the people,' but this phrase must not be explained as meaning that he necessarily oppressed them. It obviously has its origin in a custom by which the king and his retinue were fed by the people's contributions, a plan with many parallels. It is also probable that the king could assign the royal right of maintenance to a Kṣatriya, thus developing a nobility supported by the people. Taxation would not normally fall on Kṣatriya or Brahmin; the texts contain emphatic assertions of the exemption of the goods of the latter from the royal bounty. In the people, however, lay the strength of the king. See also Bali.

In return the king performed the duties of judge. Himself immune from punishment (a-dandya), he wields the rod of punishment (Danda).21 It is probable that criminal justice remained largely in his actual administration, for the Sūtras22 preserve clear traces of the personal exercise of royal criminal jurisdiction. Possibly the jurisdiction could be exercised by a royal officer, or even by a delegate, for a Rājanya is mentioned as an overseer (adhyakşa) of the punishment of a Sūdra in the Kāthaka Samhitā.23 In civil justice it may be that the king played a much less prominent part, save as a court of final appeal, but evidence is lacking on this head. The Madhyamasi of the Rigveda was probably not a royal, but a private judge or arbitrator. A wide criminal jurisdiction is, however, to some extent supported24 by the frequent mention of Varuna's spies, for Varuna is the divine counterpart of the human king.25 Possibly such spies could be used in war also.26

There is no reference in early Vedic literature to the exercise of legislative activity by the king, though later it is an essential

¹⁹ Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiii. 6, 2, 18; 7, 1, 13. See also Brāhmaṇa (above, 2, 83) for the claim of the Brahmins to serve only king Soma, not the temporal king.

²⁰ Cf., e.g., Maitrāyanī Samhitā, ii. 1, 8; iii. 11, 8; iv. 4, 3; Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, v. 4, 4, 11; Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, ii. 6, 5.

²¹ Satapatha Brahmana, v. 4, 4, 7.

²² E.g., Gautama Dharma Sūtra, xii. 43 et seq.

²³ xxvii. 4. Cf. Kşatriya, n. 18.

²⁴ Cf. Rv. i. 25, 13; iv. 4, 3; vi. 67, 5; vii. 61, 3; 87, 3; x. 10, 8 (= Av. xviii. 1, 9); Av. iv. 16, 4.

²⁵ See Foy, Die königliche Gewalt, 80 et seq.

²⁶ Cf. Rv. viii. 47, 11; Foy, op. cit., 84. The reference is not certain.