

lend, but rather that he will not even appear to interfere with it, by exercising, unlicensed, his own strong claim to borrow. Had he foreseen that this right would one day be called in question, could he have recorded more pointedly his own acknowledgment of its validity?

And this brings me to the last of your arguments which I propose at present to analyse. It is perhaps the most extraordinary of any that have come under my notice. You say (p. 33):

“The last of the Ten Commandments which we
“continue to use instead of the Two,* shews us what
“was the general state of society for which the code
“was framed, and fixes the real position of the slave
“in the household. “Thou shalt not covet thy
“neighbour’s *house*, thou shalt not covet thy neigh-
“bour’s *wife*, nor his *manservant*, nor his *maid*—
“*servant*, nor his *ox*, nor his *ass*, nor anything *that*
“*is thy neighbour’s*.” We see that the wife is as
“completely a subject of property and a part of a
“man’s estate as a *manservant* or a *maidservant*.
“And when this is seen, all thought of degradation
“as attaching to the condition of a slave is at an end.”

Had you not yourself italicized the words I should have fancied you must have forgotten that this passage comprises with the manservant and the maid-

* The precise gist and *animus* of this qualification is, I admit, not clear to me.