

them to the "happy ending" which is generally considered the duty of a writer of fiction. The woes and sorrows of Irish Catholics were at this period so heavy, that no sunbeam seemed ever to lighten the heavy clouds of gloom.

Mary O'Neill spent the rest of her life with her mother-in-law, either in Brussels or Louvain; and there the little Rosa grew up to womanhood. The two widows passed their time in many acts of charity; their home was open to Irish refugees, and their slender means were stretched to the utmost to afford relief. When Rosa grew to womanhood, she followed in the footsteps of her aunt, and became a Poor Clare in the convent of that order at Louvain.

Lady O'Neill, whose life had been marked by so many sorrows, survived even the daughter-in-law she loved so tenderly.

When her own time came to leave the earth, which had indeed been a valley of tears to her, she was interred in the Franciscan convent at Louvain. There, the traveller may still read her epitaph, which tells in a few brief words the touching story of her life.

THE END.

ANOTHER LIE NAILED.

ABOUT SLAVES.

No. III.

Let us now look at the treatment which this "machine of the genus vocal" received at the hands of his master.

If ever the idea of absolute power—power without limit—power without control either physical, moral or religious, was ever realised on earth, it was realised in the person of the Roman slave owner. One single man surrounded by thousands of slaves, who had to live solely and only to supply *his* wants or minister to his enjoyments; his every caprice *their* law; cruel and avengeful as only a Pagan Roman could be cruel and avengeful, he could torture, or maim, or kill a thousand slaves at a nod; debauched as only Pagan slaveholders could be debauched, the slave's honor was in his power.

It is true the Emperors strove, by repeated edicts, to restrain this power and to protect the slave; but the very number and constant repetition of these edicts show how powerless they were for good and how small their results.

1st. Nero, not yet become debauched by the Imperial power, charged magistrates to receive the complaints of the slaves, "*these victims of the cruelty and luxury and avarice of their masters,*" as he styles them; and he forbids masters to condemn their slaves to be devoured by the wild beasts *untried*.

2nd. Domitian, and after him Adrian, forbade masters to practice immoral and cruel mutilations upon their slaves.

3rd. Adrian took away from the masters the power of life and death, and ordained that no slave, even though guilty of crime, should be put to death without judicial sentence.

4th. Antoninus Pius condemned a master, who, without just cause, should slay his slave, to the same punishment as he would have to undergo if he had slain another man's slave, and ordered all those slaves to be sold to fresh masters, who, on account of harsh treatment, should take refuge under the statue of the Emperor.

5th. Marcus Aurelius made it illegal, *without judicial sentence*, to sell a slave, if a condition of the sale should be that the slave was to fight against the wild beasts of the arena.

A prohibitory law presupposes a previously existing criminal custom. Now what do these laws teach us? 1st. That slaves were condemned by their masters *untried*. 2nd. That that condemnation was often death or horrid mutilations. 3rd. That though guiltless of any crime, and at the mere will of his master, the slave was often mutilated. 4th. That a barter in slaves existed in order to supply victims to fight against the wild beasts in the arena to make a Roman holiday. That these laws were *sometimes* put in effect must be admitted. Adrian ordered a Roman matron to be herself made slave, because she had been cruel to her slaves. Antoninus Pius escheated the slaves of a brutal master.

But the very frequency of the re-enactment of these laws proves of how little avail they were found as against the close borough of the Roman aristocracy.