The Vedic assemblies, namely the Vidatha, the Sabhā and the Samiti, lost their original character with the gradual transformation of the tribal state into the territorial state. We do not find any mention of the Vidatha in the post-Vedic period. The words Sabhā and Samiti do occur in the later inscriptions and literature but they represent an altogether different connotation. They are no longer the Village Assembly and the Central Assembly of the Vedic period.

The word Samiti occurs in the Rāmāyaṇa at quite a few places in a compounded form, combining the word Java, and has been used as an epithet of some of its important characters. For example Rāma and Indrajit have been referred to as Samitijava. The various verses in which the word occurs make it obvious that it has been employed in the Rāmāyaṇa to denote 'war' or 'battle' and not the Vedic assembly. And the compounded form conveys the sense 'victorious in war or battle'.

The term Sabhā appears more frequently than Samiti in the epic. According to a contemporary writer, Vālmīki has used it to convey different meanings viz a place of meeting for the king and his ministers, a social club where people played and said humorous tales, a king's court of justice and an assembly which discussed important state-matters. But a
perusal of the contexts in which the word occurs does not support the above view. Moreover, the verses quoted by the author of the above theory in support of his argument are unable to confirm his inferences. The fact is that the term Sabha has not been used to convey so many senses, as shall be seen from the following discussion.

The word Sabha occurs first in the Ayodhyākanda wherein it is said that the Sabha became resplendent by Rāma’s luster like the sky full of Grahas and Nakṣatras in winter by the moon. The said passage has been used by some to prove that the body referred to here was the Pariṣad which had assembled to approve of Rāma’s selection. But the argument is unfounded and, therefore, does not receive any support from the epic. The word Sabha has nowhere been used by Vālmīki as a synonym of Pariṣad. Moreover, it is significant that the poet has compared the Sabha with the winter sky, studded with the heavenly bodies, and not with a living organism; thus he has himself made it clear that the term has not been used to denote an organisation or a body comprising human beings. The Sabha referred to above stands for the hall where the Pariṣad, which was summoned to consider the appointment of the heir-apparent, discussed the matter.

The Sabha has been referred to again in the context of preparations for the scheduled consecration. We are told that Pauras put up long flagstaffs with flags on temples (Devāvatanesu), crossroads (Catuspathas), streets (Rathas),
Big buildings (Attalakas), markets (Aranas), houses of the rich citizens and Sabbas. In this context also the term has been grouped with buildings, roads etc. inanimate things.

The word appears again in the same book when we are told that the Dvijas assembled and went to the Sabha in the morning following the death of king Dasaratha. In this reference also the word appears to indicate the Assembly Hall where the counsellors, the ministers and other members used to hold meetings presided over by the king. Had it not been so, there was no need to describe the counsellors as going to it to discuss the grave political crisis caused by Dasaratha's sudden demise. During the deliberation it was said that the people living in a kingless country did not cause the construction of Sabhas for the benefit of others. And it has again been placed along with Uyyana (garden) and Rupasrtha (alm-house) which does not leave any doubt in the mind of the reader that the Sabha in the Ramayana means nothing but a hall.

In another passage containing the word Sabha, we are told by Valmiki that Bharata was entertained by artists in a Sabha by performing dance and instrumental music. Here again the term means a large room or a hall where such performances could be arranged.

Some more passages in the book II lend further support to our view. In one of these we find Bharata very unhappy to learn that Rama was sent into exile just to make way for
him to become the king. Therefore he wept bitterly and others in the palace cried, too. At that juncture the Purohitā went to the Sabhā of Ikṣvākūs, which was mostly made of gold (śatākamūtha) like the Sudharmā Sabhā of the gods; there he sat on a gold-seat with a Svastika shaped covering and gave orders to the messengers. Further, we read that he summoned Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas and the Amātyas to discuss the anointment of a new king. When all the members occupied their respective seats, the Sabhā is said to have looked 'like a calm lake full of whales (Tīmis) and water-elephants (Nāgas). Elaborating the description further the poet tells us that it was full of distinguished people (Āryaganas) who sat on their allotted seats, and looked like a cloudless full-moon-night. In the verses following the above account, it is said that Bharata wept in the Sabhā and remonstrated to the Purohitā with a voice choked with tears. Those who sat in the Sabhā have been referred to as Sabhāsadas.

The word Sabhā occurs again in the sixth book at quite a few places. We read that when Rāvana was trying to make Sītā agree to his proposal, he was approached by a Rākṣasa who told him that Praharṣa and other counsellors had assembled in the Sabhā to discuss a very serious matter with him. Thereupon Rāvana entered the Sabhā and made suitable arrangements. In another account we are told that Rāvana spoke to his ministers very loudly and the Sabhā resonated his speech. Here again it is obvious that the Sabhā was the term to denote a hall.
In another account Valmīki tells us that after the death of his son Rāvana got very furious and ran out of the Sabha in order to kill Sītā, but he was prevailed upon by his wise Sakīva Supārśva, who told him that killing a woman was not in his interest. Thus pacified Rāvana re-entered the Sabha and considered the action for next day’s battle. In this account also Rāvana leaves and enters the Sabha along with his Sūhrde. It is, thus, clear that the term means only the building and does not include any occupants.

It is explicit that the word Sabha in the epic has not been employed to mean either a political or any other type of institution. Valmīki has evidently used the word to denote a hall which had seats for the assembly, which echoed speech, which could be entered and left and which shone because of the dangling ornaments and colourful clothes of the occupants. The use of similes comparing the Sabha with a lake and a cloudless moonlit night also strengthens our argument that it was an inanimate object. The idea that Sabha in the epic was sort of a precursor of the modern political assembly or that it was a popular body representing the people as well as the state is unfounded and unsupported.

It has also been argued that the term Sāsāsad in the epic is a synonym of ‘Sabhā and Pārisad’ and, therefore, stands for a political institution. The evidence of the epic, however, does not confirm this view, too. The word Sāsāsad occurs twice in the Ayodhyākanda in the context of Bharata's
meeting with Rāma in the forest. In the first instance Bharata says, "Alas! my elder brother, who deserves to be worshipped by Prakṛti in a saṃsad, sits here amidst wild animals." Here the word 'Prakṛtibhī' means 'by the subjects and officials'. In the other verse in the same context the gathering at Citrakūṭa has been referred to as Saṃsād. This gathering as we know from the epic comprised the princes, the queens, the ministers, the soldiers and the people.\(^{24}\) In the Yuddhakīṇḍa we find the term being replaced by Janasamāsad and read Sītā saying, "I shall enter fire as that is the only course for me, being unable to please my husband by my qualities and disowned in the Janasamāsad."\(^ {25}\) The gathering at Lakhē comprised the Vānaras and Rākṣasas.

It is, thus, easy to conclude from the above that this term also does not mean a political body. The term Saṃsad in the Rāmāyaṇa stands for any gathering of people and has been derived from the root 'Sad' with 'Saṃ' as prefix, conveying the sense 'a gathering of people'. In fact Vālmīki has himself made the meaning of this term very clear by using it as a synonym of Janasamāsad. It can be further argued that the Saṃsad has nowhere been described in the Rāmāyaṇa transacting any government business or discussing any matter concerning the policy. Therefore also, the word Saṃsad in the Rāmāyaṇa denotes only a gathering of people, irrespective of its constituting elements.
Thus, we have seen that the words Sabha and Sabha in the Rāmāyaṇa do not denote the political institution, which is but natural for the Vedic Sabha and Samiti had already disappeared from the scene when the events of Rāmāyaṇa took place. It has also been shown by us that the word Sabha in the epic means a gathering of people only.

There is, however, another term in the epic, namely Parīṣad, which certainly stands for the political institution which existed in the epic period, was held in esteem and transacted important business of the state. The powers, functions and constitution of this body can be well understood from the various accounts comprising description of its functioning.

In the Ayodhya-kāṇḍa we read that king Dāsratha hurriedly convened a meeting inviting Pauras, Janapadas and subordinate kings, after reaching a decision in consultation with his Svacivas. Others present in the meeting were the Naigamas and the counsellors. The assembly thus convened has been referred to as Parīṣad.

Dāsratha told the Parīṣad that he had been serving the people, following the path of his ancestors, and had grown old in the shade of the white royal umbrella. He, therefore, expressed his desire to have rest after appointing a heir-apparent with the permission of the honourable Dvijas. Thereafter he proposed the name of Rama and assured them that
his eldest son was the most suitable choice for the office to serve the people as best as possible. The Pariṣad agreed with the king and approved his proposal. The Pariṣad gave reasons for its decision and told the king that it had been based on Rāma's great qualities and popularity. Later, the king sent for the prince and gave him some advice in the assembly before its adjournment.

The term Pariṣad occurs again in the last book on two occasions. In the first instance we are told that Rāma listened to the recitation of the Rāmāyaṇa in the Pariṣad, along with the Munis, the kings, and the Vānaras. And this was the same Pariṣad which has been referred to in the first book. The Pariṣad was attended by the counsellors, the king's brothers and the Naigamas also, who were the permanent participants in all the important meetings at Ayodhya during Rāma's rule. The kings present in the meeting were the feudatories and the allies, who had come to attend the sacrifice.

The recitation of the Rāmāyaṇa made Rāma aware that Lava and Kuśa were his own sons from Sītā. He, therefore, ordered his messengers in the Pariṣad to go to sage Vālmīki and say that Sītā should prove her purity in the Pariṣad with the permission of the sage, if she was upright. He told them to apprise him of their views and that if Sītā was ready to take an oath before the Pariṣad, she could do that on the day that followed. Vālmīki and Sītā accepted the proposal, thereupon
Rāma invited the sages, the kings and others who were desirous of witnessing the oath and adjourned the meeting.\textsuperscript{40}

The next day Rāma went to the place of sacrifice and invited all the illustrious sages himself.\textsuperscript{41} They all came along with the kings.\textsuperscript{42} The Rākṣasas and the Vānaras also came there for the sake of curiosity.\textsuperscript{43} Besides them, thousands of people belonging to different castes came there to watch the oath-taking.\textsuperscript{44} When all had taken their respective places, Vālmīki entered the Parīṣad with Sītā\textsuperscript{45} and asked Rāma to give her the permission to present her proof of purity. But before she could speak, he himself declared pledging the fruit of his long penance and giving information about his lineage that Sītā was sinless and upright.\textsuperscript{46}

In his reply to Vālmīki's speech in the Parīṣad Rāma said that he fully agreed with the sage and had full faith in the flawless utterance of feelings. He further said in the Parīṣad that Sītā had given proof of her purity previously also in the presence of the gods and that, even then, he had abandoned her just for the sake of avoiding the scandal. He declared before the Parīṣad that he would accept Sītā as wife only if she was considered upright by the gathering.\textsuperscript{47}

Thus, the scene for the ordeal was set. Sītā who was wearing red-coloured garments said with folded hands that if she had not thought of anyone other than Rāma, the goddess Earth should give her a place. When she had said so, a celestial
The throne arose tearing the ground apart. The goddess, who was seated on it, took Sītā on her lap and disappeared underground. Thus, the Parīṣad meeting ended on a sad note.

Another Parīṣad meeting is witnessed in the last book discussing Laksmana’s case, who had disobeyed the royal orders. Those present there besides the king were the counsellors, the brahmans and the king’s brother. In the meeting Rāma decided that he would disown his brother and send him out of the kingdom.

The Rāmayana provides accounts of some other largely attended meetings also held at Ayodhyā, Lakhā and Kīśkindhā. Those assemblies have not been given any name but they were certainly the Parīṣad meetings. At Ayodhyā, such an assembly was convened by Vāsishtha to appoint a successor after the death of king Dāsratha. The counsellors had requested Bharata to be the king but he had refused. That presented a constitutional crisis; therefore, an assembly was convened to persuade the prince to accept the crown. The assembly, we are told, was attended by Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, well wishers, counsellors and Amāṭyas, who were collectively called Āryagana. Those who requested Bharata to be the king have been referred to as Rājakarta, Amāṭyas and Prīṣads. Bharata, nevertheless, refused to be anointed and ordered preparations for a march towards the forest where Rāma had gone.

At Kīśkindhā also, we find a large gathering comprising the Manaṭris and the people (important people) for anointing
Sugrīva after Vālī's death. An earlier account also tells us that the Mantrīs and Rauravāsīs prevailed upon Sugrīva to be the king when they believed that Vālī was dead, but Vālī returned from the hole alive and threw out Sugrīva in the presence of his ministers, Prakṛtis and Subhrās. Thus, the assemblies which saw Sugrīva anointed twice and also his banishment were the Paṇiṣad.

At least some of the meetings held at Lekhā were of the above type. The assembly which received Hāṃmaṇ after his capture can be characterised as the Paṇiṣad. In the said assembly, Rāvana was seated on a marble throne attended upon by women holding small fans, and his counsellors, Vibhīṣana, Meghanāda and many of the mighty Rākṣasas leaders occupied seats according to their position. Rāvana initiated the proceedings by asking Prahasha to enquire of Hāṃmaṇ why he had caused devastation. After a long debate Rāvana agreed with Vibhīṣana and ordered for burning Hāṃmaṇ's tail as a punishment. Later, another meeting of the Paṇiṣad was held after Hāṃmaṇ had left Lekhā charred and devastated. Besides, the assembly in which Aṅgada delivered Hāma's message was the Paṇiṣad: it was attended by a number of Rākṣasa leaders, the Amātyas, the Saṭivas and Rāvana himself. The Rākṣasas were incensed by Aṅgada's frank delivery of his master's message and tried to arrest him in the Sabha.

Some more assemblies convened at Ayodhya to consider various matters very much resemble with the Paṇiṣad. They
were convened for the following purposes:

(1) To anoint 'Satrughana as the king of Madhupura.
(2) To discuss the problem arising because of the death of a Brāhmaṇa's son.
(3) To advise the king regarding the sacrifice.
(4) To be informed by Rāma that he desired to relinquish the throne in favour of Bharata.

In all the above assemblies we find that the Naigamas were invariably present besides the Purchita, the Brāhmaṇa counsellors, the ministers and Rāma's brothers.

Thus, it would be seen that the Parisad of the epic period was a political institution which had multifarious functions as given below:

(1) It was an assembly which listened to recitations of important literary works.
(2) It approved the selection of the crown prince and appointed the new king in times of crisis.
(3) It considered important policy matters and helped the king regarding formulation of the policy.
(4) It acted as a law court presided over by the king and decided the fate of criminals, conceding the supreme authority to the king himself.
(5) It received the messengers from other states and listened to the messages.
(6) In war-time the Parisad acted as the war-council.
The Parisad meetings were presided over by the king or, in his absence, by a prince or the Aurohita. The different accounts of the Parisad over a sort of procedure of the proceedings also. The assembly was first addressed by the chair, and then followed by other speakers. But if the Chairman desired, the proceedings could be initiated by the seniormost counsellors or the Aurohita. The king, it seems, did not speak to the outsiders directly but made enquiries through his functionaries. The Parisad meeting could be convened either by the king himself or by the seniormost counsellor. The king was requested through a messenger in the latter case to be present in the meeting. But if he had already died, the meeting was presided over by the functionary who was respected by other officers.

The Parisad of the Ramayana period enjoyed much importance and nothing which had any bearing on the state was done without consulting it. But practically, the opinion of this body was not binding on the king. We find that Rama rejected the majority verdicts of the Parisad twice: once, when he decided to give asylum to Vrikshasa, and second, when he decided to banish Laksmana instead of ordering the capital punishment for him. The assembly was thus not more powerful than the king, at least as long as he was on the right path. It could give its frank opinion but the authority to accept, reject or change it resided in the king himself.

The most important aspect of the Parisad was that the members enjoyed a complete freedom of speech. We, therefore, read a lot of criticism of the king being voiced by the Parisads.
Vāśiṣṭha disapproved of Dāsaratha's attitude when the latter refused to send his son with the sage after promising help to him. In Kīśkindhā, Hanumān criticised Sugrīva saying that he was not showing steadiness of thought and was exhibiting fickleness associated with monkeys. In another context he again criticised Sugrīva for not keeping himself aware of the time. In the assembly at Lankā, Vībhīṣana boldly aired his dissent, Mālyavān criticised Rāvana's act of having abducted Sītā calling that as Adharma and Kumābhakarna chided him for not giving a thought to consequences before taking action.

Since the Pariśad discussed very important policy matters also, the deliberations were undertaken under perfect secrecy and carefully guarded from being known to others. The secrecy of Mantra has been stressed upon again and again in the epic. Rāma showed great concern for it and asked Bharata, "I hope your Mantra does not over-run your kingdom." It seems to have been considered as a very serious crime to overhear or even see the assembly in discussion. An attendant of Rāvana, Sarman, has been described by the epic as having been successful in knowing what Rāvana was discussing in the meeting, but that was a feat of spying accomplished by her. Moreover, the way it has been described shows that deliberations were not open secrets for every one.

Thus, the epic-age marks a period of transition in annals of polity. This period had no knowledge of the Vidhāna,
the sabbhā and the Sāmīti as military, village or political assemblies of the Vedic age. They had completely vanished by that time. However, the Mantrī-Parīṣad which dominated the political scene of India right from the Kautūlīyan age up to the early medieval period seems only in its formative stage. It is known as Parīṣad only in the Rāmāyana. Its composition, strength and functions, too, had not crystallised in that age. But that it was the highest deliberative body of the state is borne out by a large number of allusions to it quoted above. In fact it met on all important occasions but its membership seems to have varied from region to region and even from occasion to occasion. It is just possible that it was left to the discretion of the monarch to invite such of the members of the Parīṣad as were needed for a particular issue under discussion of the Parīṣad.

It would be interesting to note that the Rāmāyana describes the Parīṣad meeting in a hall which was known as Sabbhā. There is not the slightest indication in the Rāmāyana to warrant some of the scholars' conclusion that the Sabbhā of the Rāmāyana was the assembly itself. The age of the epic, thus, seems to have revived the old connotation of the word Sabbhā in some of the passages of the Rgveda where it does mean the Assembly Hall.

As regards the word Samsad, it has one and the only one meaning in the whole of the Sanskrit literature including the Rāmāyana, i.e. a gathering which was essentially non-political in character.
In certain matters at least, the king reposed more confidence in his brothers, sons and relations than the counsellors. Their position was normally superior to that of Mantrīs and Amātayas. In the last book, for example, the preliminary discussions or even final ones have been described to have taken place between the king and his brothers only. The leadership question regarding the attack on Lavaṇa and banishment of Sītā were decided by Rāma and his brothers. Similarly, when Rāma desired to perform a sacrifice, the type of the sacrifice was decided by him in consultation with his brothers, after which the Brāhmaṇa counsellors were summoned and informed.

The Paura-Jānapadas:

The term Paura-Jānapada occurs in the Rāmāyana at various places. According to Jayaswal and others, there were Paura-Jānapada bodies in the epic period which had two sections, the inner and the outer. The inner section, according to them, was the executive council which sat permanently. The theory has been brilliantly put forward by Jayaswal who argues at a great length that these bodies were the successors of the Vedic institutions, Sabha and Samiti. While it is true that the term Paura-Jānapada often denotes the inhabitants of towns and villages that comprised a kingdom, he argues, it should be remembered that the expression, especially when used in the neuter singular as Paura-Jānapadam, denotes a constitutional body consisting of the representatives of the capital and the country. Such a body is known to the Rāmāyana, he opines.
The above theory has been vehemently criticised by many scholars raising many objections. According to Kane, one may at once admit that Jayaswal displays great learning, industry and ingenuity in his essay on the subject, and presents a very glowing picture of parliamentary institutions in ancient India. But unfortunately it cannot be accepted as the truth. Refuting the theory he further says, "In all the passages that he (Jayaswal) quotes from the Rāmāyaṇa and other classical works, the ordinary meaning of Paura (residents of the capital) and Janapada (inhabitants of the country) is quite enough and it is impossible to hold that any elective body is meant. In most passages the plural of Paura-Janapada is used." According to Altekar, the grammatical argument relied upon by Jayaswal to show that the term should have been in a singular number in the Rāmāyaṇa's verse and would then denote a representative body is untenable. The Paura-Janapadas appealed to by Bharata to request Rāma to return to Ayodhya were the ordinary people. To Jayaswal, however, the Paura-Janapadas were so powerful that they could depose a king and nominate a successor, and their kindly feelings towards a member of the royal family indicated his chance of succeeding; their President was apprised by the king of the policy of the state decided upon in the council of ministers; they were approached and begged by the king in all humility for a new tax, while their confidence in a minister was regarded as essential qualification for his appointment as a counsellor.
Jayaswal can no doubt be accused of trying unnecessarily to establish that there were parliamentary institutions in an ancient India comprising elected representatives. But Kane, Altekar and others on the other hand have tried to prove that such institutions did not exist in any form; and if existed, enjoyed no power to influence the course of events. They have ignored the fact that the public opinion was a great check on the king in ancient India against his being guided by wishes, and that a simple scandal among the common people could change the course of events, what to talk of a representative body. If the Paura-Janapada existed, it could not be totally powerless.

We will not discuss, hereunder, the theory of Paura-Janapada in its entirety, but shall only examine whether they mean anything more in the Ramayana than the common people living in the capital and the country.

The terms Paura, Paurajana, Jamapada, Nagara, and Jana occur in the Ramayana frequently. The words Paura and Janapada have been often used in a compounded form also. In certain passages, these terms seem to be conveying more than the ordinary sense and, therefore, require a serious examination.

The Pauras were undoubtedly connected with the Janapadas with Janapada, as is averred by so many references in the Ramayana. In the book I, we are told that after persuading Ramsapada to send Rama to Ayodhya to perform a sacrifice, Dasaratha returned to Ayodhya. Before reaching the
capital, he sent messengers to inform the Pauras to decorate
the city nicely to welcome the honoured guest. On the basis
of this reference it can be argued that the message was not
sent for all the people in the city if a proper and systematic
compliance was desired. The Pauras who were informed were the
responsible people recognised by the state.

The first time when the Pauras and Jānapadas have been
described in the epic as taking part in the state function and
when they seem to be having some status is in connection with
the sacrifice arranged to be performed by Rāgaśriga so that a
son were born to the king. The Ruchita was in charge of all
arrangements and, while passing orders for various jobs, he
told the officers to build up residences for the Pauras and
Jānapadas. If the words meant the common people, it is not
explained as to why it was necessary for the poet to mention
these separately for the purpose of being provided with boarding
and lodging facilities during the performance. It can be said
that it was natural on the part of people in ancient India to
participate in important state functions and that it was
obligatory on the part of the state to make arrangements for
their stay, the states being small and having small population.
If that be true in the case of the above reference, it still
remains to be explained why could not the poet say the same
thing in one line that residential quarters were also to be
made for the people besides the invited kings, instead of
employing separate verses for the Paurājanas and Jānapadajānas.
Moreover, the arrangements being made were for the specially invited guests and arrangements for the Pauras and Jēnapadas have been specially mentioned. Therefore, they seem to have been different from the ordinary people of the state.

The Pauras are again referred to in the context of Triśāhka - this time along with the Mantrīs - and are said to have fled away from him, cursed as he was by the sons of Vaśiṣṭha. These Pauras, we are told, were those who were faithful to him earlier. In another reference, we find the Paura-Jēnapadas present in the Sabha at Ayodhya as members of the Pariṣad, which was summoned by the king to consider with them and have their opinion on the issue of choosing a heir-apparent for the state. In this context, Vāṃśiś uses the adjective Labdhāmānaḥ for the kings and the Paura-Jēnapadas present in the Sabha, which is significant. The reference specifically shows that the Pauras and Jēnapadas who sat in the Sabha were not the ordinary citizens, more so because the poet has compared them with the gods surrounding Indra. They have been described seated by the side of the kings in the council at Ayodhya. It is important that the Paura-Jēnapadas were not made to stand as the common people would have been treated, but were allotted seats in the Sabha and shown respect. Further, the Paura-Jēnapadas (along with the kings and others) told Daśaratha that it was time for him to have rest and described the virtues possessed by their choice, giving the solid reasons. It could not have been possible for common citizens.
After the choice was made and Rāma was selected for the office of Yuvarāja, the Pauras took the king's permission and went back to their homes. In the first verse of the following Sarga Valmiki says, "When the Pauras had gone along with the Mantris."\(^{113}\) (here the term Paura has been used to indicate both). Had the Pauras been merely the common people, there was no use mentioning them as leaving along with the counsellors.

On the coronation day, the Paura-Jānapadas were again found present, Summantra saw them at the gates of the palace. In this reference, the Pauras are called Mahādhana\(^{114}\) (the rich ones), and the Naikamalikyas are also present.\(^{115}\) The use of the epithet Mahādhana for the Pauras indicate that those who were associated with the coronation of Rāma were the rich citizens of the state.

At Citrakūṭa, when Rāma had not conceded to the request to return and the Parchita and Jabali had also failed to persuade him, Bharata spoke to Paura-Jānapadas urging them to impress upon Rāma to return.\(^{116}\) The Paura-Jānapadas told Bharata that Rāma was right because he was obeying his father.\(^{117}\) It is interesting that in this context the terms used in two successive 'Slokas are Paura-Jānapadas-Janās and Paura-Jānapadah-Janāḥ'\(^{118}\) referring to the same group of people, and that the verbs in both the verses are in plural forms. So it cannot be said that the Paura-Jānapada term in the epic means a parliamentary body when used in a singular neuter form, and
means the common people when employed in a plural form.

It is clear from the above that the term Paura-Jānapada - sometimes even Paura - denotes the two groups of people consisted of the respectable citizens of the state from the capital and from the rural areas respectively. But it is not possible to contribute to the idea that they were some sort of parliamentary bodies or body comprising members chosen by the people to represent them on different occasions. In our view the Paura-Jānapadas were such citizens of the state as enjoyed public-respect because of their economic condition as well as noble conduct and, therefore, recognised by the state as the opinion leaders of the masses. They were the unchosen leaders of their areas and could affect the public opinion. Because of this fact and because of their position, they were given honour by the state and associated with the important state functions and such matters as required the consent of the people.

The main functions of the Paura-Jānapadas, thus, seem to have been to participate in all the major state-functions like sacrifices, to represent the public opinion in the selection of the heir-apparent and the new king, to participate in the coronation ceremony and to help the administration in jobs which required active participation of the people, in which respect they were of great utility to the state because of their influence among the masses. The way they have been described being associated with important functions and decision
making indicate that in a manner they, too, were considered important organs of the state.

In the end it may be admitted that the terms have been used in the epic unscrupulously and the issue has been confused. Sometimes Vālmīki uses Paura-Janapada or even Paura to indicate two groups of people having some say in the state matters; but on most other occasions he just means to describe the people in general living in the capital and the rest of the country. Thus, when Rāma said, "Tell me without fear or hesitation and with confidence what the Pauras and the Janas in the Janapada talk (about me)";¹¹⁹ he clearly meant the people of the state; Bhaḍraka made it more clear when he said, "Listent O King! how the Pauras talk good or bad about you, on the crossings, in the streets, in the forests and the parks."¹²⁰ Here the Paura term includes Janapada also as Rāma had earlier enquired of both.¹²¹

The High Functionaries:

The high functionaries and office-bearers of the state have been different at different times in ancient India. The Śāhitas of the Vājraśāstra and the Brāhmaṇa literature mention at several places some high functionaries known as Ratnins (Jewels) who probably formed the council of the king. The order and names of the 'Jewels', however, vary in different texts though most are the same in all of them. The eleven Ratnins according to the Sātanātha Brāhmaṇa are Senāpati (the commander-in-Chief), Purohita (the preceptor), Mahiṣi
In the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, Govikartana has been omitted and the queen called Vāvātā added. These Jewels are described in the Brāhmaṇa as the bestowers of kingdom. The council of Jewels of the Vedic period appear to have comprised (i) kings relations, (ii) king’s courtiers like the Chamberlain etc., and (iii) the important officers of the state etc. The status of the Jewels was fairly high. At the time of the Vaiśānava sacrifice the king had to repair to their houses in order to offer the so called Ratnin oblations.

The Ratnins gradually disappeared from the scene and the new functionaries called Tirthas took their place. The Rāmāyana no doubt refers to some Ratnin names but they do not have the same, old connotation. In the description of Aśvamedha performed by king Daśaratha, we read that Mahīṣā, Vāvātā and Parivṛtti were asked to touch the sacrificial horse before its Aśvakāparī was taken out and cooked. The above three, thus, performed no state function and are never heard of again in the epic. Similarly, Sūmanta has been referred to as Sūta in quite a few verses, but he has also been called Amātya and Mantri. Purohita and Senapati, two more Ratnin names, are very much known to the epic but as Tirthas, and Sūta in the Rāmāyana has the rank of Amātya or Mantri. They are no longer the Ratnins or offered Havis by the king.
Tīrthas i.e. the new functionaries were eighteen in number. The Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata, and Kautilya speak of 18 Tīrthas. Kalidāsa also employs the term Tīrtha in the same sense. Thus, we find that the functionaries of the state were no longer known as Ratnis by the time of the epic.

The most effective functionaries from among the Tīrthas were Mantrīs (or Sacivas) and Amātyas. They were regarded most indispensable and given the second place in the list of state's elements. Of the three terms, Amātya is the oldest and occurs in the sense of 'minister' in the Āpastamba Dharmaśūtra which says, "The king should not live more luxuriously or better than his Gurus and minister." The word Saciva occurs in the Aitareya Rāmāyaṇa first, where it is said that Indra considered Marutas as his Sacivas. In the Rāmāyaṇa we came across all the three terms as already stated and discussed.

The importance of having Mantrīs and Amātyas has been emphasised by all the ploity-writers. Kautilya says, "Sovereignty (Rājatva) is possible only with assistance." According to Kāmandaka, "A king, who being intoxicated by his pride, disregards the counsel of his counsellors is soon attacked by the enemy." In the Rāmāyaṇa, we read that Mantrīs and Amātyas were considered very important for the state. We find Dasaratha lamenting that he did not consult his wise counsellors before taking action in Rāma's case, and to Sugrīva Rāma advised to consider the five-fold employment...
of the three (Sāma, Dāna and Daṇḍa) in Kṣaṇa (decline), Vyṛddhi (prosperity) and Sthāna (place).  

The ministers were consulted in all matters, whether personal or political. Daśaratha consulted them before deciding upon performing an Aśvamedha, king Kuśanabhā discussed with them the marriage problem of his daughters who had been made hunch-backed by Vāyu and Bharata took their advice when he desired to supervise the administration from Nandigrāma. It was warned that a king who made haste in taking up projects, without considering with his ministers, exposed himself to his enemy. The general advice to the king given in the Rāmāyaṇa is that he should look after his free of thorn kingdom along with his ministers.

Valmīki, as already said, employs all the three terms and frequently uses two or more for the same person. But he starts the introduction by making a very clear distinction between Amātyas and Mantrīs of Daśaratha. He informs us that Daśaratha had eight Amātyas, namely Dhrāti, Jayanta, Vijaya, Surāṣṭra, Kāṣṭravardhana, Akopa, Dharma-pala and Sumantra who understood the essence of Mantra and signs (Ingrīta) and were always busy in doing likable and beneficial jobs for the king. Besides them, the king had two Rāvīja, namely Vaśīṣṭha and Vāmadeva, and six other Mantrīs in Suyajña, Jābali, Kāyapa, Gautama, Maṅkanḍeya and Kātyāyana. Vaśīṣṭha and Vāmadeva were Mantrīs also. Later, we are told that the eight Mantrīs of the second group were all Brahmaṇas. The above description,
Thus, makes two separate groups consisting of Amātyas and Mantris respectively. But the issue is confused when Sumantra is found referred to as Mantrīsattama also. Similarly, the poet first informs us that Rāvaṇa was sitting with his Mantris, Mahāparāśva, Brahma, Durdharṣa and Mitumbha, but later refers to Brahma as Amātya and Senāpati.

Thus, we can understand that at Ayodhya (and most probably in some other Arya states also) there was a two-tier ministry comprising the Brahmāṇa-Mantris and the Amātyas. From among the Amātyas in all the states, whether Arya or non-Arya, those who were more proficient and fulfilled the qualifications were chosen as Mantris (Counsellors) and were addressed as Mantris, Saivis and Amātyas. A Mantri and an Amātya could be appointed as Senāpati or Duta also.

One thing, however, very clear that the Brahmāṇas headed by the Brāhmanas were never addressed as Amātyas or Saivis. They were either referred to as Mantris or Brahmāṇas. While Vasūṣṭha and Vāmadeva were the Ātviṣ also, the other six at Ayodhya were, perhaps, the highly learned Brahmāṇas whose services were sought by the state as advisers for all matters which concerned its interest. They were not always available near the king and, therefore, had to be sent for through an Amātya, whenever the need arose. In the epic, we find them performing multifarious jobs as follows:

(1) We find them being requested by the king to be present for further consultation, when the king had made up
his mind in consultation with his Mantrīs (the other group) that he would perform an Aṣvamedha.

(2) We read that they were addressed as Gurus\(^1\) and their wishes were carried out by the Amātyas.\(^2\)

(3) Later, we find them discussing the question of the marriage of the princes, when Viśvāmitra arrived.\(^3\)

(4) When Janaka's messengers came to Ayodhyā to intimate his request to Daśaratha, the Brāhmaṇa Mantrīs were consulted, and when Daśaratha proceeded to Mithilā, they led the party.\(^4\)

(5) They assembled again when Rāma was to be chosen as Yuvarāja, and then for the anointment.\(^5\)

(6) They discussed with the Amātyas the action required to be taken after Daśaratha had died and decided to send for Bharata.\(^6\)

(7) It is further said that they approached Bharata in order to persuade him to get anointed, and that on his refusal they gathered in the Sabha to solve the problem.\(^7\)

(8) They went with Bharata to the forest to bring back Rāma and tried in vain to persuade him to return to Ayodhyā.\(^8\)

(9) On Rāma's return they performed his coronation.\(^9\)

(10) They assembled to consecrate 'SatruIgn,\(^1\) to decide the course of action when a Brāhmaṇa's son had died.\(^2\)
to advise Rāma regarding the performance of a sacrifice\textsuperscript{161} and to decide Laksmana's fate.\textsuperscript{162}

It can be seen from the above that these Mantrīs were consulted on almost all the important occasions. They were no doubt employed by the state,\textsuperscript{163} probably against stipulated salaries, but the king never treated them at par with his Amātyas. He behaved with them as a pupil would behave with his Gurus. For instance, when these Mantrīs assembled to advise king Daśaratha regarding the sacrifice, the latter worshipped them.\textsuperscript{164} The noteworthy point is that these counsellors were not called for the preliminary discussions, they were summoned only when the king had already made up his mind to do a thing while considering alone or with his Śacivas. It also seems that they had no executive duties, a position which made them purely and primarily the counsellors of the king.

The second group of Mantrīs is seen in the Rāmāyaṇa working not only at Ayodhyā but in the Vānara and the Rākṣas capitals also. The fact that these Mantrīs have been called Amātyas, too, confirms that they were selected from the cadre of Amātyas and were higher in rank, as has been made clear by Kaṭṭilaśa while discussing the appointment of Amātyas and Mantrīs: he has opined that an Amātya should be appointed if found honest in any one of the four tests but a Mantrī should qualify in all the four tests.\textsuperscript{165} The tests, according to him, were to be given only after appointing them as Amātyas on the basis of qualifi-
cations and employing them in minor jobs. Kanṭilva, therefore, is of the opinion that Mantrīs should be chosen from amongst those appointed first as Amātyas. In the times of the Rāmāyana also, it seems, that an Amātya was given the status of Mantrī after some experience and on the basis of tests, as is suggested by Kanṭilva. But even after being appointed as Mantrīs, they continued to be called as Amātyas, probably to differentiate them from those Mantrīs who were not from Amātya-cadre and also to indicate that they were also the executives. Thus, the Amātya-Mantrīs (if we could call them by that term) are found in the epic providing such services as arranging meetings of the Paṇiṣad and counsellors, and executing all orders of the king whether personal or official besides the counsel. The distinction made by the Aṃarkoṣa between a Mantrī and an ordinary Amātya is not in any way found to be different from the one found in the epic. However, in the Rāmāyana, the Amātya is not found ceasing to be an executive while performing the job of a counsellor. There might have been other Amātyas who performed the job of executives only.

According to Kanṭilva, the king should first satisfy himself by various means regarding the qualities of the candidates, and then appoint them to ordinary offices in consultation with his counsellors and chaplain and test them by means of secret tests, tempting them as regards each of Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Bhaya (fear). From among the tested candidates, he should appoint (i) those proved loyal in Dharma-
test to the post of judiciary and suppression of criminals, (ii) those proved upright by the test of material to the post of administration and in stores, (iii) those proved loyal by the test of fear to duties near (his own person) and (iv) those proved honest in all the tests as his counsellors, while those proved dishonest in all the tests in mines, forests and factories.¹⁷¹ Nāma also says that sacivas should be well tested before appointment.¹⁷²

The Rāmāyana prescribes different qualifications for Mantrīs and Amātyas. A Mantrī according to it, should have qualities like bravery, learning in Śāstras, control over senses, good lineage and understanding of signs, while an Amātya should be having a tradition of royal service, bravery, skilfulness, farsightedness and purity. The epic tells us that those appointed as Amātyas were tested further also. A reference to such tests has been made in the speech of Rāma hoping that the Amātyas engaged by Bharata were those with a tradition of royal service, piety and proven honesty by means of all the Unāḍha (tests).¹⁷³ The above verse avers that, first, those who had the qualifications were to be employed in insignificant jobs (as also suggested by Kauṭilya), and then tested by Unāḍha. If they proved honest, they were appointed to high (Śreṣṭha) jobs like those of counsellors. If they were found moderates (Madhyas) or inferiors (Avaras), they were employed in moderate or inferior jobs.¹⁷⁴ The Rāmāyana does not tell us much about the Unāḍha by which an Amātya was
to be tested by the king, but in the book I we are told that
the ministers of Daśaratha were well tested in Saunâyda which
means friendship or affection. It can be deduced from the
reference that the Unsadhās of Vālmiki were the tests of loyalty,
which could have been given by means of tempting the officials
as regards Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Bhaya, as suggested by
Kautīlyas.

Kautīlyas tells us that according to the Mānava school
the number of ministers should be twelve while according to
the Bhārdvājas and Ausānases it should be sixteen and twenty
respectively. Kautīlyas himself is of the opinion that the
council should have as many ministers as a state can afford. Kēmāndaka also quotes the Mānas and agrees with Kautīlyas. According to the Manumṛtī, the King should have seven or eight Saṁcivas in addition to some Amātyas. The birds, however, have the largest ministry to advise, precisely of 37 ministers selected on caste basis and represented by 4 Brahmāṇas, 8 Kṣatriyas, 21 Vaiśyas, 3 Śūdras and one Śūta versed in the Āras. In the Rāmāyana, the number of Daśaratha's ministers has been given as 16 including 8 Amātyas and 8 Mantrīs, In the book VI, we read that there were 16 persons who gave counsel to Rāvana although in another reference Rāvana has been described as surrounded by 4 Mantrīs. Thus, the number 16 seems important in both the cases. But in the book IV we find the names of only 9 Vānaras who consecrated Saṅrīva. On the basis of these evidences it can be said that the maximum
number of ministers a state could have been sixteen, but that could be reduced according to the requirement of the state.

The *Mahābhārata* advises a caste-based selection in a given ratio. *Menu* says that the king should discuss all matters with his Brāhmaṇa Saiva, particularly those related to īḍa or ādigaṇa, and thus alludes to his consent to appoint ministers from other castes. In the case of the Rāmāyaṇa, we know that eight of Daśaratha's ministers were Brāhmaṇas. From among the others Sumantra has been referred to as Sūta and Puruṣaṅgavīdī, but he was the most trusted minister of the king and had a free access to the palace, which shows that he could not be a lowly born person. The castes of other ministers have not been stated; nevertheless it can be assumed that they were from Kṣatriya caste, since all the ministers in the Rāmāyaṇa period were required to be brave fighters also.

*Kautilya* thinks that the king should hold consultation with three or four Maṇtrīs. *Menu* opines that he should first consult each one of his counsellors separately, and then do whatever is beneficent to the state; but in matters relating to the six-fold policy he should consult only the Brāhmaṇa Saiva and take action only after deciding with the latter. In the Rāmāyaṇa, we find the king being advised that he should not settle his policies by himself alone or in consultation with many ministers. The passage shows that the consultation (Maṇtra) was advised to be held with a few ministers, neither
with one nor with many.

According to the Rāmāyāna, the king discussed matters with a few ministers first, and then called the meeting of all the ministers to have their opinion if he felt necessary; Daśaratha, for instance, did so in the case of the sacrifice described in the book I. The urgent matters, however, were sometimes straightway discussed in the full meeting of the counsellors, as was done by Rāvana during the war. In Ayodhyā also the urgent matters were discussed with all the counsellors, as was done in the case of the Brāhmaṇa whose son had died. The urgent deliberation with all the counsellors can be compared favourably with the Arthaśāstra which says, "In urgent matters he should call together the counsellors as well as the council of ministers." 188

On the duty of Mantriṣ Kśandaka says, "It is the duty of ministers (Mantriṣ) to stop the king from doing what is not good as they are the friends and Gurus of the king." 189 Sukra says that a kingdom cannot be brought prosperity by those ministers whom the king is not afraid of to annoy; they are no better than ladies who are to be decked with ornaments and fine clothes. What is the use of those ministers whose advice does tend to the advancement of the kingdom, the people, the army, the treasure etc. he asks. 190 In the Rāmāyāna, the self-willed king of Lakhā, no doubt, has been described saying, "A minister who wishes well (of himself) should speak only when asked and
what is sweet, beneficial, the best and reasonable." But the Rāmāyaṇa does not preach such a conduct. The book IV says, "the duty of a minister is to advise the king what is good or bad in the matters relating Dharma and Artha." It is further said, "A Mantri must speak out what is beneficial to the king fearlessly." It shows that a minister according to the Rāmāyaṇa should fearlessly say what is good and not only what is sweet. Kautilya says, "They should think about their own side and the opposite side, bring about commencement of what has not been done, carry out what has been commenced, bring improvement on what has been carried out and the excellence of (the execution of) orders in the case of works." In the Rāmāyaṇa we find that Daśaratha's ministers knew all that was happening on their own side and on the other side. Regarding early commencement of what had been decided during consultations we can quote Rāma's words: "I hope that after deciding the Artha which has a small beginning and a great return, you (Bharata) do not delay its commencement (through ministers)."

The Rāmāyaṇa does not give any clear indication of the distribution of functions among the Amātyas. Griffith has suggested that the names of Daśaratha's ministers are suggestive of their portfolios. Thus, according to him Dhṛṣṭi, Jyanta and Vijaya, meaning boldness, victorious son of Indra and conquest respectively, were associated with the portfolios of war; Siddhārtha and Arthasādhaka, meaning 'the successful man
and 'efficient in the acquisition of riches or wealth' respectively were employed in the Finance; Ásoka, meaning 'without sorrow,' and Mantrapāla, meaning 'the protector of Mantra or the sacred texts' were the ministers of law and justice; and Sumantra had miscellaneous affairs to look after. The last officer, according to Griffith, was the royal bard, the royal charioteer, the royal equerry and the private secretary also.

The above approach is defective and dangerous. If the names were indicative of the portfolios of Daśaratha’s ministers, there should have been some further evidence in the text to support this view; and there was actually one clear opportunity for Daśaratha to call either Siddhārtha or Arthatādhaka by name to say that he should provide Sītā with enough ornaments and clothes to last for 14 years; but he called only the one who was engaged in collecting wealth or riches, without naming, and ordered him to do the needful. It has been rightly pointed out that it is difficult to associate Ásoka with law and justice merely on the ground that a minister can cause sorrow to the people by interfering with their personal life and property, even if the general reasoning by Griffith be accepted. Similarly, Mantra in political contexts stands for 'Diplomacy' and, therefore, Mantrapāla could be associated with foreign affairs also. Besides, it cannot be that Vālmīki adopted a different criterion while giving out the names of Daśaratha’s ministers than he used while enlisting the ministers
in other kingdoms. It can also be observed that what the author of the theory has suggested are mere inferences, not supported by any textual evidence. The names, therefore, cannot be indicative of ministers portfolios at Ayodhya.

There are no doubt various references in the epic which indicate various portfolios held by the ministers.

The Purohitc out of the eight Brāhmaṇa counsellors only seems to be having other duties besides giving counsel to the king. He was the Ācārya\textsuperscript{200} and Guru\textsuperscript{201} of the king. At the time of a sacrifice, he was given the overall charge of arrangements and to guide the learned Brāhmaṇas as well as the workers what they should do for the successful completion of the undertaking;\textsuperscript{202} for this job he was specially requested by the king,\textsuperscript{203} which indicates the exalted position he had. It was he who decided the list of invitees and ordered the ministers about the mode of invitations.\textsuperscript{204} As the Purohitc, he performed the Ḫāmakarana and Jamakarikākarma\textsuperscript{205} of the princes, explained the omens and gave advice to the king.\textsuperscript{206} Whenever there was a distinguished visitor, he went with the king and stood by his side while he received the guest.\textsuperscript{207} He was in fact the most trusted and revered man; therefore led the queens when they went on journeys.\textsuperscript{208} He acted as the spokesman of the king also and in that capacity gave suitable replies on his behalf.\textsuperscript{209} And, above all, he was associated with all the religious functions of the state in his capacity of Purohitc.
The more important duty he had to perform was the installation of the new king. Besides being responsible for performing the anointment of the heir-apparent, it was his duty to take-over the charge of administration and preside over the Parisad meetings in the absence of the king. He was the spokesman of the Parisad also.

We would like to present how 'Sukra divides portfolios among his eight ministers, before discussing the portfolios of the eight ministers of King Dasaratha. According to 'Sukra, the designations and the portfolios of the ministers should be (1) Purodhas (Aurochita), (ii) Pratinidhi Pradhāna (President of the council), (iii) Sasiva (War Minister), (iv) Mantri (Home Minister), (v) Brāhivēka (Minister of Justice), (vi) Praptita (Minister of Ecclesiastical Matters), (vii) Dūta (Minister of Diplomatic Relations) and (viii) Sumantra (Finance Minister). The portfolios allotted by 'Sukra would perhaps suit any ancient Indian state, but his set of designations would be quite confusing if given to the ancient ministers, particularly in the context of the Ramayana wherein we find that many of the terms used by him either do not occur or occur as synonyms. Moreover, he has included the Aurochita in the list of eight ministers, but in the Ramayana there are eight Amātyas besides the Aurochita.

There are various scattered references which throw some light on the nature of functions the ministers (Amātyas) were
expected to perform in the times of the Ramayana; thereof we
can form an idea about their portfolios, too. A few Sargas
are particularly helpful in this regard. From the references
in these Sargas, it can be deduced that the following portfolios
were probably allotted to the ministers.

1. Amâtya For Espionage: An Amâtya was probably responsible
for having secret information about what was happening inside
and outside the state. In the book I we are told that the
ministers of Daśaratha knew all that was happening in their
own country and in other countries. Not only they knew what
had happened but also what was being planned. The information
about the internal and external affairs was collected by planting
three spies on every one of the eighteen Tirthas in the foreign
lands and the fifteen Tirthas within the state.

The Caras (spies) had to remain unknown. Besides the
spies employed on the Tirthas, the Amâtya employed such spies
who got mixed with the common people and extracted vital
information for the state. The spies, according to the
Ramayana, "should go about disguised as a common man and try
to know the reality through movements, appearance and way of
talking of the people." Acting accordingly, Hemâna disguised
himself as a monk and approached Râma. Another spy, namely
Bhadramukha, is said to have told Râma what was being said
about Sita in the state.

There was thus a well organised espionage activity under
the control of the Amâtya-in-Charge of espionage, who probably
gave a daily report to the king in the evening. The information collected by the spies was known as Bhrānta and given due importance by the king.

2. Anātva For Finance: Finance was the most important department because all the activities of the state depended on it. That was why the minister in charge of finance was always busy in augmenting the Kośa. Ṛṣāra, according to the epic, summoned this minister when he desired to give Sītā enough clothes and ornaments to wear in the forest.

The functions of this minister were to receive the tax collected from the people without causing any injury to them. He collected only what was the stipulated state-share for it was believed that the one who collected tax harshly was despised by the subjects. He was to see also that there was no pilferage of the collection and that the expenditure did not exceed the income. That he could obviously do by presenting a periodic report to the king.

The main sources of income of the state were agriculture and cattle. It was, therefore, the duty of this minister to see that those living by these professions did not suffer due to any calamity caused by drought or wild animals. The Finance Minister, it seems, was assisted by Dhanu-dhāya who has been referred to at various places. Whenever the king needed money or ornaments etc., he called the minister of finance to provide the desired articles. The ornaments etc. of the king and others in the royal household were kept in the
treasury as is proved by the description of Rama distributing his belongings to the people.\textsuperscript{227}

3. Amātya For Home Affairs: We are told that the ministers of king Daśaratha were always busy in protecting the noble ones from the bad elements in the society.\textsuperscript{228} It points to the existence of a department for home affairs under an Amātya who was to ensure:

(1) The people had no fear from thieves.

(2) Those who were rich could sleep peacefully, leaving their doors open at night.

(3) Those who undertook long journeys to far off places with lots of saleable commodities were secure on the highways and reached their destinations without any loss of property.\textsuperscript{229}

(4) The kingdom was free from the menace of thieves, decoits and others in equally or more evil profession.

The minister in charge of the home affairs must have had many officers to assist him. One of such officers was, probably, the Antahpāla who was responsible for the protection of people within the fortified city.\textsuperscript{230}

4. Amātya For Defence: An Amātya was, presumably, responsible for the defence of the country. In the book III Raṇaṇa is stated to have had an army of fourteen thousand soldiers stationed in Janasthāna, which fought Rāma and got killed. The maintenance of such large armies required a defence
department, and we are told by the epic that there was a minister who was always busy in augmenting the army and who looked after its needs. It was his duty to see that the state had strong forts having enough stocks of corn, wealth, water, machines and expert archers to fight from the fort, to enable the state withstand enemy's attack for a long period during which the state could not have any income or acquire life-sustaining material from outside. The army was made up of four organs, namely chariots, elephants, horses and foot-soldiers. Therefore, it was the duty of the minister not only to recruit soldiers but also to get the chariots manufactured and acquire horses as well as elephants from the state's own sources and from other countries. The Nāgayana was the place which provided elephants for the army and the Amātya was to arrange for its protection. It was also, perhaps, his duty that the army was well contented and did not get annoyed because of late payment of dues.

This minister was sometimes assisted by the Senāpati who was separately appointed as has been indicated in the case of Kosala state.

5. Amātya For Justice: we read in the epic that Dasaśratha's Amātyas punished even their own sons if that be required. The reference seems to be referring to the minister for justice, who has been named in the later works as Prādvivāka. Referring to the administration of justice, Rāma asked Bharata, "I hope your learned Amātyas consider the disputes between the
rich and the poor without showing any consideration and do not let off a criminal for money. I hope that a noble man of pious soul (but), accused of theft, is not imprisoned without being examined by those who are experts in scriptures, just because of greed. These passages aver that there was a well established department of justice under an Amātya, who was probably assisted by junior judges.

The minister for justice was, thus, to see that justice was administered properly and that punishments were given keeping in view the capacity of the accused, but were harsh enough to be deterrent.

6. Amātya For Foreign Affairs: Śukra, as already stated, designates him as Dūta, but we do not know what designation he was actually assigned in the times of the epic. He, however, must have had the charge of such affairs as maintenance of diplomatic relations with other states and implementation of the policy based on Śāntāna theory, through four expedients. At Ayodhyā the department seems to have been under the charge of Sumantra as it was he who sent invitations to other states when requiring their participation and who sent messengers or went himself wherever the diplomatic relations demanded so. Earlier, he advised the king how the sage could be brought from the Anga country to perform his sacrifice. At times he acted as the personal secretary of the king, too.

7. Amātya For Welfare: The state in the epic period was essentially beneficent. It engaged itself in a lot of welfare
activities for which there must have been a minister-in-
charge, who was to see that old people, children without
parents and Brâhmanas learned in the Vedas were not suffering.
The state provided stipend and subsistence to them and also
to others who were unable to earn their livelihood. It is
interesting that the state not only provided money to the
needy ones but also saw to it that they were morally up and,
therefore, happy. 246 Besides these activities, the minister
was responsible for undertaking such works as caused happiness
to the people in this world as well as the next world. He,
therefore, caused many temples (where people could say prayers),
tanks, wells, gardens etc. built for the benefit of the
subjects. 247

8. Amâiya For Roads and Buildings: There was a department
in the times of the Râmâyana which was responsible for building
roads and buildings. It employed many workers like architects,
workmen, carpenters, artisans, miners, geologists or geographers,
measurment-experts, mechanics, masons, hunters or those who
traced the way, wood-cutters, well-makers, white-washers,
experts in bamboo-structures etc. 249 All the said employees
are described in the Râmâyana as going ahead of Bharata to
make way to the forest.

Under the charge of this minister must have been the
work connected with building of roads and bridges and their
maintenance. He caused the constructions of canals also so
that agriculture did not entirely depend on rains. He must have also been in charge of forests and protection of the people from the wild animals. There are references to traders going to far-off places for selling their goods; the long travels for trade could have been possible only if the roads were good and safe.

The qualifications prescribed for Amātya required that he should be a 'Sūra. That quality enjoined upon him the military duty also. An Amātya, therefore, was not expected only to be an expert politician and learned in the 'Sastras but also a valiant fighter and a leader of the army. The Rāmāyaṇa refers to the army as Kangrihājunctā because the ministers were expected to protect it from all sides.

The Amātyas acted as messengers also; for instance, Bharata was called back to Ayodhya by sending five ministers as messengers (Dātas).

The Purohita enjoyed a unique position in the times of the epic and even later. Kantilva has advised the king to appoint a Purohita belonging to an exalted family, having character as well as a thorough learning in the Vedas along with their auxiliaries and proficiency in polity; and then to follow him like a pupil or son. In the Rāmāyaṇa, we have many references which show the status of the Purohita. The king worshipped him, and treated him as a friend and guru; the Iksvākus worked
upon him as their ultimate means.\textsuperscript{256} He was also the Ācārya of the king and a Mantri.\textsuperscript{257} No doubt he was employed by the king\textsuperscript{258} and his qualifications were prescribed,\textsuperscript{259} but that did not make him of the status of an employee.\textsuperscript{260} His authority can be judged by the fact that he could even refuse to perform a sacrifice for the king if he thought that it was not right.\textsuperscript{261}

As a counsellor he enjoyed the first position. Therefore the other ministers of king Daśaratha were referred to as "Vāsinśā Mantrīs.\textsuperscript{262} The other ministers dared not disobey him even when the king was present.\textsuperscript{263} If the king died a sudden death before appointing a heir-apparent, he automatically became the chief administrator till a suitable arrangement was made by him. Besides, he presided over the meetings of the assembly when the king was absent.\textsuperscript{264}

The status of other ministers also was very high. The seven other Brāhmaṇa Mantīrīs of Ayodhya were held in esteem as is evident from so many references. They were in fact also addressed by the king as Gurus.\textsuperscript{265} As for the non-Brāhmaṇa ministers, we have already shown how they criticised the king in the assembly meetings and even otherwise, if necessary. At times they have been shown doing odd jobs like driving a chariot, bringing the bow containing box of iron and singing praises of the king like a bard,\textsuperscript{266} but the king
was well aware of their importance as the backbone of the government. As a matter of fact the first lesson in kingship was that the Amätyas should be kept happy and contented.²⁶⁷

The Ayodhyákanda has a fine exposition of the status of the minister. According to it, the ministers of king Daśaratha never took their orders from even queens.²⁶⁸ Moreover, they honoured the king as long as he remained on the right path. If he strayed, they even disowned him as the example of king Trisāñku confirms.²⁶⁹

Some other high officers of the state referred to in the epic are as follows:

(1) Senāpati: Senāpati or the Commander-in-Chief existed since very old times of the Vedas. He was one of the Kānas and offered śaiva by the king at the time of his coronation. In the epic, he has been referred to in many verses. Ayodhya and Lanka both had Senāpatis. Lanka's Senāpati was Brahasta, as has already been discussed, but the name of the Senāpati at Ayodhya has not been given although a verse enjoins the king to appoint an able Senāpati.²⁷⁰

As we have shown by the example of Brahasta, a Mantrī or an Amātya could also be the Senāpati. Moreover, any high functionary of the state, excepting the Brāhmaṇas, could be appointed to lead the forces for a particular expedition; for instance, the Yuvarāja of Ayodhya was made the Commander-in-Chief to conquer the Gandharvas.²⁷¹ During the war of Lanka,
Nīla was appointed the Senāpati of Rāma's forces; and earlier, Dūṣāna and Triśūra were the Commanders of Kṛṣṇa's army.273

The Mahābhārata,274 Kauṭilya,275 Kumandaka,276 and Sukra,277 among others, have prescribed the qualifications for the Commander-in-Chief. According to Kumandaka, the Senāpati should have a good lineage, citizenship of the same country, proficiency in Mantra, knowledge of Daṇḍanīti, power, bravery, tolerance, steadiness, pleasantness, influence, energy, friendliness and knowledge of Vyavahāra. The epic on the other hand prefers only such qualities in the Senāpati as are more useful in warfare. According to it, he should be courageous, brave, patient, wise, pious, born of a good family, loyal and skilful.278

Valāṃki has used various terms to denote the Commander-in-Chief such as Senapati,279 Vahinipati,280 Scinyspala,281 and Balādhyaṅka.282 But he confuses the issue when he uses the terms in plural forms as in the following instances:

(A) The five leaders sent to fight Hānumān have been called Senāpatis.283

(B) The leaders who were ordered by Prahasta and Durmukha to collect the army have been referred to as Balādhyakṣas.284

(C) Mahāpārśva orders more than one Balādhyakṣa.285

(D) The term used for the Vānara chief is also in the plural form.286
Thus, the use of plural forms may suggest that the armies had more than one Commander-in-Chief each. But we know that the term Senāpati meant the Chief of Army. Therefore there could only be one chief for each army.\textsuperscript{287} The references having plural forms seem to have been used in view of the high office the Senāpati held, as can be explained in the case of ministers and Adhyakṣas also. That of course does not explain the use of the term for five individuals simultaneously.

(2) Yuvaraṇa: We have already discussed the education, assignments and coronation of the Yuvaraṇa. According to the evidence of the epic, a younger brother or a brother's son could also be made Yuvaraṇa, besides the eldest son of the king; for instance, Sugrīva\textsuperscript{288} was appointed as Yuvaraṇa under Vaṁśi and Bharata\textsuperscript{289} enjoyed the same position under Rāma. At Lāṅkā, the eldest son of Rāvana was the Yuvaraṇa.\textsuperscript{290} In Kīcchhā, later, Aṅgada was made Yuvaraṇa to Sugrīva.

It is, however, obvious that the eldest son of the king only had the right to be the Yuvaraṇa, if he had the required qualities. The others were offered the post only when the king had no male issue or had an unworthy heir, just to provide a successor to the state in the event of a sudden or early death of the king. This proves the wisdom of the thinkers in ancient India, for such an arrangement did not allow any chaos and smoothly installed a new king on the vacant throne.
The Yuvarāja was required to lead the forces as and when required. He was not placed on the list of Mantrīs but his name was among the eighteen Tīrthas who were advised to be spied upon.

According to 'Sukra, Yuvarāja and Amāyas are the two arms of the king. But 'Sukra warns the king against transferring all powers to the Crown-Prince except when he were about to die.291 The Rāmāyaṇa also has the allusion as to how a Yuvarāja could be dangerous.292 But on the other hand, Dasāratha wished to transfer all his powers to Rāma and then retire, which was an interesting situation because that meant vesting all the powers in the Yuvarāja and making the king.

It is, thus, the view of the Rāmāyaṇa that the king should pass on all powers to the Crown-Prince when intending to retire, but should not share much powers with his Yuvarāja if he wanted to continue to rule the country. Sharing much powers with the Yuvarāja has been considered dangerous by the epic, too.

Kauṭilya, places Yuvarāja on the same footing as Mantrī, Puruchita, Senāpati, queen and king's mother. The Rāmāyaṇa places him above the ministers but below the Puruchita.

The Yuvarāja had lots of wealth and cows; he had some source of income, too, and his wealth was kept by the Dhanūdhyakṣa. He participated in deliberations on policy as
well as other matters and was consulted by the king in all
important matters. This fact is revealed by Rāma's discussion
with Bharata in the case of Sītā and regarding performance
of the sacrifice. 293

(3) Suhrās: Suhrās have been frequently mentioned
in the Rāmāyana. Vāśīṣṭha has been referred to as Suhrā294
and Sumantra as Paramasuhrā. 295 In the last book, we find
Rāma sitting with them discussing the condition in the country.
In the said context the Suhrā seems to mean a spy. In other
instances he appears to have been a minister as well as a
friend. In quite a few more references the term Suhrā has
been identified separately from Mantri, Aṃtya and even
Nāgās, 297 and he seems to have had a separate identity.
May be, when used separately in such references, the term
Suhrā means a friend of the king who enjoyed the status of a
counselor.

(4) Dūta: The word Dūta and his office was
well known in the most ancient times. In the Rgveda, Agni
has been referred to as Dūta, being requested to bring the
gods to the sacrifice. The Dūta in the Vedas has been
associated with espionage also, as is found in the context
of Sāma, the bitch, who was sent by Indra to find out the
treasure of Pānis. 298 This term occurs in the Rāmāyana also.

The Mahābhārata enumerates eight qualities of Dūta.
According to it, he should not be stiff, timid, dilatory or
easy to win, but should be amiable, kind, free from diseases
and endowed with a fine mode of speech.\textsuperscript{299} Kautilya says that a Dūta should have such qualities as an expert’s knowledge of all the scriptures, good family, purity, understanding of signs and appearance etc., faithfulness, good memory, knowledge of Deśakala, handsomeness, fearlessness and good speech. A Dūta, according to him, is very important as he is the basis of Gandhī and Vigrāha.\textsuperscript{300} The Rāmāyaṇa prescribes the qualities of citizenship, learning, skillfulness, intelligence, faithfulness and expertise.\textsuperscript{301}

Kautilya describes three types of Dūtas, namely Nisāstrārtha, Parināstrārtha and Cāsanhara.\textsuperscript{302} In the Rāmāyaṇa many Dūtas are found sent for various purposes. It seems from the various references that they had the rank of Amātya.\textsuperscript{303} Vālmīki does not tell us about their types specifically, but we can see the first type in Hanuman,\textsuperscript{304} the second type in Aṅgada and the third type in the messengers who were sent to tell Bharata to return.

The Dūta acted like a Cara also; for instance, Hanuman disguised himself and entered Lanka at night under cover of darkness; he acted according to time and place in order to save his mission.\textsuperscript{305}

On the privileges of Dūta Kautilya says that even the lowest caste Dūta should not be killed.\textsuperscript{306} In the same context the Rāmāyaṇa advises, “A Dūta, whether noble or evil, is consigned to someone else’s cause and says what has been said by others; therefore he should not be killed.”\textsuperscript{307} But it adds
that a Dūta can be punished in many ways if he overdoes his duty. 308

The Rāmāyaṇa, nevertheless, differentiates a Cara from a Dūta as has been done by Kantīlīva and Kāmandaka. 309 In the epic, such agents as were primarily assigned the duty to know the enemy's secrets have been referred to as Caras 310 and not as Dūtas.

(5) Rtvij: The Śākūṇḍa has a reference to two Rtvij of king Daśaratha, 311 namely Vaśiṣṭha and Vāmadeva. Later, Vaśiṣṭha is separated from the other and frequently addressed to as Purohita, Ācārya, Guru etc. Thus, only Vāmadeva was primarily employed by Ayodhyā to perform the duty of the Rtvij. He was the Brāhmaṇa who was referred to by Rāma when he said, "I hope that the one who is wise, who knows the procedure, who is upright and who has been engaged for fires, reports to you about the Ṣavīṇī that have been offered and are being offered." 312 He enjoyed the position of a counsellor, in which capacity he took part in all the deliberations on important state matters. 313

Rtvij and Purohita have been distinguished between by Manu also who tells the king to appoint a Purohita and a Rtvij. 314 One verse earlier he notes the qualifications of each of them. Vaiśnavalkya differentiates between their functions also and says that the king should make the one his Purohita who is a Daivajña (fortune-teller), learned and
expert in Daṇḍāṇīti and the Atharvaveda, and for Brahma-
Smārta karmas he should have a ṛtvij. Thus, the ṛtvij of
the Rāmāyaṇa must have performed his Homa etc., besides
giving counsel.

(6) Stryadhyaṇaka: Kautilya includes an officer
designated as Antarvāṃśika in the list of the Tirthas. He
has been referred to as Stryadhyaṇaka, and Kalatrādhyaṇaka
in the Mahābhārata, Stryadhyaṇakasmahāmātra in Rock Edict at
Girnara and Antahpurādhyaṇaka in the Matsyavāmaṇa. In
the epic he has been referred to as Stryadhyaṇaka, using the
plural form again and also adding the word Bhūn (many).

The Lord Chamberlain was an old man, wore red-coloured
clothes and carried a cane. He sat at the gate of the harem,
wearing ornaments, and was assisted by Kikkaras, Sārṣvaras
and female attendants in the harem. Kautilya, we know,
prescribes a pay of 24000 Paṇas for the officer.

The Stryadhyaṇaka had vast powers. Even a prince could
not enter the harem without his permission. Besides
regulating the entry, he was responsible for the management
of the Antahpurā. He seems to have been a man of proven
religious purity,

(7) Dhanādhyaka: In the Bālapal, Daśaratha has
been described saying, "Today my Dhanādhyakṣas may go ahead
of others, carrying lots of wealth in the form of various
kinds of jewels.\textsuperscript{325} Thus, the Dhanadhyakśa was officer-in-
charge of the treasury and responsible for its account.\textsuperscript{326}
He provided for state's expenditure. During a march the
Dhanadhyakśa managed the provisions. The ornaments of the
king and the royal family were kept in his store.

(8) \textit{Kulaputra:} Rāma said to Bharata, "I hope all
your officers who are born of good families (Kulaputras) are
faithful to you and are ready to lay their lives for you.\textsuperscript{327}
Thus, he seems to be referring to all important officers.
Valmīki, however, does not explain further and proceeds to
explain the Dūta.

The term Kulaputra has been translated as "Counsellors
etc.\textsuperscript{328}" but that does not seem to be correct if the context
is not ignored. It does not refer to all the high officers
of the state.

In the \textit{Sundarakānda}, we have terms like Amātyasūtā\textsuperscript{329}
and Mantrīsūtā.\textsuperscript{330} The sons of Mantrīs and Amātyas, probably,
have been referred to as Kulaputras also. It seems that the
sons of the high functionaries were employed by the state for
not very high jobs before their selection as Mantrīs and
Amātyas, which offices were filled up by hereditary appointments.

(9) \textit{Vaidya:} This officer was referred to by
Daśaratha when he was anxious to know the cause of Kaikeyī's
indisposition; he claimed to have employed many efficient
Vaidyas who were well contented,\textsuperscript{331} too. The Vaidya was,
therefore, the royal physician.
Kāmandaṇaka refers to this officer while describing the measures a king should take to protect himself against poisoning. Vālāṃki does not inform us about the status of the officer anymore, but it can be concluded that he was a very important officer in the epic period also for the king’s security depended on him.

He was responsible for checking and testing all things meant for the royal use and consumption. He treated the members of the royal family during illness. He was kept well contented, obviously, as a safety measure against being won over by enemy.

(10) Dvārādhyakṣa: Kauṭilya refers to Dauvarika, literally 'Doorkeeper' but otherwise Lord Mayor of Palace, and includes him in the list of Tīrthas. In the Rāmāyaṇa, Dvārādhyakṣa and Dwāstha are the two terms used to denote the officer.

The Dvārādhyakṣa was to see that the deliberations between the king and his counsellors were not seen or heard by anybody. He was probably responsible for the administration of the whole palace and regulated entries also.

(11) Upādhyāya: The Rāmāyaṇa refers to an officer designated as Upādhyāya, associated with the training and education of the princes. Rāma hoped that Bharata honoured Upādhyāya Sudhāṅvā who was accomplished in the use of arrows and missiles and an authority on the Arthasastra.
qualities required in him are given in the epic as expertise in the use of arms and polity. The Upadhyāya seems to have enjoyed a very high status, just below the Aurohita and Rtvij.

(12) Antahpāla: He was the officer responsible for the security of the palace and, most probably, of the boundaries. The Antahpāla was assisted by officers like Caityapālas who fought Hanumān at Lanka when the latter had destroyed the Caitya.

The use of plural forms has been made in the case of this officer also, which again seems to be meaningless.

The Antahpāla has been included in the list of high functionaries by the Arthatāstra, as the incharge of frontiers. In the epic we find him stationed within the boundary wall of Lanka for the protection of the city as well as the palaces.

It is thus clear that although the Rāmāyana refers to the high functionaries of the state as 18 Tirthas, yet all the functionaries of the Tirtha-list are not found actively functioning. We hear of Mantrī, Aurohita, Yuvrāja, Senapati, Dvārādhyaśa, Stryādhyaśa, Dhanādhyaśa and Antahpāla, but not of others. That, however, should not be taken to mean that the other functionaries did not exist because the epic reveals its knowledge of their existence in clear terms.
Kautilya has prescribed fixed salaries for all the functionaries of the state. He holds that they would not revolt against the king or yield to temptations after receiving the large amounts of salaries. The Ramayana does not tell us that the high functionaries of the state received fixed pay and allowances. But we are informed that the soldiers were paid Vetrana (pay) and Bhaktan (allowances). It can be, therefore, concluded that all the officers, whether high or low, received fixed emoluments against their services.

The king, the queens and the princes do not seem to have received any fixed salaries. We are told only that Kaushalya had a large income from 1000 villages given to her as Upaniyanam and that Rama had lots of wealth. The princes might have had their Upaniyanam, too.
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Mānūha subṛdāṃ madhye vākyoṃ paramgarhihitam. Rām.IV.10.8
55. Rām. V.47.10 and the preceding verse.
56. Mantrībhīrmantratatvajñānairanyaiśca subhadādhibhiḥ,
Anvāṣyamānāṃ sacivaiḥ surairiva surēvaram. Rām.V.49.13
57. Rām. V.50.
58. Meghamāda had brought Hanumān as captive and was
accompanied by many soldiers. The presence of other
Rākṣasas is confirmed by the verses which tell us that
Hanumān was tied at his tail by them with rags etc.(V.51)
60. Rām. V. 50-51.
60A. Rām. VI.6.
63. Rām. VI.31.72.
64. Aurodhassam ca kakutsthau naigamāntvijastathā,
Mantriṇāścaiva me sarvānāyadhvaṃ maṣajñaya.
Rām.VII.55.5.

65. Sa duḥkhena susastapto mantriṇaḥ saṃpāhvyat,
Vāsiṣṭhāṃ Vāmadevaṃ ca bhṛatrīṇaḥ saha naigamān.
Rām.VII.65.2.

65a. Rām. VII.74.

66. Purodhassam mantriṇaṃ ca naigamaṣedmaḥbhavīt,
Adya Rāja/ūbhisekayāmi Bharatam dharmavatselam.
Rām.VII.97.1-2.

67. Rām. VII.97.
68. Rām. II.1-5.
69. Rām. II.61; II.75.8-12.
70. Rām. II.2; II.76; VI.3.
72. Ibid.
73. Amātyaiḥ sahitāḥ sarvaiḥ Prahastaiḥ saṃpasthitaiḥ,
Kimcidātyayīkṣā kāryam teṣām tvam iva darsanam kuru.
Rām.VI.23.35.

74. Rām. VI.11-12.
75. Rām. VII.96.13.
76. Laksānaṇasya vadbenādyaya, Rām.VII.96.11.
78. Abh sākhāmyaratvaṃ te —-— Rām. IV.2.16.
79. Rām. IV.31.9-17.
81. *Rām. VI. 26. 5-20.*
82. *Rām. VI. 51:* also see Ṣrahasta's critic of Ṛavāṇa in VI.45.14 ff.
83. Kaccite sañtrito mātra rāstram na Pārīdhāvati,
    *Rām. II.94.13.*
84. *Rām. VII. 93.15.*
85. *Rām. VI. 14. 16-17.*
86. Sakhismhena teśhīhru maya sarvam pratiśruten,
    Lōnaya gahane sūye bhayamutesiṣya Ṛavajat.
    Taccā me viditaṃ sarvasubhnīkṛyamya Maithili.
    *Rām. VI. 24. 5-6.*
87. *Rām. VII. 94.*
88. *Rām. VII. 43-44.*
89. *Rām. VII. 74-81.*
90. *Rām. VII. 82-2.*
91. op.cit. p. 227; Ramaśraya Sharma (op.cit. pp.339-39)
    takes Paurā-Jānapada as a single body with two houses
    mentioned by Jayaswal.
92. op.cit. pp. 238.
93. Ibid, p.231.
94. op.cit. pp. 93-94.
95. Ibid, p.95.
96. His argument is that because of a singular verb
    Upatīṣṭhati every subject in the verse joined by particle
    Ca should be in singular form. It would then denote
    the Paurā-Jānapada body and not merely the people.
    (Jayaswal, op.cit).
According to Ramáraya Sharma (op.cit. p.367) "noteworthy in this connection is that the Jánapadas are described here as having their permanent quarters in the metropolis". The assumption is, however, unfounded because if we take the word Āraśayāhi as an adjective of 'Jánapadaḥ', the Paurās would be missing from the scene altogether. In our view the word Āraśayāhi has been used for Paurās, which meaning would mean presence of both, the Paurās and Jánapadas.
112. Te tamucurmatmanam paurajanapadaṁ saha, Ṛām. II.2.18
113. Gataśvatha nṛpo bhūyah paur̥su sahasantrībhīḥ,
    Ṛām. II.4.1.

Here again, reference to Janapadas is missing which shows that the term Paura is sometimes loosely used by the poet to mean both, Pauras and Janapadas.

114. Daradā paurānvividhanmahādhanamupasthitāṁ, Ṛām. II.12.24
115. Ṛām. II. 13.2.
116. Āśinastveva Bharataḥ paurajanapadaṁ janam,
    Uveca sarvataḥ prekṣya kimāryam namāstatha.
    Ṛām. II.103.19.
117. Te tamucurmatmanam ——, Ṛām. II.103.20 read with 21.
118. Ṛām. II.103.22.
119. Kathayasya ca visrahdho nirbhayo vigatajvarah,
    Kathayante yathā paurā-jaṇā janapadesuḥca, Ṛām. VII.42.11
120. Śṛṇu rājan yathā paurāḥ kathayanti subhāsubhān,
    Catvarāpārathye su vaneṣupavaneṣu ca. Ṛām. VII.42.13.
121. The following verses also show that the term Paura sometimes means both, Paura and Janapada.

Paurānaṁ mama Śītayeṣ yadṛśi vartate kathā, Ṛām. VII.44.2
Paurapavādaḥ sumahāsastḥa janapadasya ca, Ṛām. VII.44.3
Pura ca janapade caiva tvātikte jañātītmae,
    Ṛām. VII.46.11.

Paurapavādahḥitena, Ṛām. VII.46.13.
122. Sātaphatha Brāhmaṇa, V.3.2.
123. Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, I.7.3.
124. Ete vai rāṣṭrasya pradātāḥ, Ibid.
126. Hitadhvaryurtathodgata hastena samayojayana,

Mahiyā perivṛttyatha vāvatāmaparāṇaḥ tatha. Rām. I.13.28
127. Rahāḥ sūto rājānasmidamahavita, Rām. I.8.5.
128. Rām. I.67.1; V.1.77; VII.91.1; II.94.29.
129. Kaśadaśādaśāñīesu swapake daśapāka ca,

Triḥbhiṣṭribhaviññātairvetsi tīrthāḥi gaurakṣi.
Rām. II.9.30.
130. Sāntiparva, 69.30; Sabhāparva, 5.33.
132. Raghuvarṇa. XVII.88.
133. Gurūnāmatyāśca nātijīvet, Āpastambha Dh. Sūtra, II.10.

25-10.
136. Kāmandaśa, XI.52.
137. Rām. II.94. 10-11 and 19.
138. Rām. II.53. 15-16.
139. Rām. IV.37.23 and VI.51. 7-8 and 114.
141. Rām. VI.51.19.
142. Rām. II.94.11.
143. Aṣṭau bahīhuvarvīrasya tasyāmātyā yaśasvinah,

Śucayāsamanraktaśca rājakṛtyesu nityaśe. Rām. I.7.1
(also see Rām. I.7.2 for names of the Amātyas).
144. Rām. I.7. 3-4.
145. Vasiṣṭho Vāmadevasca Jabāliśca dṛṣṭvāratḥ,
   Agrataḥ Prayayuh sarve mantriṇah mantrasūjitaḥ.
   
   Rām. II.105.2.

146. Rām. VII.82.
148. Rām. VI.8.1; VI.23. 35-37.
149. Sa nisīdate mātin kṛtvā yaṣṭavamsiḥ buddhimān,
   Mantriṇibhiḥ saha dharmatma sarvaiśvā va kṛtātmabhīḥ.
   
   Rām. I.8.3.

150. Śighramāṇaya me sarvān gurūnāṁ puruḥitāḥ Rām. I.8.4
151. Gurūnāṁ vacanaścāghraṁ sambhavāḥ sambhriyante.
   

153. Ete dvijāḥ Prayāntvagre syandanaṁ yojayaṁ vá me,
   
   Rām. I. 68.5.

155. Rām. II.61.
156. Rām. II.73-76.
157. Rām. II.77 and the following Sargas.
158. Rām. VI.108.
159. Rām. VII.55.
160. Rām. VII.65. 2-3.
161. Rām. VII.82. 2-3.
162. Rām. VII.82. 2-3.
163. Vide: Rām. II.94.10.
164. Tanpūjīyitvā dharmatma rāja Daśaratho te, Rām. I.11.7
165. Tatra dharmopadhāsuddhān —— Sarvopadhāsuddhān

166. Ibid.

167. Rām. I.8.4; I.11.4; VI.22. 2-5 etc.


169. Mantripurāchitasaṁkheṣaṁānigṛdhitakaranāṁghu sthāpayitē/
mātyānupadhābhiḥ sodhaya. Arthasastra, I.9, and also
see I.10.


171. Ibid.

172. Sacīvānsapta eṣṭau vā prakurvinā prīkṣitēn.
Manu, VII.94.

173. Amātyānupadhatītanpitrpaītēmahaṁśucīn,
śreṣṭhānāreṣṭheṣu kaccittvaṁ niyojayaśi karmāṇu.
Rām. II.94.21.

174. Kaccinmukhyā mahās-veva madhyamēṣu ca madīyameḥ,
Jaghaṇyēṣa jaghaṇyēṣu bhṛtyah karmāṇu yojitaḥ.
Rām. II.94.20.

175. Sambhṛdeṣu aprīkṣitēḥ, Rām. I.7.7.


177. Kamandaka, XI. 67-68.

178. Manu, VII. 94 and its following verses.

179. Mbh. XII.36. 7-8. The critical edition avoids mention
of 8 Kṣatriyas and 21 Vaiṣyas. But the reading adopted
is not logical. The reading quoted by us (XII.35. 7-9)
is more reasonable.

180. Rām. VI.8.
181. Rām. IV. 25. 31-33.
182. Menu, VII. 57-58.
184. Ityuktvēntahpuraṇamājūma Rūpaṇavit, Rām.II.13.17.
185. Trīṣu caturṣu va naikantam krochreṇopadhyate
186. Menu, VII.57-59.
187. Kaccimāntrayaya naikah kaccimna bahubhiḥ saha,
Rām. II.94.13.
188. Atyayike kārye mantriṇo mantriṣaparādām cābūya bruyāt.
Tatra yad bhūyisthāḥ kāryasiddhikāraṃ va bruṣyatat
189. Sajjasāmamakāraṃca nirundhyurmantriṇo nṛpaḥ ————
nṛpasya te hi suhṛdāste eva guravo matah. Kāmandaka,
IV.41.44.
190. *Sukra, II. 82-83.
191. Rām. III.33. 9-10.
193. Niyuktaṁ mantriḥbhīrvinayo savāyaṁ pārthīvo hitem,
Ata eva bhayaṁ tyaktvā brahmaśabdhrtaṁ vacah.
Rām. IV.31.18.
194. Arthaśāstra, I.15. 51-52.
195. Teṣaṁaviditaṁ kṣicīṣvēgu nāsti pareṣu va,
kriyāmanam kṛtam vāpi cārenāpi cikṣitaṁ, Rām.I.7.6.
196. Rām.II.94.16.
198. Satvaramābḥyā vyāytaṁ viṣṭaṁasacaya, Rām.II.34.14.
199. Sharma, Ramasraya, op.cit. p.320.
200. Rām. II. 103.4.
201. Guruṣa me paramo bhavān. Rām. I.12.3.
203. Rām. I.12.3.
204. Tataḥ sumantramāhūya Vasīṣṭho vākyaśāhravit, Rām.I.12.16
205. Atītyākāśāḥṣaḥ tu nāmakarmatathākarota,Rām.I.17.11-12
    Jamakriyādīni ------- Rām.I.17. 11-12.
207. Rām.I. 49.11.
208. Rām.II.96.24.
210. Rām.II.3.3-4.
211. Jīvatyapi mahārāje tavaiva vacanaṃ vayan,
    Natikramāmehe sarve velāṃ prayyeva sāgaram.
    Rām.II.61.24.
212. Rām. VII.96.
213. 'Sukra, II. 69-70.
214. For example, Sarga seven in the Bala-kanda and Sarga 61 and 94 in the Ayodhyākanda wherein the state of administration in Ayodhyā, conditions in a kingless country and enquiries regarding proper working of state-machinery have been described.
216. Kaccidāśṭādaśūryesu svapaṅge desapaṅca ca,Rām.II.94.30
217. Rām. IV. 2.22.
218. Svakaḥ rūpaḥ parityajya hikṣuṇuṣuṇa vānaraḥ,  
Ababhāge ca tao vīrav yathāvatsraṣāṇaḥ ca. Rām. IV. 3.2.

219. Rām. VII.42.
'Śuka and Sārāna, we understand, were the two ministers on Rāvanas side who were assigned espionage work for collecting information regarding the strength of Rāma's strength etc. (Rām. VI. 16-17).

220. Anena preṣitā ye ca rākṣasa laṅhuvikramāḥ,  
Rāghavāstirṇa ityevam pravṛttiṣṭairīhūrtāḥ. Rām. VI.24.16


222. Rāja satvaranāḥya vyāpyatāṃ vittasamāyate, Rām. II.34.14


224. Rām. II.94.22.

225. Rām. II.94.39.41.

226. Adya sarve dhanaśhyakṣaḥ dhanaśabdāya puṣkalam,  
Vrajantvagre suvihita nanāratnasamrastāḥ. Rām. I.68.2

227. Rām. II.32; II.29.20.


229. Vide Rām. II. 61.16-17.

230. Rām. V. 5.


232. Rām. II.94.44.

233. Kāmaśaṇiṣṣaye jātāryābhikāsca hayottamaḥ,  

234. Kaccinānaṃ guptaṃ kunjaraṇaṃ ca trpyasī. Rām. II.94.43
another reading is:
Kaccanāgaravanapravartasthanti sankhānag,  
Kaccinna ganākāravanānmunjasanāmca tasya.

Ram.(G.P.edition)
II.100.50.

235. Vide Ram. II. 94. 26-27.
236. Vide Ram. II. 94. 24.

In Lahkā the portfolio of Senāpati was manned by
a Mantri (VII.8.1; VI.23. 35-37).

237. Prāptakālaṇam yathā-daṇḍam dhīryuyuḥ saṁśyapī, Ram.II.7.7.
238. 'Sukra, II. 69-70.
239. Vyasaṇa kaccakhyasa ——— Ram.II.94.49.
240. Chītaścaiva prāśaṇa kāle ——— Ram.II.94.48.
241. Kaccidāryo Viśāmbhitam ——— Ram.II.94.47.
242. Sutikṣṇa daṇḍāḥ samprakṣya purusasya balābalaṁ.

Ram.I. 7.10.

246. Kaccidvṛddhāṃśa bālāṃśa vaidyāmukhyāmśa Rāghava,  
Dānena manasā vaca trikhirītairrubhūṣage. Ram.II.94.51.
247. Kaccīcāśita-'satairjuṣṭah samiviṣṭajānākulaḥ,  
Devastvānaiḥ prabhbhiṣca tadāśīcāsopābhiteḥ.

Ram.II.94.51.

249. Ram. II. 94. 1-3.
250. Ram. II. 94.39.
251. Cf. Nārāyaṇa Janapade vāṇijo dūrāgaṁināḥ—— Ram.II.61.16
252. Tamasāryayah ēṣyāḥ pitarām puto bhṛtyāḥ svaminamiva
253. Abhivādyya Vaiśṭham nyāyataḥ pratipūjya ca. Rām.I.12.1
254. Anumāṇyā Vaiśṭham, Rām. I.10.3.
255. Bhavānigdoḥaḥ suhṛmaḥyam guruṇaśa paramo bhāvān,
   Rām.I. 12.3.
256. Iksākūnasārveṣam purodhēḥ paramā gatiḥ, Rām.I.56.20.
257. Rām. I.69.9; I. 67. 4-5.
258. Purchitṛaṃ cośanasaṃ varayāmāsa sūraṃ, Rām.VII.70.18
259. Rām. II.94.7.
260. Rām. VI.115.51.
261. Vide Trīśāṅku's example (Rām.I.56.12).
262. Rām.I. 18.16.
264. Rām.II.61.
   Sūkhumānayā me sarvāngurūmānantapurchitaṃ.
   Rām.I.34.
266. Sumantra sang praises of Deśaratha and acted as a
   chariot while Janaka's ministers brought the box of
   the bow.
267. Amattyaprabhṛtibhāṣyaṃ puraṣṭāṇamūrayaḥ. Rām. II.3.27.
   The Gītāpress edition which follows the Southern
   recension has Sumantra even saying:
   Aśrutā rājāśvacanam kathast gacchami bhāvī (II.14.6)
269. Rām. I. 57.10.
270. Rām.II.94.24.
271. Rām.VII. 91.1.
274. Kūlināḥ satyasaṃpannaḥ 'sakto-mātyaḥ praṃśātāḥ, 
Etaireva guṇairuyktaśatathā senāpatirbhave 
Vyuḥaṇtrāyudhīyānām tattvajñāno vikramaśvītāḥ, 
Vārsātitorṇavātānām sahīṣhāḥ paramadhipātā.

Mbh. XII. 86. 30-31

275. Tadeva senāpatiḥ sarvayuddhaprabhārāpanavādyāyinī 
baṃṭaśāvarathasvarasamughaṣṭhāscatasaṅgarsya- 
balasya- 
muṣṭhamadhiṣṭhānam vidyat. Arthasastra, II. 33.

276. Kūmandaka, XVII. 27. 44.
278. Kaccid dhṛṣṭaśca sūrāśca dhṛtimāṃ satīmāṃcchāciḥ, 
Kūlinācāmṛaktaśca dakṣaḥ Senāpatiḥ kṛtāḥ. Rām. II. 94. 24

279. Rām. III. 26. 1
280. Rām. VI. 8. 1; VI. 3. 30.
282. Rām. VI. 43. 3.
283. Tatāsteyvasanēsu Senāpatiṣu pañcaṣu, Rām. V. 44. 39
284. Rām. VI. 45. 17.
286. Kapilasenāpatimukhān, Rām. IV. 44. 7.
287. Rām. II. 94. 25.
289. Miṃjuṣyānāno bhuvi yaṃvarājye tato/tvaṣṭām 
bharataḥ mahātmā. Rām. VI. 116. 79.
290. Rām. VI. 80. 13.
291. 'Sukra, II. 12.
292. R̄̄m. IV. 52-53.
293. R̄̄m. VII. 43-44; VII. 73-82.
294. Bhagvänanigdhah shrīyambyah, R̄̄m. I.12.3.
295. R̄̄m. II. 46.15.
296. R̄̄m. VII. 42.
297. Amātyaiśca suhṛdbhīśca buddhīmadbhīśca mantābhīḥ,
       R̄̄m. II.104.17.
       Na suhṛdbhirna cāmātyairmantrasyātva naśaiganah,
       R̄̄m. II.53.16.
298. R̄̄gveda, I.12.1; I. 161.3.
300. Kau, VII. 63-64.
301. Kacchijanapedo vidvān daksīṇah pratibhūvān,
       Yathoktavādī dūtasate kṛto Bharata paṇḍitaḥ, R̄̄m. II.94.29
302. Amātyasampedopeto niṣṭārthah, pāḍagunahināh
       pariṣīrthāh, ardhagunahināh sāsanabahārāh Arthaśāstra,
       I.15.
303. R̄̄m. I.12.
304. R̄̄m. V.2. 39-39.
306. te saṃanta-vāsyino/pyavadhyaḥ, kīsāṅga punorbhṛmaṇāh
       Arthaśāstra, I.15.
307. Saṅhurva yodh vāśādhuḥ paraśresṣa samarpitaḥ,
       Bruvanparārtham paravāma dūto vadhantarhati.
       R̄̄m. V.50.11.
308. Dūtasya dṛṣṭo bahavo hi daṇḍāḥ, R̄̄m. V.50.7.
309. Kāmandaka, XII.32.
311. Ṛtvajau dvāvabhimaṭau -------- Rām. I.7.3.
312. Kescidagniṣu te yuktō vidhiśno maṁaṁjūh,
      Hutaṁ ca hagyemen ca kaśe vedayate sadā. Rām. II.94.8
313. Cf. Purchā ṛtvijāścaiva rāja ca sahaṁantrībhīh,
      Rām. I.49.11
      Asanaśu yathānyayaśupaviṣṭānsvamantataḥ, Rām. I.49.12.
314. Purchitāṁ ca kurvita vṛnuyādeva cartviṃ,
      Te/aya gṛihyam karamīḥ kuryvetānādhānica Huma, VII.78
316. Arthasastra, I.11. daunvīkantavamsīka ----
318. Mth. Śalya. P. 29.72 and 94.
321. Tatra kāsyino vṛddhānvetrapāṇīṃsvalāṅkṛtān,
      Dadarāśa viṣṭhitānvarīstryābhyaṃsaṃsāhitān. Rām. II.14.4.
322. Rām. II.59. 2-4.
323. Daunvarīkantavamsīka --------caturviṣātisahamāḥ.
      Arthasastra, V.3.
324. Rām. II.14.4.
325. Adya sarve dhanādhyakṣā -------- Rām. I.68.2.
326. Rām. II. 29.20.
327. Rām. II. 94.28.
328. Rām., Gāthapress edition, II.100.94.
329. Rām. V. 46.7, (VII.35.6 also).
330. राम. व. 43.1.
331. संति में कुशाल वायु अब्हितुष्टस्वा सर्वोत्साह, राम. व. 10.8.
332. कामदाका, व. 11-15.
333. अर्थास्त्र, व. 1.11.
334. सा राज्यो दरानाकन्तकी द्विधयाक्षणर्वेसा हि,
   "सिग्रहमक्ख्याते में प्रेतम कृष्णेषु गौडिनै सुतं,"
   राम. व. 17.24.
335. विसज्या तु सह्र्द६र्गम बुद्धियः निन्दिता राघवेनिन्द्र,
   सम्पे द्वाष्ठमांसामिदाम वस्मामाब्रवित्। राम. व. 13.1.
336. वि-दे, राम. व. 93.
337. इग्वात्सामपपमार्थास्त्रा विश्वायाः,
   सुभवानामुपपध्यायं कासित्वें तता मन्याते। राम. व. 94.9.
338. राम. व. 5.9.
339. राम. व. 41.11.
340. इ-दे.
341. अर्थास्त्र, व. 1.11, व. 3.
342. कनवते ध्वार्षे नानसृवद्यवनामकोपकं नासेः
   भवति। अर्थास्त्र, व. 3.
343. राम. व. 94. 26-27.
344. राम. व. 29.18.