

Bühler<sup>35</sup> was inclined to interpret as a proof of landowning. The evidence is, however, inadequate to prove what is sought. It is not denied that gradually the king came to be vaguely conceived—as the English king still is—as lord of all the land in a proprietorial sense, but it is far more probable that such an idea was only a gradual development than that it was primitive. The power of devouring the people is a political power, not a right of ownership; precisely the same feature can be traced in South Africa,<sup>36</sup> where the chief can deprive a man arbitrarily of his land, though the land is really owned by the native. The matter is ultimately to some extent one of terminology, but the parallel cases are in favour of distinguishing between the political rights of the crown, which can be transferred by way of a grant, and the rights of ownership. Hopkins<sup>37</sup> thinks that the gifts of land to priests, which seems to be the first sign of land transactions in the Brāhmaṇas, was an actual gift of land; it may have been so in many cases, but it may easily also have been the grant of a superiority: the Epic grants are hardly decisive one way or the other.

For the relations of the king with the assembly, see **Sabhā**; for his consecration, see **Rājasūya**. A-rāja-tā, 'lack of a king,' means 'anarchy.'<sup>38</sup>

<sup>35</sup> In his note on Manu, *loc. cit.*, *Sacred Books of the East*, 25, 259.

<sup>36</sup> See Keith, *Journal of the African Society*, 6, 202 *et seq.* The evidence, so far as it goes, of other Aryan peoples does not support the theory of original kingly ownership. Such ownership did not exist, as far as can be seen, in Anglo-Saxon times (*English Historical Review*, viii. 1-7), nor in Homeric Greece (Lang, *Homer and His Age*, 236 *et seq.*), nor at Rome.

<sup>37</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>38</sup> Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, i. 5, 9, 1; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, i. 14, 6; Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, 74.

Cf. Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, 162 *et seq.*; Hopkins, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 13, 84 *et seq.*; Foy, *Die königliche Gewalt nach den Dharmasūtr* (Leipzig, 1895); Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, 46 *et seq.*; *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1901, 860, 861.

2. **Rājan** in several passages—means no more than a 'noble of the ruling house,' or perhaps even merely a 'noble,' there being

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Rv. i. 40, 8; 108, 7; x. 42, 10; 97, 6; Taittiriya Saṃhitā, iv. 6, 8, 3; v. 7, 6, 4; Kāthaka Saṃhitā, xl. 13; Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, xviii. 48; xxvi. 2; Av. xix. 62, 1, and possibly ii. 6, 4, etc.; Ludwig, *Translation of the Rigveda*, 3,

236, 237. Possibly *rājñah* in Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, i. 4, 5, may be taken in this sense. The king there is said to be a non-Āryan, but the reading is corrupt, and Oertel's conjecture is not probable. Cf. **Rājya**, n. 2.