seed, and he means by this that he will stay where he places himself without food either until he is paid or until the barley seed germinates and sprouts and grows and ears and gives him bread to eat (*Early History of Institutions*, p. 297).

Dharna means detention or arrest. The semi-divine legislator of India, Manu, who wrote a lawbook in verse, somewhere between 1280 B.C. and 400 A.D.—the learned are not quite sure when—and Brihaspiti, who wrote a standard Braminical lawbook, named Vyavahara Maqukha, both refer to the practice. This was the way the plan was worked in the latter part of the last century: The Brahmin who adopted this expedient for the purpose of gaining a point which he could not accomplish in any other way proceeded to the door, or house, of the person against whom it was directed, or wherever he might most conveniently arrest him; he then sat down in dharna with poison or a poignard or some other instrument of suicide in his hand, and threatening to use it if his adversary should attempt to molest or pass him, he thus completely arrested him. In this situation the Brahmin fasted, and, by the rigor of the etiquette, the unfortunate object of his arrest had to fast also, and thus they both remained until the institutor of the dharna obtained satisfaction. In this (as he seldom made the attempt without the resolution to persevere) he seldom failed, for if the party thus arrested should suffer the Brahmin sitting in dharna to perish by hunger, the sin would forever lie upon his head. And we are told that if a Brahmin be slain, as many as are the pellets of dust which his blood would make in the burnt-up soil of India, so many are the periods of a thousand years which the slayer must pass in hell (*Manu*, xi. 208). The Indian Penal Code (sec. 508) has forbidden the Brahmins to practise this special mode of oppression any more, and now "sitting dharna" chiefly survives in British India in the exaggerated air of suffering worn by a creditor who comes to ask a debtor of higher rank for payment, and who is told to wait. But it is still common in the native states (*Early History, etc.*, 299—304).

When a Kaffir had a lawsuit or claim against a fellow, he and his friends went in force to the village of the defendant; on their arrival they sat down together in some conspicuous position and awaited quietly the result of their presence. This was the signal for mustering all the adult male residents that were forthcoming; these, accordingly, assembled and also sat down within conversing distance. After a long silence the argument began (*Compendium of Kaffir Laws*, Dugmore, p. 38).

Among the ancient Egyptians—according to that most reliable historian, Herodotus (II. 136)—the levers used for extracting money from debtors were their reverence for ancestors and respect for the sanctity of family tombs. No man was allowed to borrow money without giving in pledge the body of his father, or of his nearest relative, (Herodotus only says "his father," but Sir Gardner Wilkinson presumes to suppose that some fathers did not die conveniently for their mummies to stand security for their impecunious sons, and so he suggests "the relative" idea). If the debt was not paid at the proper time the mummy could be removed, and the debtor was then considered infamous; and as the creditor usually found it much less inconvenient to take possession of the family