

to be construed as a relinquishment of their obedience, or as a pardon of their faults, is a problem, which, at this day, does not merit a formal solution.

The law of England (as we all know) hath divided the residents within the British dominions into two classes; 1stly, into that of subjects; 2dly, into that of aliens, who are subdivided into a body denominated denizens; a name, which implies, that they had once been aliens, but had been admitted by their denization, to some of the privileges of subjects.

But the law of England knows nothing assuredly of a *real* subject, or *unreal* subject; to affirm of a person, that he is more a subject or less a subject is to speak neither good English, nor sound law; since the term subject does not admit of degrees: And every one must consequently be either a subject to all intents, or to no intent. To admit novelties into our language is almost as dangerous, as it is to allow innovations in our law. The unmeaning epithet *real* was prefixed in the Treaty* to the well-known terms *British subjects*, with design to distinguish those British subjects, who, having been born without the United States, never permanently resided

* The American negotiators have at length explained to the world the import of the perplexing expressions *real* British subjects, by their letter to the Congress, dated the 18th of July 1783, and published in the Pennsylvania Independent Gazette of the 24th of April, 1784: "The British Ministers, say the negotiators, were unwilling to make use of any