled from his kingdom which he had acquired through this ten ancestors. 9 In the Rāmāyaṇa, we find two long lists of ancestors of both Daśaratha 10 and Janaka. 11

The eldest prince, as a general rule, was made the king when the reigning monarch died or retired. The right of the eldest son to succeed was zealously guarded in the Vedic period. 12 The Nirukta has the story of Devāpi and Santanu, the two brothers belonging to the Kuru family: Devāpi was the elder but Santanu got himself coronated, forcing the former to observe austerities in the forest; the result was disastrous as Santanu's kingdom suffered a 12 year long drought-spell: Santanu, therefore, desired to give up the kingdom in favour of his brother but Devāpi was no longer interested and preferred to be his priest for performing the sacrifice. 13 The Mahābhārata says, "How can a younger brother be the king, violating the right of the elder." 14  Kautilya states that the people esteem the rulership going to the eldest son except in the case of some calamity. 15 According to  Manu, the eldest son should succeed
the king if he is not suffering from a physical or mental defect, in which case the younger brother should be made the king. Sukra also recommends passing on the kingship to the younger son or brother in case of a physical defect in the first prince.

The Rāmāyaṇa recognises the rule of primogeniture and explains the reasons also: all the princes could not be given the right to succeed for fear of mismanagement and chaos. The statements of Bharta, Kaikeyī, Daśaratha, Manthara and Sūṇrīva point to the fact that the eldest prince normally succeeded the king.

Being the eldest prince, however, did not necessarily make one eligible to succeed to the throne in the times of the Rāmāyaṇa, as is evident from the numerous references. The first son of the king had to be physically and qualitatively worthy of the high office. We are informed that Daśaratha considered Rāma's candidature taking into account the qualities possessed by him and his popularity among the subjects. Kaikeyī also considered Rāma's selection as justified because she thought that he had the best qualities, although she changed her mind later. Daśaratha gave argument in the assembly in support of Rāma's suitability for the office of heir-apparent, mainly emphasising the qualities of the prince. The Pariṣad in its turn approved the proposal because it was sure that the prince had the required qualifications.
king had to possess the necessary qualities; otherwise, he forfeited his claim. For example, Asmañjasa was the eldest son of Sagar, who was exiled and, thereby, deprived of kingship because he was not virtuous and popular among the subjects. Thus, the law of primogeniture was not given any weightage if the first prince was not righteous.

A few references in the epic seem to suggest that the king had the right to select his successor, overlooking the claim of the eldest prince. For instance, Manthara is quoted saying to Kaikeyī that the king could pass on the rule to another virtuous son, besides the eldest one. She is reported to have further said that it would be better if Bharata received kingship from his father. Daśaratha himself said to Rāma to get anointed before he changed his mind. At Citrakūṭa, Rāma revealed in the presence of the gathering that their father had pledged the kingdom in favour of Kaikeyī's son at the time of his marriage, and that can be taken to explain, too, why Daśaratha was in a hurry to make Rāma the heir-apparent when Bharata was away and why the kingdom was first offered to Rāma and then to Bharata. We read also that Rāma divided his kingdom among his own sons and the sons of his brothers. Nevertheless, it is not possible to agree with the said deduction for the evidence of the epic on this point does not go in its favour.

It has also been argued that Daśaratha might have promised to his father-in-law because at that time he was
without a male issue and had lost all hopes of getting one by his wives; he might have reasonably hoped that if a son was born to Kaikeyī, he would be the right successor; but he realised later that Rāma had a clear, constitutional right to succeed and, therefore, sent Bharata away from Ayodhya to put through his plan to coronate Rāma.

As far as Daśaratha's offering the kingship to Rāma and then to Bharata is concerned, there is nothing in the Rāmāyaṇa that may conclusively lead us to such a deduction. These arguments are mere conjectures and, hence, unconvincing. If they are accepted, Daśaratha would be proved as an Anatvāsandha and not the truthful king, as the Rāmāyaṇa depicts him. Moreover, if the pledge were a reality, Kaikeyī should have asked for it instead of depending upon the two promises said to have been made by Daśaratha; but Kaikeyī and Bharata do not display any knowledge of the pledge. And where was the necessity of the pledge if Daśaratha and the other party was so sure of the inability of the other two queens to bear a son. The hurry shown by Daśaratha was, therefore, not because he wanted to break his earlier pledge, he could not afford to do so for fear of Akīrīti. It seems that he apprehended some disaster because of his bad dream and, may be, some pressure from Kaikeyī, knowing her fickle nature or some resistance from Bharata, too, because of the human nature. And he was proved partially right.

The evidence of the epic does not contradict the allusion directly that the king could use his discretion and
transfer kingship to any of his sons. It is, however, evident that he would not have dared break away from the settled tradition as long as he was in his proper senses and on the right path. However, it is also very clear that he could divide his kingdom for his sons.

Thus, it can be safely concluded that the eldest prince succeeded the king if he had the necessary qualities, consent of the monarch, approval of the counsellors and willingness of the subjects.

Kaikeyi's statement that Bharata would have got rulership from Rāma after the expiry of a hundred years does not mean that the office of the king was held in rotation among the princes. It was in fact immediately refuted by Manthāna.

In the event of a king leaving no heir-apparent, the counsellors selected one from the same family and made him the king. The epic, however, does not tell us about the order of succession in such an eventuality, but the Vālmīkiyāyana prescribes an order, viz son, full brother, half brother, uncle, male of the same family, daughter's son, stranger.

The epic does not seem to accept the claim of a stranger. Moreover, the arrangement actually suggested in the epic was to last as long as the princes were away from the capital, and even that was not sanctioned by Vāsiṣṭha who preferred to call Bharata back to anoint him as the king.

It may also be interesting to discuss whether the age of the prince was also a consideration for anointment in the
times of the Rāmāyaṇa. Jayaswal states that a Hindu king could be coronated after the 24th year only. But according to Kane, it is proving too much. The evidence of the epic, however, shows that the coronation normally took place when the prince had attained the age of 25 years. Rāma, for instance, was selected for anointment when he was twenty-five years old.

His coronation had to wait for more than a year after his marriage because he was not of the age. According to some, the coronation of new king should wait for one year after the death of the king. But the Rāmāyaṇa does not have any such provision. On the contrary, we read the arrangements and activities to anoint a new king started the very next day of the death of the king.

The mode of succession can be best understood from the description of Rāma’s selection. The king considered the qualities of the eldest prince first by himself and then in consultation with his counsellors. Thereafter, the Parīṣad consisting of the feudatories and ally kings, the counsellors, the ministers, the Paurāṇa-Janapadas (and Naigamas) was convened. In the Parīṣad, the king announced his decision to select the successor and put forth a proposal, illustrating the merits and justification of the choice. The Parīṣad considered the proposal and gave its opinion, explaining also the reasons. After receiving the Parīṣad’s approval, the king requested the Aurohita, the Ṛtvij and the other Brāhmaṇas to make arrangements for the anointment ceremony. At the same time, the prince thus selected was sent for to be present in the assembly.
arriving in the assembly, he announced his name and bowed to
the king who offered him a seat near his own. The process
of selection of a heir-apparent was thus completed.

The approval of Rāma's selection, nevertheless, does
not indicate that kingship in the times of epic had become
elective. Monarchy, as already shown, had become hereditary
long before the times of the later Vedic literature. Therefore,
Jayaswal's argument that it continued to be elective down to
the eighth century A.D. is untenable. The election of king
was not a normal practice.

The Rājakrta in the Atharvaveda and the Rājākṣṭhara
in the Rāmāyaṇa were not the kingmakers or king-electors; they
were the Brāhmaṇas who were entrusted with the duty to offer
the coronation ablution.

The description of Rāma's selection as well as the other
evidences in the epic do not lend any support to the view that
the people had an effective say in the selection of a successor.
In the case of Rāma, Daśaratha had already made up his mind
and sent invitations before convening the assembly. Later,
we find that the heir-apparent approved by the assembly was
sent into exile for fourteen years without its consent or the
approval of the 'king-makers'. The assembly, the Rājākṣṭhara
or the people, therefore, did not enjoy any power to elect a
king in normal circumstances; they followed the accepted law
of succession, and the crown passed on to the next generation
basically by the law of primogeniture. This practice was
followed not only by the Aryas but also by the Rākṣasas and the Vānaras.

The coronation ceremony became elaborate, ritualistic and very technical in the age of the Brāhmaṇas. It was known as Rājasīva. Its details found in different books are almost common and supplementary to one another. The ceremony was divided into three parts, the preliminary ritual, the coronation and the post-coronation ceremonies. The preliminary ritual mainly consisted of the Rātnī-havī which the king was usually to offer at the houses of his Rātnīs. The actual coronation followed on the second day; the king was seated on a throne covered with a tiger's skin and sprinkled upon with sacred waters brought from the holy rivers and seas. The priest performed this ceremony, chanting proper Vedic Mantras; but later, a Kṣatriya and a Vaiśya were also associated. The Mahābhārata even records the association of a representative of the 'Śūdra caste. Before the coronation, the king was required to take an oath, and after the ceremony, the king went out for a state drive either in a chariot or on an elephant. Then, a durbar was held where he was offered a homage, followed by the game of dice or a chariot race.

In the epic-period, too, the coronation ceremony was divided into three parts although it has not been named as Rājasīva and the rituals are different in some respects. We read that on the first day the prince was initiated into
IBSAMA by the priest, the prince worshipped God with Havis, partook the leftover of the Havis and slept for the night on a bed of grass in the temple. In the meanwhile, waters from rivers, seas, reservoirs, wells and ponds were collected in gold-pitchers and handed over to the priest along with other required articles. For the coronation, the prince and his wife were seated on the Bhadrāṭha, and then the priest and the Rtvij Brāhmaṇas sprinkled the herb-juice mixed water on them. The eight girls, Mantrīs, Yudhās and Naigamas followed them. After the Abhiseka, the priest placed the crown on king's head and decorated him with the help of other Brāhmaṇas with ornaments. The new king then gave away horses, cows, bulls, gold coins, ornaments and clothes in large numbers. Hereafter a durbar was held and the allies and feudatories gave and received presents.

The above account does not mention RatuHavis, which shows that this institution had ceased to exist by the times of the Rāmāyaṇa. The Rājasūya had also separated and we hear of it as a sacrifice involving uproot of many other kings by the one who wished to perform it. The coronation oath also has not been mentioned nor the king has been described going on the streets on a chariot or an elephant. But we know from the epic that a chariot, covered with a tiger's skin, and an老子 elephant were ordered for by the priest, obviously for a similar purpose. The absence of the 'Sudra indicates only that their right to participate in the ceremony had not been recognised yet. However, the coronation oath must have
existed in the times of the R̄mayāṇa, too, for it is found in the latter epic.

No regular R̄ākṣas-coronation has been described in the epic and, therefore, cannot be compared; but the coronation among the Vānaras was almost of the same pattern except that there was no Aurohita: the ceremony, we are told, was performed in accordance with the advice of the scriptures and the great sages. The only R̄ākṣas ceremony described is that of Vibhishana, a simple one after the war.

The great responsibility of kingship required a very careful training of the princes. Therefore the scriptures as well as the polity writers devote a good deal of space to deal with the subject. The Mahābhārata, Kautilya, Menu, the Aminurāṇa, Kāśyapa, Sūkra prescribe four subjects for the king's education, namely Āryaśāstra, Traya, Varga and Dipanātī. According to Kautilya, the prince should learn the use of alphabet and arithmetic after the ceremony of tonsure; when the initiation is performed, he should learn the three Vedas, the Atharvaveda, the Īthāśa and the Vedāṅgas; he should learn philosophy (Āryaśāstra) also from the learned ones, Varga from the heads of departments and the science of polity from the theoretical as well as practical experts. The Arthāśāstra stresses upon the need of self-discipline and association with the elders also. Menu and Kāśyapa, too, extol the value of Vinaya and waiting upon the aged ones.
Vālmīki was also well aware of the importance of a careful and intensive training of the princes. The details of the curriculums of the education and training of the princes in the times of the Rāmāyaṇa are not found described at one place, whereby we are left with the option of deducing them with the help of the scattered references to the educational accomplishments and skills of the princes and the kings.

The educational curriculums of princes in the times of the Rāmāyaṇa included study of the Vedas and the Vedāṅgas to make them understand the Dharma prescribed for all the four varṇas and to inculcate self-discipline in them. Of the Vedas, the Vaiṣṇavaṇḍa has been particularly mentioned and we are told that Rāma could himself perform rituals, chanting the proper Mantras. From among the Vedāṅgas, the teaching of the Dhanurveda has been referred to again and again which shows its popularity, and the princes were required to master it. The teaching of this Vedāṅga comprised knowledge of various arms both ordinary and divine and all other matters related to warfare. The Kosala king had a regular teacher, employed to train the princes in the use of arms, horse-riding, elephant riding and training as well as training these animals. The warrior who fought from chariots were considered most, therefore the princes were given training of fighting from chariots and chariot-driving. Some aspects of chariot driving, namely Māndala, Vīthī, Gata and Pratvagata have been referred to in the Rāmāyaṇa.
The military training included also leading the army during an expedition, formation of Vṛūhas, fort-capturing and all other aspects of warfare (Senānaya). The princes were trained to acquire expertise in this field. The organisation of march, the formation of Vṛūhas and the application of siege on Lehka speak of the expertise which Rāma had acquired.

The term Āmyākṣa is also found in the Rāmāyaṇa; the king was told not to associate with those who explained what was said in the scriptures in an adverse manner, after acquiring Āmyākṣa. Thus it can be inferred that it formed the part of the curriculums although the fear is expressed that it could be misused by those who were not wise.

The term has been used to denote philosophy.

Vārtā occurs in the Rāmāyaṇa, used in the sense of agriculture and cattle-rearing, and it is said that the happiness of the people depended on it. Thus, Vārtā's importance for the prosperity of the country was well acknowledged and it can be well imagined that the princes were given education in this branch of knowledge.

The other science taught to the princes has been referred to in the Rāmāyaṇa as Rāṣṭrvidyā and Arthasastra. The teacher of Arthasastra at Ayodhya was Ācārya Sudhanvā, who taught them the use of arms also. These terms in the Rāmāyaṇa are synonyms of Dāpanīti (Statecraft). The princes were taught the six-fold diplomacy, the four expedients, Senāya,
Yoga, Naya-Anaya, etc. They were imparted to the knowledge of customs and traditions (Janikasamaya and Acara) and punishment and reward, besides all the scriptures whether written in Sanskrit or in the mixed languages. In addition to that, they were taught the means of income and the justified items of expenditure.

The practical training, too, was given due importance. We are told that Rama performed some duties related to public work (Purakarya) before his selection as the heir-apparent. These jobs were assigned to him by his father and involved such activities as brought happiness to the people of the state. It is probable that the princes were attached to various departments to understand the practical aspect of the sciences already learnt by them. For further enhancement of knowledge, the princes attended upon the elders and the learned Brahmanas in between their exercises in the use of arms.

The importance of discipline was also well understood. The princes were always advised to inculcate more and more discipline in themselves. For instance, Dasharatha said to Rama, "Be in possession of more Vinaya."

The ideal of kingship in the Ramayana period was that the king should be a Raja, i.e. a sage-like king. For such a development of personality, it was very important that he was not only educated in different branches of knowledge but also trained for a real hard life. In the epic we find that the princes were trained for a very hard life. We are told
that Rāma and Lakṣaṇa could travel all the way from Ayodhyā to the Siddhārāma on foot, sleeping and resting on hard ground. In the hermitage, too, they kept awake for six nights before actually encountering the Rākṣasas living in the vicinity. Later, when the sacrifice was over, they travelled with the sage to Mithilā on foot again. Their hard-life training is also manifest by the fact they could easily adapt themselves to the forest life and Lakṣaṇa could easily make a raft and build a cottage at Citrakūṭa. The moral standard of the princes was so high that they were normally immune to all sorts of allurements.

The virtues expected to be inculcated in the princes by such intensive as well extensive teaching and training were truthfulness, righteousness, compassion, gratefulness, self-restraint, selflessness, etc. The vices intended to be curbed by it were the fourteen Rādādosaś. The education of princes in the times of the Rāmāyana however, was not altogether a dry affair. We read that the princes had an excellent knowledge of fine arts like painting and music; Rāma, for example, was well versed in Vaiśeṣika-gītaps like music and painting. It obviously means that teaching of these arts formed a part of the curriculums.

Kauṭilya says that when the king is active, the functionaries also become active, following his example; if he is negligent, they also become remiss. Therefore, he
should himself be energetically active. For the purpose of keeping him active, the *Arthasāstra*, *Manu*, *Yājñavalkya* and *Samandaka* have prescribed a very hectic routine.

Kauṭilya says that the king should divide his day and night into sixteen parts by means of *Nālikās* or measures of the shadow, allotting each part for a separate purpose as follows:

(A) **Day Divisions**

(i) Listening to the measure taken for defence, income and expenditure.

(ii) Looking into the affairs of the citizens.

(iii) Bathing, eating and reading the scriptures.

(iv) Receiving revenue in cash and assigning jobs to the heads of departments.

(v) Having discussion with the counsellors and meeting with spies.

(vi) Involving in recreation and consultation.

(vii) Inspecting elephants, horses, chariots and foot-soldiers.

(viii) Deliberating on military plans with the commander-in-Chief.

At the end of the day he should worship the evening twilight. He has been advised also to utilize the eight parts of night for the following purposes:

(i) Interview with secret agents.

(ii) Bathing, eating and study.

(iii) Going to bed to the strain of musical instruments and sleeping during the fourth and fifth parts.
(vi) Rising by the sound of trumpet and pondering over the teaching of the sciences as well as the work pending.

(vii) Consulting the counsellors and allocating duties for the secret agents.

(viii) Receiving blessings from the priest, the preceptor and the chaplain, and seeing the physician, the chief cook and the astrologer.

Thereafter, he should go round a cow with a calf and bull and proceed to the assembly hall.

The daily routine of the king on the times of the Rāmāyana has not been described in a systematic way, but we can form an idea about it by assembling the scattered information found in the epic. His day was divided into two main parts, Śrīvāhnā and Īśabhāna. In the morning, the king was bathed, dressed and ornamented by the girls and women employed for the specific job. After that, he touched auspicious things brought by virgins, who also presented something for him to drink. Then, probably, he offered Āhūti to the fire-god and went to the temple, where he worshipped God and said the morning prayer. Thereafter, he came out of his Antahpura and sat in the Sabha to look into the affairs of the citizens. In the first half of the day itself, the king went out on the main road in the city to show himself to the subjects, considering it very important. Since army was very important, the king was
very keenly interested in its fitness and, therefore, he
inspected it every day. This was, probably, also done in
the first part of day. During the latter half the king
remained in his harem, enjoying good food and Madhu while
witnessing dance and music performances. In the evening
he worshipped the evening twilight also.

In the first quarter of night, the king sat in the
middle apartment of the palace along with his Subhāja,
listening to their humorous conversation. There itself
he received the reports on what was happening in the kingdom If any matter required an immediate action, he would summon
his counsellors or the concerned officers to give the
necessary instructions. In the second quarter he, probably,
went to bed listening to music and slept for two quarters. He was woken up in the last quarter of night by playing and
singing music. In this part of night, he considered
Arthanaṁyupa, i.e. measures taken or to be taken for the
success of Artha, which was perhaps the same type of work as
has been prescribed by Kautilya for the first part of day.
The epic lays a great stress on sleeping and waking according
to time.

Thus, it can be seen that the routine of the king
provided in the Rāmāyana is not as strenuous as prescribed by
the polity-writers, particularly by Kautilya. The king of
the epic was allowed to spend a lot of time in his harem with
his wife/wives, attended upon by a large number of servants
and artists for his entertainment.
According to Kautilya, the royal residence should be built on a site recommended by experts and should have a rampart, a moat, gates and many halls. It should also have an apartment for ladies, places for water and trees, dressing room, council-chamber and assembly-hall (Upaāthāna). In the Rāmāyaṇa, we are told that the palace was built on an extensive piece of land, surrounded by a large ground and a high wall. A large force-like the one advised by Kautilya - was retained outside for its protection. It had a large number of rooms for different purposes and bearing different names. The main parts of the royal residence were Antahpura, Madhyakāsa (Council-chamber) and Sabhā (assembly-hall) which was an outer apartment.

The Antahpura must have been a very large place as it accommodated a large number of inmates. It had the king's apartment and apartments meant for the queens; we are told that king Daśaratha had 350 wives and that Sītā was assured by Rāvana a place above his seven thousand wives. It was in the interior-most part of the palace and, thus, could be reached after crossing many doors. Entry to Antahpura was strictly regulated through an officer called Sryadhakāsa, an honoured old man stationed outside the entrance. The officer was incharge of the harem-administration, too, and assisted by old and young women. If anyone wanted entry, the king or the queen was informed by the assistants and a decision was taken.
The royal palace was expensively furnished. The beds (*Savanāsana and Paryānaka*<sup>145</sup> and seats (*Asanas*)<sup>146</sup>) were made of marble, inlaid with precious stones, and of gold.<sup>146</sup> Skins of animals<sup>147</sup> and carpets (*Kuthās*)<sup>148</sup> were used as spreads for the beds and seats, besides the cotton sheets.<sup>149</sup> The floor was covered with large carpets having beautiful designs; a carpet in Rāvaṇa's palace has been described by Vālmiki as having a woven figure of the Earth.<sup>150</sup> The royal garden was named *Aśokavanīkā*<sup>151</sup> everywhere. It had a beautiful tank with stairs going deep into water, decorative trees resided on by singing birds, lotuses and other flowers, *Āsanagṛhas*, *Citraśālaṃgrahas*, *Dārupavatakas* and lots of attendants.<sup>152</sup>

The palace was always full of music, played by well versed women artists on a variety of instruments.<sup>153</sup> The king went to bed and awoke listening to the sweet notes.<sup>154</sup> In the apartment, where the king slept, there were many armed women called *Unāśyanīs*, who slept nearby.<sup>155</sup> The king was woken up when only a quarter of night was left.<sup>156</sup> At this hour *Vandīs*, *Sūkas*, *Māradhas* and accomplished singers sang in his praise; the *Prāvyālakas* narrated his past achievements and the *Brāhmaṇas* showered blessings. In the meanwhile the king was bathed, dressed, ornamented and given make-up by women servants, deft in the art.<sup>157</sup>

The king devoted the first and the last quarters of night and the first half of day to the discussion of state-
matters (Paurakāryas) as already stated. The secret
discussions were held in the council chamber, and the
Paurakāryas were performed in the Sabhā. The council chamber
was well guarded and nobody could enter it without king's
permission; for example, even the king's brothers were not
entitled to enter it without permission. In the assembly-
hall, the king sat on a throne, placed high on a platform
and approachable by a flight of stairs. The ministers,
the princes and others sat on prescribed seats, keeping their
faces towards the monarch. In the hall, he listened to
judicial and other matters relating to the subjects and
passed orders thereon. Vital matters like appointment
of a heir-apparent were also discussed and approved in this
Sabhā.

The Rāmāyāṇa does not provide much information about
the types of clothes the king wore. In fact this kind of
information is generally absent in the works of ancient
Indian poets as the head to foot description had not become
a norm in ancient times. Nevertheless, we are told by
Vālmīki that the kings were very fond of wearing fine dresses
made of delicate (Sūkṣma) material of woven silks; the
dress material has been referred to as Kṣanīya and Kṣanīya
as white as the foam of nectar. Cotton (Nīla) and
cotton clothes were also known and liked. According to
some, the dress of the king in those times consisted of two
along pieces of cloth which can be named as Adhovastra and
Uttarāśva and which were worn differently by men and women.
The garments, it is argued, were not stitched. But the argument lacks foundation. It is no doubt true that references to stitched garments are not frequent in the epic—the only tailor-made garment referred to being the kāhenaka worn by some officers—but the one found in it is sufficient to prove that the stitching was not unknown. Moreover, the Rāmāyaṇa refers to tailoring as a profession. Tailor (Tunnavyāva) has been mentioned in the list of people of different trades, who accompanied Bharata to the forest. It can be, therefore, argued conclusively that not only the king but the people in the Rāmāyaṇa age also wore stitched garments, besides garments referred to as ātā and Uttarīva.

Another item of dress known to Vālmīki was āsana (a covering for head), worn by the king probably when seated on throne.

Sandals made of wood or leather were also in use. These footwears were decorated with precious metal.

The king was very fond of ornaments made of gold with precious stones embedded. The ornaments for head were Kukuta and Kiriṭa (Crowns) for the king and Cudāmani for the queen. Kupdala were worn by the king as well as the queen. The ornaments for neck have been referred to in the epic by various names, viz. Hara, Sūtra or Hnasūtra and Śrā. Hastabhūrana were worn on hands, called separately as Angulīvaka (rings), Vala and Tathārea (bracelets for wrists), Kevyā and Anśada (bracelets for
upper arms. The queen wore girdles around their waists, known as Rásana and Kanci. The only ornament for the feet has been remembered as Nūrua.

The king was very particular about his personal decoration for which the terms used in the epic period were Pratikatāra and Alankāra. There were specialist servants in the royal palace who were very proficient in the art of bathing and anointing. The monarch used various kinds of cosmetics (Aṅgarāga), unguents (Aṃulya), scents (Svagandha) and ointments (Bhakti). Sandals were the most popular paste. The material was ground for the use of the king by pious women. The king used flower wreaths of various types also. The water used for his bathing was mixed with Haricandana. Besides, the king employed skilful barbers having a very soft touch for shaving and hair-cutting.

The king's food contained inter alia Amma, fruits and non-vegetarian dishes. The kitchen was manned by expert cooks referred to as Bhakrayasakārakāla. According to the Rāmacarita, the king as well as the queen took intoxicating drinks known as Madhumārīyakā. The Rākṣasa king has particularly been described consuming various kinds of natural and fermented wines, namely Sārksāva, Madhīka, Hupāsava, Bhulāsava, etc. But addiction to wine-drinking was considered a serious offence among the Aryans. Rāga and Sūdava were the soft drinks prepared from fruit-juices. Sugarcane juice and curd were also greatly relished. Among cereals, the Rāmacarita mentions rice (Tāli, Tondula,
Kalama), wheat (Godhama), barley (Yava), beans (Māsa), gram (Cūnaka), Mūdga, Kulattha, etc.\textsuperscript{213}

As already said, the palace was always full of music played on Vina and other instruments\textsuperscript{214} for entertainment of the king. Besides that, he entertained himself watching dance performed by beautiful women and listening to humorous conversation and dramas\textsuperscript{215}. It seems that the king employed court-jesters for his humour, who have been referred to in the Rāmāyaṇa as Nāsyakāra\textsuperscript{216}.

The royal garden was particularly a spot for entertainment and sport, therefore called Āṇkavanikā and Kṛṣṇakūhā\textsuperscript{217}. It was beautifully laid, having seats covered with carpets and a number of arbours. Here, a large number of attendants attended to his requirements\textsuperscript{218}. When the king came out in the palace-garden, he was surrounded by women guards and a large number of servants carrying golden lamps, fans, water-pots, etc.\textsuperscript{219} The king was very fond of hunting, too\textsuperscript{220}. On those occasions he was accompanied by servants and soldiers on carriages\textsuperscript{221} and it seems that the queens also went with the king to enjoy the sport\textsuperscript{222}. We know that Kautilya allows the king to hunt only in a safe and protected forest\textsuperscript{223} and Nāyu classifies it as a vice\textsuperscript{224}. But the Rāmāyaṇa, although it considers it dangerous and refers to many kings who lost their lives while hunting,\textsuperscript{225} does not say that the king should not go for it. In fact the princes were encouraged to go for hunting.\textsuperscript{226}
The Rāmāyana alludes that when the king went on a journey, the way was cleared for him by his men wearing cloaks and turbans by beating vetrāncharīyamas.\textsuperscript{227}

Valmiki tells us that king Dāsaratha had 350 wives\textsuperscript{228} and that Rāvaṇa had 7000 queens.\textsuperscript{229} The first queen was called Aśramabīśa\textsuperscript{230} whose position can be easily evaluated with the help of the references\textsuperscript{231} available in the epic. Kauśalyā, we are told, had one thousand villages as means of her income, which was quite enough; these villages were her Upajīyavan.\textsuperscript{232} The Aśramabīśa, however, did not yield any influence in state-matters and her views could not change the course of events. For example, Kauśalyā could not stop Rāma from going to forest and Sītā was not given any opportunity to prove her purity before she was sent to forest.\textsuperscript{232A} Nevertheless, in religious, social and state functions, she enjoyed privileges over other queens; and it was she who sat with the king to perform rituals during sacrifices,\textsuperscript{233} who was consecrated along with the husband at the time of Rāṣṭhitidhantaka and who distributed presents sitting on the throne with the king.\textsuperscript{23}\textsuperscript{4}

The above references suggest that not only the Rākṣasa kings but the Aryan kings also had hundreds of wives. A verse in the epic suggests that even Rāma and Bharata had a number of wives.\textsuperscript{235} But in the last book, we are categorically told that Rāma did not marry any other woman after Sītā's banishment\textsuperscript{236} or before that. The answer to the riddle lies, perhaps, in the verse wherein Janaka is stated to have given among other
things, one hundred girls as a matrimonial present.\(^{237}\) The poet, it seems, has included the number of such girls given as \textit{kanyādāhana}, while giving the number of a king's queens. But the examples of polygamy among kings are no doubt available in the epic, and it cannot be denied that the king could have more than one wife although sometimes it was forced by the want for an issue.\(^{238}\)

\textbf{Rāma's marriage with Sītā} shows that the king could win his spouse in contests of valour besides the arranged marriages. The daughter given in valour-tests was known as \textit{vīryaśukla}.\(^{239}\) A powerful contender could try force also for the hand of a princess if he could not get her peacefully.\(^{240}\) In the marriage, the bride's father gave a large number of presents. In Sītā's marriage, Janaka gave one hundred thousand cows, many carpets, one crore silk clothes, one hundred girls, many Dāsas and Dāsīs, gold coins, pearls and jewels. He gave many elephants, horses, chariots and foot-soldiers also.\(^{241}\)

\textit{Kautilya} advises that the king should not allow his queens to have any contest with outsiders. He does not allow the queens to meet even their own family members except in the establishments for maternity and sickness.\(^{242}\) In the epic, we read that the queen could not be seen even by the aerial beings.\(^{243}\) She could be seen by common people only during a calamity, a war, a \textit{svayamvara}, a sacrifice and a marriage.\(^{244}\)
The Rāmāyana's king claimed divinity and proclaimed inviolability. It was generally believed that no one should do anything which was against his interest. The king was inviolable either by word or deed and a king-killer was considered a great sinner. Inspite of that, the inviolability evaporated into air as soon as he left the path of Dharma. An unrighteous king could be killed, dethroned, imprisoned or sent into exile. That he could be deprecitated for dereliction of his duty is shown by the epic at many places. The sages, who otherwise regarded the king as worshipable and honourable, did not hesitate to get him killed if he went astray.

The king was the supporter and upholder of the law (Dharma). In the Vedic age, it was held that the ideal king was a Brāhmaṇa, dedicated to law and piety like Varuṇa. He was divine but the law was still more so and to be respected by him. One of the Upaniṣada ordains the king to realise that there is nothing above Dharma. The Rāmāyana echoes the idea that Dharma and the king maintained each other; thus, it goes a step farther. In the times of the epic, it was believed that Dharma had its roots in the king and the king was supported by Dharma. The king had but a narrow and definite path to follow and could not be self-willed. The one who did not follow the dictates of the law could not remain as king for long. It was also believed that the people always followed their king and, therefore, the king was expected to have an exemplary conduct.
reasons for Rāma to obey his father was the fact that the subjects would start disobeying their elders, following his example.259

The other popular notion about the king was that he was the true source of happiness and the cause of sorrows for his subjects,260 and Manu has expressed similar views in so many more words.261 It was, therefore, expected of him in the epic times that he should lead a life which was pure and perform his duty without fail. He was considered the father of his people, and like a father he was expected to do whatever was beneficent to all the four castes.262 Happiness of the people, it was understood, depended on his pious deeds. The miseries of the countrymen were, for that reason, attributed to him. An unrighteous king was considered worse than even a lump of earth.263

According to the Bedhāvana Dharmaśūtra, the king is the servant of his people.264 This notion, however, is not supported by Vālmīki who believed that their relationship was not like that the servant and the employer. The king, no doubt, received 1/6 of people's income as well as produce and the people demanded his explanation if he failed to protect them,265 but at the same time he was addressed as lokenātha,266 Mānavendra267 and Mānavasānātha.268 Evidence of the epic, thus, reveals that their relationship was based on their respective duties: if the king failed, he earned a sin; if people were not loyal, they became sinners,269 too. It was more or less on the pattern of the Kauṭilyan ideal.270
According to Jayaswal, the king was the trustee and the state was the trust for the Hindus. If the object of this trust was not fulfilled, the trustee was "to be shunned like a leaky ship on the sea."271 The highly regulated life of the king in the Ramayana-period, requiring him to devote time equally to Dharma, Artha and Kama, did not allow him any wasteful expenditure. In fact his duty was more onerous than that of a trustee; while a trustee is not expected to sacrifice anything for the trust, the king was expected to sacrifice even his own life to make his people happy. The image of being righteous was dearer to him than his life.272 The political thinkers in ancient India proclaimed that king's happiness lied in people's happiness.273 The Ramayana also impresses upon the ruler to keep his people happy and contented. According to the poet, tyrants live like rootless trees.275

The Mahabharata says that king Pithu was called Rajan because he kept his subjects contented, and Ksatriya because he protected them against injuries.276 According to Kautilya, the king should establish safety and security by being active, maintain his subjects in the observance of their respective duties by exercising authority, keep-up his personal discipline and endear himself to the people by bringing them in contact with wealth and by doing good to them.277 The activities of the king as envisaged by the ancient Indians related to all the aspects of human life, here and hereafter.278 In the Ramayana, the words Raksha and Rajjana occur in fragments in
the context of King's duty. Besides contentment, the king was responsible for maintaining them in the observance of Dharma.279

Contentment of the public could not be dreamt of and Dharma could not be followed in the state if there was insecurity and chaos. Therefore the king was enjoined that all people must be protected in accordance with his duty.280

Dangers to the public-security was visualised from two sources, external and internal. The king augmented his army continuously to ward off the external danger; his ministers were always busy in increasing their army's strength and kosa.281 Besides that, he built-up forts and kept them well equipped to sustain long drawn battles.282 He kept himself fully informed about the enemy's activities through his spies and did not neglect his foe, considering him weak.

Within the state, the king had to protect his people from two kinds of dangers, described by Kautilya as man-made and divine.283 TheRamayana does not categorize them, but we understand that the king was required to save the subjects from all the dangers. He was to see that there was no violence in his state284 and that the strong did not cause any harm to the weak.285 He was also to see that his people and their properties were completely safe from Dasyus286 and Tuskaras.287 The adulterers (kama) and the wicked ones (Nasas) were to be restrained by him,288 and the road journey was to be made safe for the traders.289 For these functions, the king was
"the restrainer of the unrestrained ones."  

Mānava opines that the king, whose kingdom is cleared of the bad elements, lives in heaven. The picture of the Rāmāyana painted in the epic confirms that Vālmiki also had similar views on the subject.

Another internal danger considered by the Rāmāyana was from the wild animals and serpents. The king was to see that the country was not threatened by these menaces. The Rāmāyana does not tell us about the measures taken by the king in this regard; we are told only that Rāma's kingdom had no fear from Vyālāh (wild animals). The Arthashastra, however, advises the state to spread poisonous food and to give incentive to hunters to overcome the problem. May be in the epic-period also the state employed the similar means.

The king was to protect his people from what can be categorized as providential calamities, too. The Rāmāyana refers to Vātajabhaya (danger from wind), Agniabhaya (danger from fire), Durbhikaabhaya (danger from famine), Vyādhi and Rogā (diseases), drowning of people (due to inundation), drought and premature death. Kantila tells us what the state could do to protect the subjects from such calamities. According to him, taking measures against floods and fire was the obligation of the people, but the state could make them equip themselves with the necessary means of safety. Besides that, he advises the state to perform sacrifices to
to please the gods and to cause spell-casting. The Rāmāyaṇa again does not inform us much about the activities of the state in this regard but there are certainly some allusions. The state was not to leave the agriculture at the mercy of the rain-god. Obviously, the king was to provide some kind of irrigation facility, possibly in the form of water-reservoirs and wells etc. which are in fact described being constructed before Bharata's journey to forest. We read also that king Rāmapāda took great pains to bring Rṣyaśāṅga in his kingdom to end the drought, which confirms the undertaking of sacrifices by the state to overcome providential calamities.

According to the Rāmāyaṇa, the people could also suffer because of a corrupt and inefficient administration. Therefore the king was to keep a watch over his officers to ensure that they did not treat the people harshly. He was also to see that justice was properly distributed and that no one found guilty escaped punishment even if he were a son of a minister. At the same time, he was to watch that no innocent person was punished just because of greed for money. In a dispute between a rich and a poor person, his judges were to give their judgement without any consideration of the position of the parties involved. It was believed that injustice could destroy the family and animals of the monarch.

The Rāmāyaṇa refers to the king as the father of his subjects. He was 'the great accomplisher of the overall
advancement of the kingdom 306 and 'the one who desired achieving prosperity of his people'. 307 The king was to see that the people engaged in different occupations were protected against all calamities. In the event of a drought he was to help the subjects with food, etc. 308

According to Hanum, the king should work in such a way that his people are as happy to see him as on seeing the full moon. 309 In the Rāmāyaṇa we read that the king was expected to share the happiness and sorrows of his subjects. 310 He was to do everything that pleased the people and nothing that caused agitation to them. 311 He was to go out on the streets daily to meet the people, 312 besides participating in their ceremonies like Śāmāja, Dāna, Yajña and Vivāha. 313 The king was to ensure that his citizens did not think about him disapprovingly; therefore he was to act in such a way as did not cause any grief to them when following his own example. 314 The popular notion, as already said, was that the sufferings and happiness of the subjects resulted from the bad and good deeds of their monarch. Hence a very high standard of moral life was made obligatory for him.

The aim of the state was to make the subjects happy, contented and fearless so that they could pursue their ultimate goal abiding by the rules of Dharma. Kautilya says that the king should maintain the observance by the people of their respective duties. 315 The Rāmāyaṇa refers to his
King as Dharma\textsuperscript{316} and Dharmavik\textsuperscript{317} and to the subjects as Sudharmik\textsuperscript{318} as well as 'those abiding by their respective duties'.\textsuperscript{319} He tells us that there was no one in Ayodhya who did not perform the Asmita; the Brahmans were busy in their own duty of Dana and study and all the four castes worshipped the gods and honoured their guests; the Ksatriyas respected the Brahmans, the Vaishyas obeyed Ksatriyas and the Sudras served the other three castes.\textsuperscript{320} The king of the Ramayana was the protector of Dharma, too. He ensured that the people observed their duties rigidly and stopped them from doing what was not Dharma. It was believed that if a king allowed someone to do the forbidden, he brought miseries to his people and earned for himself a place in hell.\textsuperscript{321} Therefore any citizen who did not keep to his caste-duty became liable for the severest punishment as, for example, was given to 'Sambuka.\textsuperscript{322} Regarding the four stages of life (Aramasa), we are told that Rama was selected for coronation when he had attained the age of 25 years. Moreover, there are references in the Ramayana to the observance of the Agramadharma by the people.\textsuperscript{323}

Kaut\textsuperscript{i}ya names four sources of law, namely Dharma, Vyavahara, Caritra and Rajaasana, and places the royal edict above the other three sources in case of conflict.\textsuperscript{324} He believes that the rules made by the king could set aside the 'Sastric rules. But according to Manu the king could formulate only such laws for the administration of kingdom as may not violate Jatidharma, Pegrudharma, 'Sredharm and Kulesharma.\textsuperscript{325}
Thus, it would appear that besides the first two sources of law, namely Dharma and Vyavahāra, the local conventions of the castes, Janapada, and trade corporations had also the validity of law. In the Rāmāyaṇa, we come across many terms used for the sources of law. We read that Rāvaṇa was the best among the gods and demons in understanding Dharma, Lokavṛtta, and Śāstra. In another reference, we come across terms Caritra, Sārdhāma, and Dharma.

The above quoted word Caritra seems to be identical with Caritra of Kautilya, which means local conventions. That the Rāmāyaṇa accepted the conventions as a source of law is evidenced by the use of word Deśadharma which can be identified with Hamu's Janapadasastra, both meaning conventions of a particular territory. The Vyavahāra of Kautilya has its counterpart in Vālmiki's Lokavṛtta which can be interpreted as agreements arrived at by the people.

The first source of law, namely Dharma, has been treated as the most comprehensive source by all the political thinkers. This is the position in the Rāmāyaṇa also as we find Vālmiki referring to the ingredients of Dharma at different places in the epic such as Sārdhāma, Sanātanaśastra, Sanataśastra, Gurodharma, and Pitṛnait śastra. It is very significant that the Rāmāyaṇa does not mention Rājasāsana (royal edict) as a source of law. This is because this source of law was of foreign origin. No Indian thinker prior to Kautilya had referred to it.
accepted royal edict as a source of law for the first time under the impact of the Greek empires in Syria and Egypt. It is true that the word Rājasana occurs in the Rāmāyaṇa also but it carries the ordinary meaning of king's order.

We have discussed the duties of the king before the powers because he derived his powers through the performance of his duties. Otherwise the Indian political writers do not talk of the powers of the king at all. The king was required to provide an efficient administration for the security and welfare of his subjects. That gave him the administrative and judicial powers. Since he was expected to protect the country against foreign invasions, he became vested with the authority to decide relationship with his neighbours. In this manner, the king of the Rāmāyaṇa was quite powerful. He was the supreme head of the executive, with the authority to appoint his counsellors, ministers, commander and even the Aurohita to help him in discharging his duties in accordance with Dharma. If he felt that some functionary was not performing his duty properly or was disobedient or disloyal, he had the authority to remove him or punish him suitably. He presided over the meetings of the assembly and discussed matters with his ministers. He listened to the opinions expressed in the assembly and by the ministers but decided himself what was to be done. His verdict was the final in all matters. For example, in the case of Vibhīṣaṇa
we read that Rāma over-ruled the majority-opinion. Similar to this, he had the sole authority with regard to assignment of duties of his officers.

The king was the Supreme Commander of the army. If he was killed or made captive, the army immediately surrendered. He was the Śvēmā of the army and, therefore, protected from all dangers.

The king had the sole powers to collect the tax and make expenditure. His power to spend was not limited, which exposed the treasure to wrongful utilisation also.

The most dreaded power of the king was his coercive power (Danda). He was called Dandadhara and Vineta (the restraider). He was the Supreme-Judge also and could sometimes decide a case all by himself. Daśaratha even claimed to having vast powers and offered to punish any innocent person and release anyone condemned to death. But the king normally decided matters in consultation with his Rāsādī, for example the cases of the dead child and Lakṣmaṇa. The king had full regard for the opinion of his court and mostly accepted its advice. But he was not bound to accept it, and we find that Rāma overruled the opinion of his ministers and others in the case of his brother, giving suitable reasons. He could order an already decided case for a review also.

The king as we have stated above was vested with the power to decide relationship with other states and to formulate
a foreign policy. No doubt he discussed the foreign policy with his counsellors but he had the final authority. Rāvana, for instance ignored the opinions of Vibhīṣaṇa and Mālyavān.

The Arthasastra has devoted much space to the description of measures for king's protection. Kama and the Nāṭaka also discuss the problem. In the Rāmāyaṇa, we find that protection of the king was given utmost importance. He was considered the basis of law and victory and was protected in all situations. Therefore, according to the Rāmāyaṇa, armed women slept near him at night and accompanied him to other places in the harem, and outside he was guarded by alert, youthful and loyal guards carrying bows and axes. When he went on state drives, he was surrounded by his ministers and others for his protection. The security arrangements described in the Rāmāyaṇa are, however, not as elaborate as prescribed by the political thinkers, but they are enough to show that the king was protected well.
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87. Kāmndaka, I. 60.

88. Vede ca vedāṅgeṣu niṣṭhītaḥ. Rām. V. 33. 14
Sarve vedaśīdād sūrāḥ sarve lokabhir vataḥ,  

89. Yajurveda vinītaśca, Rām. V. 33. 14.

90. Rāma performed the last rites of Jāṭāyu after he was 
killed. Rām. III. 64. 33-35.

Dhanurvedavidām tāvata, Rām. II. 1. 23.

92. Rām. II. 94. 9.

93. Ṛgveda caiva yuktā vāraṇavajinām. Rām. II. 1. 23.

94. loke tirathasammataḥ, Rām. II. 1. 23.

The king of the Rāmāyana exhibits a thorough knowledge of diplomacy. See Chapter VI, for a detailed discussion on the subject.

Ibid.


106. Ayakarmanyupāyajñāḥ samṛṣṭavyayakarmavit, Rām. II.1.21.

107. Piturajñāṁ puraskṛtya paurakāryaṁ sarvasaḥ,
Cakāra Rāme dharmāṁ priyaṁ ca hitānicā. Rām. II.1.12.

108. Sīkavṛddhājirñānavrddhārvyovrddhaisca sajjenaḥ,
Kathayānāṁ vai nityastrastrayogāntarṣvaṁ. Rām. II.1.17.


110. Rām. I.29.5.

111. Rām. II.55-56.


113. Rām. II.94.55-56.

114. Vaibhārikānāṁ 'silpaṁ vijnānasrthavibhāgavit. Rām. II.1.22.
115. राजानम्त्रिष्ठमांमर्ममुन्निष्ठानं क्रत्यां तेमदुत्थानसाध्वनां कर्वित्। अर्थास्त्र, I.18.

116. अर्थास्त्र, I.18.

117. रामु, VII. 145-46; 216-17, 222-25.

118. याज्ञवल्क्य, I. 327-33.

119. कुमारिक, VII. 58.

120. तुर्वाहाः पुराक्रत्यां क्रत्वा धर्मेन धर्मवित्।

'Seṣāṃ divasaḥ bhāgasmantah puragato/bhavet. Rām.VII.41.18.

121. Rām. II. 59. 3-4.

122. Rām. II. 59. 4.

123. तुर्वां सदिक्षमुपासिनो जाजपा यत्समाः। Rām.II.6.6.

124. Rām. II. 94. 43.

125. उत्तितालिप्ततस्तत्सि बलानामामुदारासे। Rām.VI.3.18.

126. Rām. VII.41.18.


128. Rām. VII. 73. 1-2.

129. नाद्यकाकशस्तरसे रामो निरजागां सुहळ्यवतः।

Rām. VII.41.27.

130. हस्यकारां ससंसतताः। Rām.VII. 42.1.

131. Rām. VII. 43. 44.

132. Vide, नुर्यसाग्रहाति निर्गहोति कृतिनुपारणस्वानहि।

Madhurairgitāsabdaiśca pratibudhyasva 'ṣeṣa ca.

Rām.VI.116.10.

132A. This can be deduced from the references.

133. कृतिनुपारतास्ति cintayasyarthanipūnaṃ। Rām. II.94.12.

134. Ibid.
136. Rām. V. 5.32.
137. Rām. V. 6.2.
138. Also referred to as Antarṣgha (Rām.II.4.3.).
139A. See Chapter IV for Sahbra.
139B. Also referred to as Antsrgrha (Rām.11.4.3).
140. Rām. V. 22.31.
142. Tetra kāśayīṇa vṛddhānuṃtrapatīṇaṃvahṣītṛtan,
    Dērāsa visthitandvāri strīdhyakṣāṃsasamāhitān.
    Rām.II.14.3.
143. Strīya vṛddhāśca bālaśca —— Rām.II.17.4.
144. Rām. II. 14.41 II.17.5.
145. Rām.V.8.1. (Śayanāsana); II.29.8 (Paryanka).
146. Rām. V.47.9.
146A. Jambunadamaya —— Rām.V.5.39 (also see II.66.27).
147. Rām. II.27.11; V.3.4.
148. Rām.V.7.22; VII.41.12.
149. Tūlājīnasamparā, Rām.II.27.11.
150. Mahāya kuthayāstirṇāṃ prthivilakṣāṃsānkeṣu,Rām.V.7.22.
151. Rām.III.39.27; VII.41.1.
152. Rām.VII.41 1-10; V.12; V.5.34-35.
153. Rām. II.10.13; V.4.7.
155. Rām.V.5.27.
156. Rām.II. 59.1-4.
137. Ibid.
138. Rām. VII. 42 and 44.
139. Rām. VII. 43. 2-3.
140. Ṛruoha mṛpaṁ draṣṭaṁ saha sutena Rāghavaḥ. Rām. II. 3.15.
141. Rām. II. 1. 36-37; II. 3.10; II. 3.18.
142. Rām. II. 3.20.
143. Rām. II. 2.
144. Sukṣma vastra vastrapāpya, Rām. II. 3.7.

Rāvana's white robe was so delicate that it got entangled with his ornaments. (V.16.20.).

145. Mahābhāṣya māsāsvītam, Rām. V. 47.4.
148. Tūlaṁyasamapāvaśe marge mamasaha tvayā. Rām. II. 27.11.
149A. Jīrṇakārpamahāpataṁ, Rām. V. 51.6.
150. Sharma Ramasraya, op. cit. pp.243-44.
151. Kauśeyaniśīl vraṭastera, Rām. VI. 102.30.
151. Rajakāśastuvāyāsca, Rām. II. 77.15.
151A. Sa 'sātīṁ tvaritah katyaṁ, Rām. II. 29.25.
152. Rām. VI. 102.20.
153. Sharma Ramasraya, op. cit. p.245.

S.N. Vyas suggests that bordered and embroidered clothes were known as Samvīta-vatra (Rāmāyaṇa Kaḷīna Sanskriti, p.50). But the term Samvīta should be taken to mean 'clothes' or covered up' as explained by Apte (op. cit. p.577).
174. Sa pāduke te haratāḥ pratāpavān svalankṛte,
   Rāma. II. 10.4.23.

175. Vajrasamyojasamyuktair mahārhamāṇivigrhaṁ,
   Haimairāhāhiścitrairmanaseva prakalpitaṁ.
   Rāma. V. 47.3.

176. Rāma. I. 6.10; V. 47.2.
177. Rāma. VI. 47.25.
178. Rāvaṇa's gold crown has been described as thickly set-in
   with pearls:
   Rājēmānaḥ mahārthena kaścanena virājataṁ,
   Kukta-jālavṛtenaḥ mukunḍena mahādyutim. Rāma. V. 47.2.

179. Tato vastragatam suktṣa divyaṁ cūḍāmanis 'subhōṁ,
   Rāma. V. 36.52.

180. Rāma. VI. 47.25; II. 29.5; I. 6.10.
181. Rāma. V. 47.7; II. 29.7 (hāran hemaśūtraṁ ca)
182. Rāma. II. 29.7.
184. Rāma. I. 6.11: Nāhastābhiseñapo vāpi,
185. a śya devyaghulīyakam, Rāma. V. 34.2.
186. Rāma. II. 29.5.
188. Rāma. II. 29.5; V. 47.8.
189. māpyanaḥgaradānākārak, Rāma. I. 6.11.
190. Raśmēś caṅkhaṁ, Rāma. II. 29.7.
193. Pratikarma ca R̄masya, R̄m.VI.116.16.  
Pratikarma ca Sītāyūḥ, R̄m.VI.116.17.  
Pratikarma, thus, was meant both for men and women.

194. R̄m. VI. 109.3.  
195. Alakāravidaśeṣma nāryā, R̄m.VI.109.3.  
Āninyuḥ snānajña, R̄m.II.9.3.  
196. Snānāni cāṅgaraṅgāni, R̄m.VI.109.2.  
197. R̄m. I.6.10.  
198. Ibid.  
199. Svanuliptēṣ vicitrāḥbirvividbhāṣīca bhaktibhiḥ,  
R̄m.VI.47.4.  
Apte takes it for decoration, ornament, embellishment also. (Op.cit. p.397).

200. raktacandalanaruṣitam, R̄m.VI.47.4.  
201. Uṭtamastrivimardita, R̄m.V.8.18.  
202. māiyāṁ vividhāni ca, R̄m.VI.109.2.  
203. R̄m. II. 99.3.  
204. Bhāskyāma pānahī, R̄m. I.12.10.  
Annalāṭasēca bhavavc, R̄m. I.13.11.  
205. Māṁsāni ca vicitrāṁ phalāni vividhēnica, R̄m.VII.41.14.  
The various animals and birds killed for eating and cooked in Ravana's kitchen were Mṛga, Māhiṣa, Varāha,  
Mayūra, cock, Vadhāsaka, Śalva, Kṛkṛa (Kṛkara), Siddha,  
Cakora, Chāga etc. (V.9. 11-14).  
206. Ibid.  
207. Bhāṣasamkāra-kusalamvaca, R̄m.VII.37.22.
206. Sitān saṁghya vāhubhyā mādhumaireyamuttamam,
Pāyāyāśa kākutṣṭhāḥ 'Sacīṃdroyathātmam. Rām. VII.4.1.2.

Rāvan's palace had Ṛṣabhadhū (bar) where wine was served (V.9.3).

209A. Brahmārṇa ca surūpe ca, Rām. IV.33.12.

According to Rāmasraya Sharma, drinking of wine was so popular in Ayodhya that its aroma could be felt in the atmosphere (op.cit. p.233), but the above verse clearly and categorically treat wine addiction as a sin.

On Prakash Sharma (Food and Drinks in Ancient India (pp. 118-19) and S.N. Vyas (op.cit, p.189) have discussed liquors in detail.


The Gitapress edition (p.890) quotes the following lines to define Rāga and Sāndava:
Sitāmadhvāśīdhaḥuro drākṣādaṁmayo rasaḥ
Vīralāscat kṛto rāgaḥ sāndrascāt khaṇḍavaḥ sarṣaḥ.

211. ikṣukāndharaśodakam, Rām. I. 5.17.
214. Vālmīki has referred to a number of music-instruments, namely Viṇā (V.8.35), Vajāsa (V.8.35), Maḍḍuka (V.8.35), Paṭaha (V.3.36), Mṛdanga (V.8.33), Paṇava (V.8.39), Diṅgīma (V.8.40), Ādamba (V.8.41) and Kalaśi (V.8.42).

215. Vādyanti tathā sāntim lāsyantarpyad caṇe,
Nāṭakāṇyapare prabhūbasyaṁ vividhāṁ ca. Rām.II.63.4.
216. Tatropaviṣṭaṁ rājaṁnamupāsante vicakṣaṇaṁ,
kathanaṁ bhurupanam hasyakaraṁ samantataḥ. Rām. VII. 42.1.

217. Rām. III. 54, VII. 41.1.

218. Rām. VII. 41.


220. Kadāḥem punarāgamyasaraivaḥ puṣpita vane,
Mṛgāṃ peryaṭīṣyami mātra pitra ca saṅgataḥ. Rām. II. 43.13

221. Rām. VII. 78 (Vide king Ila's story).

222. Mṛgāṃ peryaṭīṣyami, Rām. II. 43.13.

223. Śvāduḥ halagulaṃ guechamaṇaṇṭakidrumamuttānatoṣayāṃ
-------- Arthaśāstra, II. 2.

224. Rām. VII. 47.

225. Rām. III. 41. 4-5.

226. Mighnamrāṅkumjaṃcaca pibamścāṃanyacakṣa madhu,
Nadīcācā vividhaḥ paśyama rājaṁ saṃmārīgyati.
Rām. II. 32.16.

227. Rām. VI. 102. 20.

We are told in the same context that Rāma did not
mean that Utsarapī was not liked by the Arya king Rāma.

228. Rām. II. 34. 32.

229. Rām. V. 22.31.

230. Rām. V. 8.16 : Agramahisī is also referred to as
Jyeṣṭhāpatnī (Rām. II. 3.23; VI. 99. 1-2).

231. Ibid.

232. Kauśalyā bibhayedārya sahasramapi madvidhān,
Yasyaḥ sahasram grāmanam samprāptamupajīvanam.
Rām. II. 29.7.
Tārā has been depicted as giving her counsel to Vālī and Sugrīva; but it is clear that she had no power to force her decision or views. Vālī in fact did not pay any heed to her advice. (IV.16).


Rām. II.8.5.

236. Na Sītāyāḥ param bhāryāṃ vavre sa Raghunandanaḥ,
Rām. VII.89.4.

237. Daddau kenyā 'sataṁ tāsām, Rām.I.73.5.

238. The examples of Sagara and Daśaratha can be cited in this regard: Sagara had two wives and Daśaratha three, but both were without any issue before the divine favour.

239. Viṣṇusulkaṃ mama sutām, Rām.I.71.21; also see I.65.15,17

240. Tataḥ paramakopena Rājéno munipungava, Arundhanithilēm sarve viṣṇuṣagdeṣhamāgataḥ.
Rām.I.65.22.

241. Rām. I. 73. 3-6.


243. Ya na 'sakya purē drastum bhutaśrakasageṣu, Tāṃdya Sītām paśyanti rājaṃṛṣagataḥ janāḥ. Rām.II.30.3

244. Vyasanēṣu na kṛcchreṣu na yuddhe na svayamvare, Na kṛatau na vivāhe ca darśanām dusyaṭe striyāḥ.
Rām.VI.102.27.
245. Viṣṇuḥ na ca kartavyeṣu Bhāratasya kadaścana,
    Sa hi rāja prabhūśaiva deśasya ca kulasya ca.
    Rām. II.23.31.

246. Tāma hīṃsyām cākrośemākṣipenōṣṇu prātiṣṭhāpyaṇam vaaret,
    Deva rāmśarūpeṇa carantyate māhu tālve. Rām. IV.18.38.

247. Rājathā bhrahmāḥ, Rām. IV.17.32.

248. Rām. II.18. (Vide Vālī'ś example).

249. Rām. II.72.4; II.20.17-18; II.18.7; II.31.23.

250. Rām. I.20.2-4; III.6.11; VII.64.12 and 15.

251. Rām. VII.52-55 (Vide Lavaṇaś' example).


    Rāma dharmaḥbrūtām varah, Rām. VI.99.35.

256. Na mṛpaḥ kāma-vṛttayaḥ, Rām. IV.17.28.


258. Yadṛṣṭaḥ santi rājanastadeṛṣṭaḥ santi hi prajāḥ.
    Rām. II.101.9.

259. Ibid.

260. Rājadeśaścāvīpyante prajāḥ hyavidhipālitāḥ,
    Asadṛṣṭe tu mṛpaḥvākāle mṛityate janaḥ. Rām. VII.64.12.

261. Kṛtaḥ tretāyugam caiva dvāparaḥ kalireva ca,
    Rājaḥ vṛttāni sarvāni rājaḥ hi yugamucyate.
    Kali prasupta bhavati sa jāgraṇīdvāparaḥ yugam,
    Karmavahbhūtyadṛṣṭā vicarante kṛtam yugam.
    Rāma, IX.301-302.
262. *Ram.* I. 24.15; I. 25.5; V.49.4; VII.84.13.

263. *Suśakakāśṭhairbhavetkāryam loṣṭhairapi ca pṛṇasubhīh,
Na tu sthānātparibrahmaḥ kāryam syaḥ dvasudhādhipaiḥ.*
*Rām.* III. 31.17.


265. *Adharmastu mahāstāta bhavettesya mahāpetaḥ,
Yo haredbaliṣadbhāgasya ca raksatī putravat.*
*Rām.* III. 5.10.

266. *Ram.* VII. 74.10.
268. *Ram.* II. 34.35.

269. *Baliṣadbhāgaḥmuddhṛtya aprasyaḥksitaḥ praśāḥ,
Adharmo yo/syaḥstu yasyāryo/mate gataḥ,
Pripātyamāṇasya rājno bhūtiḥ putravat,
Tatastā dhruyatūm pāpaḥ yasyāryo/mate gataḥ.*
*Rām.* II.69.18 and 17.


271. See Jayaswal, K.P. op. cit. p.342 (the quotation is from Mbh. XII. 27.43).

272. *Apryam jīvitām gāhyam yuṣmānva pruṣaṁgraḥbhīḥ,
Apaṇaḥbhayaḥbhīتاḥ kīṃ punaraṁśkaṁtajaj. Rām.VII.44.13

273. *Arthashastra,* I. 18; *Agnipūrṇa,* 222.8.


275. *Na ciraḥ pāpaṁkarmanāḥ kṛuṇā lokajugupaitaḥ,
Aiśvāryam prāpya tiṣṭhanti hṛṣṇaṁūlaḥ iva drumāḥ.*
*Rām.* III.26.7.

278. Mbh. XII.77.
279. Caturvarnyaṃ ca loka/maṁsva dhaṁre niyokṣyati,

Ram.I.1.75.

280. Drajasaprakṣa dharmeṇa, Ram.VII.98.23.
282. Ram.II.94. 26-27 and 42-44.
283. *Arthasastra*, IV. 1-5.
284. Ram. VI.116.36; II. 94.38.
286. Nīrdayurakṣavat lokopāra nānāthāḥ kacchadāpṛṣat, Ram.VI.116.95
287. rūjāparādhādiva taksahasya, Ram. V.26.9.
289. Ram. II.67.22 (Vide description of conditions when there
is no king).
290. Avinītaṇum vinetaḥ, Ram.III.47.25.
291. Manu, VIII. 386-87.
292. Ram.VI.116. 84-90; I.1. 71-73.
293. Ram.II. 94.39; VI. 116.94.
294. na ca vyākṛtāṃ bhayaṃ, Ram.VI.116.84.
296. Vide: Brahmaṇadudito lokastuṣṭaḥ puṣṭaḥ sudhārmaṇaḥ,
Nirāmayo arogaśca durbhikṣaḥ bhayaṃvarjitaḥ.
Na putramaraṃ keciddrakṣyanti puruṣaḥ kacit,
Mārṣeścāvidhavā nityam bhavisyanti pativrataḥ.
Na vātajabhayaṃ kincīmāpsu majjanti jantaveḥ,
Na agniṃ bhayaṃ kincīdātāḥ kṛtyuṣāṃ tathā.

Ram.I.1. 71-73
Also see R̄ām. VI.116. 36 and 88.


298. Adevāmātrikāḥ rāmyaḥ, R̄ām. II. 94.39.


300. Viśe, kaccittvāṁ navajānanti — R̄ām. II. 94.22 (read with 21 and 23).

301. R̄ām. II. 94.43; I.7.10.

302. kaccidānyo viśuddhataḥ — R̄ām. II. 94.27.

303. Vyāsasena kaccidāḥhyasya durgaṭasya ca rāghavaḥ, Artham virāṇaḥ pasyanti tavaṃśatyaḥ bahuṣrutah.

304. R̄ām. II.94.49.

305. Piteva bandhu lokasya, R̄ām.V.94.13.


308. Tesaṁ guptiparidhūraiḥ kaccitte bharanam kṛtām, R̄ām.II. 94.41.


310. Vyāsaneṣu manusyaṁ bhṛśam bhavati duḥkhītāḥ, Utsaveṣu ca sarveṣu piteva paritusyati. R̄ām.II.2.28.


312. R̄ām. II. 94.43.
313. Dānayajñavivahesa sammājęsu mahatsu ca — Rām. II. 51. 13.
314. Asadvṛtte hi —— Rām. VII. 64. 12.
316. Tasya tveVaṃ prabhāvasya dharmajñasya, Rām. I. 3.
319. Brāhmaṇeaih kṣatriyaśirvaiśyai svakarmaniratataiḥ saḍā.

Rām. II. 94. 35.

322. Rām. VII. 65. 23.

323. The Gītāpress edition has the following verse regarding observance of Varṇaśāramadharma:

Vedaiśca brahmaśaryaśa gurubhiścopakarṣitaḥ,
Bhogakāle mahatākṣaḥ punareva pāpatsyate.

Rām. II. 12-94.

324. Dharmaśa ca vyavahāraśca caritam rājaśasanam,
Vivādārthacatuspadaḥ pācimaiḥ pūrvab dhakah,
Arthaśāstra, III. 1.

325. Jñānapadāndharmānchṛṇidharmāmśca dharmavit,
Samikṣya kaladharmāmśca svadharmam pratipādayet.

Manu, VIII. 41.

326. Na dharmaśe na ca lokarthat'naśastrabuddhigrahamśaṃvapi,
Vidyate kaścittava viśa tulyastvaḥ hyuttamaḥ sarvasurāsurānam. Rām. V. 50. 9.

also see:
Rājendharmaviruddhas lokarhitasca garbham. Rām. V. 50. 5.
327. Chinnacāritryakakṣṣaṇa satam dharmātivartinā,  
Tyakta-dharmānukṣeṇaḥ nibho Rāmahastinā. Rām. VI.17.38
328. Vyāsiddhānāmābhīrdeśa-sadharmastu pūjyatam.  
Rām. III.8.23.
329. Lokvyūtta has also been referred to as Loka-kasana-saya  
(IV.18.4).
330. satam dharmātivartinā, Rām. IV.17.39.
331. tyakta-dharmam sanātanaṃ. Rām. IV.18.18.
333. dharmam pitypaitāmahe, Rām. IV.18.39.
334. Adbhīrdeśabhirye ca nāgacchanti mamājñayā,  
336. Eko/pyamātyo medhāvī, Rām. II.94.19.
337. The stories of Daṇḍa (VII.70) and Triśākū (I.57-58)  
show that the king had the power to appoint his Rūchita.  
The epic says: Rūchitam ca āsanam varayāmāna, VII.70.18
338. We read that Rāvaṇa threatened to kill his ministers  
'Suka and Sārana, when they spoke highly of Rāvaṇa  
(VI.20.9-10). Later he banished them, and they came to  
Rāvaṇa. (See also II.94.23.
339. Rām. VI.11-12.
340. kaccimānukhyā mahātva eva madhyameṣu ca madhyānāḥ,  
Jaghaṇyāśca jagannāḥ blātyāḥ karmasu yojitāḥ.  
Rām. II.94.20.
341. Svāmi kalatam sainyasya gatireṣa paraśtapu Rām. IV.64.23.
342. Rām. I.7.8 and 10; II.94.22.
343. Rām. II.94.45.
344. Manurdaṇḍadharmaprabhuh, Rām. VII.70.5.
345. Avinītānaṁ vinatā, Rām. III.47.25.
346. Rām. VII.43.44.
347. Avadhyo vadhyaatam ko vā vadhyaḥ ko vā vishnu yogatam, Rām. II.10.10.
348. Rām. VII.65.2.
349. Rām. VII.96-97.
351. Rām. VII.96.11.
352. Tyage vadhoh vā vīhitāḥ vādhunāsūbhayam samān Rām. VII.96.13
353. This power was exercised in Sītā's case.
356. Arthasastra, I.20; See also Kāmandaka, VII and 'Sukra, I. 326-28.
357. Manu, VII. 217-20.
358. Matsyas. 219.
359. Rājomūlo hi dharmāsca jayaśca jayataṃvara,
Tasmatscrvāvasthāsu rakṣitavye naśadāpy, Rām. III. 39.10
360. Rām. V.5; V. 16.
361. Vide: Rāṣeṣakāmukhabhūtābhīṣyabhṛṁśaṭaṁ labalāḥ,
Rām. II.14.2.

also see II.4.24.

362. Rām. VI. 116.33 and VII.78 (Vide Ila's story).