

those tribes, stand as representatives of good form, used to make their raids in the dewy season. The word **Udāja**, too, with its variant **Nirāja**, records that kings took a share of the booty of war. The *Rigveda*<sup>13</sup> has many references to Vedic wars: it is clear that the Kṣatriyas were at least as intent on fulfilling their duty of war as the Brahmins on sacrificing and their other functions. Moreover, beside offensive war, defence was a chief duty of the king: he is emphatically the 'protector of the tribe' (*gopā janasya*), or, as is said in the *Rājasūya* ('royal consecration'), 'protector of the Brahmin.'<sup>14</sup> His **Purohita** was expected to use his spells and charms to secure the success of his king's arms. The king no doubt fought in person: so **Pratardana** met death in war according to the *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad*;<sup>15</sup> and in the *Rājasūya* the king is invoked as 'sacker of cities' (*purāṇi bhettā*).

*The King in Peace.*—In return for his warlike services the king received the obedience<sup>16</sup>—sometimes forced<sup>17</sup>—of the people, and in particular their contributions for the maintenance of royalty. The king is regularly<sup>18</sup> regarded as 'devouring

<sup>13</sup> E.g., the *Dāśarājña*, Rv. vii. 18. 33. 83, and cf. Rv. iii. 33. 53.

<sup>14</sup> Rv. iii. 43. 5. References to attacks on aborigines are common in the *Rigveda*—e.g., ii. 12, 11; iv. 26, 3; vi. 26, 5; 33, 4, etc. For later references to war, cf. *Kāthaka Samhitā*, ix. 17; x. 3; xxviii. 2; *Taittiriya Samhitā*, vi. 4, 8, 3; *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa*, v. 5; *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, ii. 6, 4, 2 et seq.; and Hopkins, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 13, 187, 215. In the *Rājasūya* the protection of the Brahmin is compensated with the 'eating' of the Viś, the latter interesting the king more than the older duty of protection. See *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, viii. 12, 17.

<sup>15</sup> iii. 1.

<sup>16</sup> See, e.g., *Janaka's* offer of the *Videhas* as slaves to *Yājñavalkya*, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, iv. 4, 30, and see *ibid.*, ii. 1, 20; *Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā*, i. 6, 10, etc.; Rv. i. 67, 1; iv. 50, 8.

<sup>17</sup> Rv. ix. 7, 5. Cf. vii. 6, 5, etc.; *Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa*, ii. 7, 18, 2.

<sup>18</sup> See *Bali*, and cf. Rv. i. 65, 4; Av. iv. 22, 7; *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, vii. 29; viii. 12, 17; *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa*, iv. 12; *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, i. 8, 2, 17; iv. 2, 1, 3, 17; v. 3, 3, 12; 4, 2, 3; x. 6, 2, 1; xiii. 2, 9, 6, 8, etc.; Weber, *Indische Studien*, 18, 93, n.; Ludwig, *Translation of the Rigveda*, 3, 246; Pischel and Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, 1, xvi; Winternitz, *Geschichte der indischen Litteratur*, 1, 173, 174; Keith, *Aitareya Aranyaka*, 161. It is to this form of taxation that the share of village (*grāme*), horses (*āśveṣu*), and kine (*goṣu*) of Av. iv. 22, 2, is to be referred. It is significant that the village and cattle are put on the same footing, as tending to refute the argument that the king was supreme landowner. See n. 31 below. For the rate of taxation, which later was one-sixth, cf. Hopkins, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 13, 85, 86; *India, Old and New*, 238 et seq.; 333; Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1901, 860.