

## THE INQUISITION MYTHOLOGY.

CAN anything of real interest still be found amid the general dulness of what ought long since to have become a worn-out controversy? This much—that even the Catholic of ordinary intelligence, who follows out the lines the controversy has hitherto taken, will learn to be neither faint-hearted nor of little faith whenever the Church is attacked.

Under the general name of the Inquisition the teaching and action of the Church are attacked, as shown in the history of certain tribunals—originally ecclesiastical—which are known by this name; and from the supposed workings of these tribunals judgment is passed on the Church's theory and practice of what is called religious toleration.

The controversy has, briefly, three periods.

### I.

The first period answers to the hundred and more years immediately following the so-called Reformation. The Church was then savagely attacked as not teaching the doctrine of Christ at all. Accordingly she was at once Antichrist and Scarlet Woman and Babylon, whenever by spiritual or temporal means she attempted to keep control over the consciences of her children.

There was no plea for toleration included in this anathema hurled against her. So sturdy a Protestant as Hallam remarks that "persecution for religious heterodoxy, in all its degrees, was in the sixteenth century the principle as well as the practice of every church. It was held inconsistent with the sovereignty of the magistrate to permit any religion but his own; inconsistent with his duty to suffer any but the true."<sup>1</sup>

Calvin burned Servetus and defended his conduct, which was approved by the mild Melancthon; and the state founded by him followed his example. Luther, it is true, against Rome would have "the burning of heretics to be contrary to the will of the Spirit." But he urged the princes to give the sword its right against the Anabaptists. And he incited Christians to bring pitch and brimstone to fire the synagogues of the Jews, and then to exterminate them, once for all, from the land.<sup>2</sup> He also warmly applauded the King of Denmark, who, without reason or pretext of law, had

<sup>1</sup> Literature of Europe, vol. ii. ch. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Döllinger, in Wetzer and Welte's "Kirchenlexicon," 1st edition.

deprived of their goods and thrown into prison all the Catholic bishops of what till then had been a Catholic realm. England meanwhile crowded the scaffold at Tyburn with martyrs whose sole crime was their fidelity to conscience and ancestral faith. Nor was this intolerant rancor limited to the poor "papists." In 1614 James I. burned two heretics and, says Hallam, "designed to have burned a third heretic, if the humanity of the multitude had not been greater than his own." The same historian thinks that the celebrated Fuller, in his "Church History," written about 1650, where he "speaks with some disapprobation of the sympathy of the people, . . . was the latest Protestant who had tarnished his name by such sentiment."

The general principle of this period—that of the rise and first strength of Protestantism—was laid down by the Calvinist Bullinger in a preface to his "Decades," addressed to the boy-king, Edward the Sixth of England.<sup>1</sup> He endeavors to heighten the mildness which, we are so often assured, was characteristic of this prince, by urging him to put an end to what still remained of the old religion in his dominion. At this time, it is safe to say, three-fourths of the population had received all their knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, and still placed all their comfort for earth, their consolation in the hour of death, and their hopes of heaven, in what they and their forefathers had been taught by the Catholic Church. All this was to be put an end to forcibly by the meek boy-king in the name of the new "Gospel liberty." This was the respect which early Protestantism granted to the personal convictions of Catholics.

At the end of the first period the philosopher Hobbes—who is again in favor in our day because he cannot be suspected of religious faith of any kind, and is thus a fair representative of civil atheism—declares that "true religion consists in obedience to Christ's lieutenants (temporal sovereigns), and in giving God such honor, both in attributes and actions, as they in their several lieutenancies shall ordain."<sup>2</sup>

During all this period, the cruelties said to be exercised by the Spanish Inquisition were retailed everywhere to the English people high and low. But they were not yet cited as samples of intolerance, but simply as Anti-Christian martyrdom of the saints. An example of this is the book entitled "Clamor Sanguinis Martyrum" (The Cry of the Blood of Martyrs), published in London in 1656.

This first period deeply rooted in the minds of the English

---

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Parker Society.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Molesworth.

people the dark and sinister mythology connected with the name of the Inquisition.

## II.

The second period dates from the well-known work of Limborch, the Arminian theologian. His "History of the Inquisition" was published at Amsterdam in 1692, and contained a copy of the judicial sentences of the Inquisition of Toulouse from the year 1307 to the year 1323. The Arminians were Remonstrants against the dominant Calvinists, as these in their first days had been Protestants against Catholics. Like the Independents in England, their position of galling inferiority in the state seems to have opened their minds to certain logical consequences of the Protestant theory, which they were perhaps the first to formulate. If the private judgment of each member of the community is to be for him the only authority decisive of religious truth, then, clearly, all social religion, beyond mere coincidence of opinion and good-fellowship, is out of the question. Not only is the Church invisible, but pastors may not bind consciences—not even by declaration of Bible law or doctrine; for the individual conscience may judge otherwise in its own high court of appeal. Thus the community has no right, in so far as it is religious, to interfere in any way with the profession and propagation of religious beliefs. This broad result, however, was as yet limited to beliefs which were the outcome of private judgment on the text of Scripture, the existence and divine authority of which was not yet questioned.

Constant internal dissensions and fresh divisions were ever urging onward, as to the only solution of ever increasing difficulties, to mutual toleration among the discordant children of the "Reformation." This the dominant sects in the various countries gradually and grudgingly enough conceded. Private opinion alone was not yet set up as the soul's standard of authority, but the Bible interpreted by private judgment. Still, in practice the atheist was admitted to rights that were long denied to the benighted Catholic.

Turk, Jew or Atheist  
May enter here, but not a Papist.

The human reason now needed to justify to itself this refusal to extend toleration to Catholics. In consequence the attack on the Church was embittered by the introduction of a new and much needed element. Heretofore she had been persecuted because she was idolatrous. But the reaction against early Puritanism had brought a large number of the High Church followers of Laud into fuller sympathy with the doctrines of Rome than with those

of Geneva. If toleration of Catholics were added to this, the practical result might be disastrous, especially among a people who had such remnants of "popery" as the English. Hence it was found that the Roman Catholic Church, by her past intolerance, had put herself outside the pale of human sympathy and of justice itself.

True, she had only defended that right to existence as a society which she had enjoyed for centuries, and, so far as her official action went, she had been consistent with principles towards which the Protestant world was now relenting. On the other hand, the Protestant sects, to found upstart societies without a past and often opposed to the will of the people on whom they were forced, had been persecuting in the teeth of their own principles. In such a state of affairs, not the reason, but the imagination and passions of men were to be aroused against Rome.

First, the Church was to be considered the embodiment of a tyrannical principle rendering her dangerous to the liberty and peace of all nations.

Next, the errors and vices and crimes of her children and of the entire ages in which she had lived and ruled were to be thrown upon her, and declared the necessary outcome of this fundamental principle.

Finally, all this was to be thoroughly seasoned with the already existing tales of horror, and as many new ones as the fertile genius of the times could bring forth. There would be a strong antecedent probability in favor of them all.

Accordingly, this was the epoch of revolting and obscene histories, memoirs, relations, etc., of the Inquisition, with its horrors in Spain, in Portugal, in the Indies, in all dark "popish" lands. And the insular, patriotic, un-foreigner-loving English nation hugged itself with delight to hear from Bunyan that, "as for the Giant Pope, though he be yet alive, he is, by reason of age, and also of the many shrewd brushes that he met with in his younger days, grown so crazy and stiff in his joints that he can now do little more than sit in his cave's mouth, grinning at pilgrims as they go by, and biting his nails because he cannot come at them. So I saw that Christian went on his way; yet at the sight of the old man that sat at the mouth of the cave, he could not tell what to think, especially because he spoke to him, though he could not go after him, saying, You will never mend till more of you be burned."

Thus the traditional Protestant conscience became deeply stained for another hundred years, down far into our own century.

In the year 1810, a certain John Joseph Stockdale was responsible for the publication in London of "The History of the Inquisitions; including the Secret Transactions of those Horrific

Tribunals." Its occasion was "the important question, whether the claims of the Roman Catholics to equal political rights with Protestants should or should not be conceded by the Protestant Government of the Protestant United kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland." That Ireland should be reckoned part of a Protestant United kingdom is bad enough. But what, remembering the nature and extent of the penal laws against Catholics, is to be thought of the following summary exhortation?

"The page of history, ancient and modern, even of these our days, now open for our inspection and our improvement, clearly proves that the Roman Catholic religion was, is, and will continue, in principle and in practice, unchanged and unchangeable. [This, of course, is also the Catholic's position; but observe our tolerant historian's conclusion from it.] Oh, Protestants, observe then, as you have done hitherto towards your Catholic brethren, perfect tolerance, perfect charity—but, always bear in mind the fable of the wolves and the sheep. *Remember, never to give up your vigilance. Remember the massacre of St. Bartholomew*; and remember that Popery, having been driven out of Rome, has taken refuge amongst us and is, with unceasing activity, daily gaining proselytes to its cause, especially among our highest and lowest classes. Read the following pages with more than serious—with solemn attention, for Popery is making rapid advances against your religion, and the embryo of the Inquisition (may I never find it necessary to be more explicit on this subject) is actually established in every part of the United kingdom."

### III.

The second or legendary period of the history of the Inquisition has slowly passed into the third and latest in our own time. The unavoidable political necessity has everywhere arisen of including Catholics in the general scheme of toleration. The religion of the "Reformed" nations, resting on no solid basis, has long been made a plaything for the conceit and party spirit of men, and has become tasteless to a generation weary of its assumptions, of its illogical confusions, and of its violence. With the consequent indifference to all religious truth, has come the desire to relegate religion itself to a mental region wherein emotional natures may find a congenial food in harmless sentiment and opinions.

At the beginning of the century, the German philosopher Fichte declared that the man of letters was the true high priest of this age. Later, what is called science has tried to usurp the place of religion. And the state-god has still more lately come to the front in a way that would have delighted the heart of Hobbes. Unluckily, the two essential elements of the religious problem

remain the same: the subjective needs of men living for a short time and never remaining in the same state, and the objective satisfaction they find in the existing system of revelation in the Catholic Church, which is as lasting as the human needs she is designed to remedy. The Church has therefore held her own in spite of the spirit of the age. It is not wonderful, then, that in the renewed attacks upon the Church, since her life and vigorous action are so obnoxious, recourse should again be had to the Inquisition of the past.

Men of letters have accordingly sought weapons in the manipulation of documents, or have furbished up their old arms to glare as terribly as may be under the light of modern historical research. These weapons the so-called men of science have eagerly seized, joining with the secularists or worshipers of the state-god in forming an aggressive and propagandist sect against the Church. Perhaps they deem it necessary, by appealing to the past, to draw away attention from the present, where they are ever more and more gaining the exclusive support and protection of the civil government. But in that past which they so vituperate, the people's faith and the countenance of sovereign power were, for the most part at least, in harmony. Who will dare to say the same of their own system?

Mr. Andrew Dickson White is, or was, the President of Cornell University—a secularist institution of the higher learning on which the great American commonwealth, the State of New York, has bestowed its enormous official patronage. In a lecture on the "Warfare of Science," which he has declaimed through the country, he leads off with "a remark made by one of the most moderate and judicially fair of modern philosophic historians (this from Mr. White probably means the late Prof. Draper—perhaps Buckle), that of all organizations this world has known, the Roman Church has caused most undeserved woe and shed most innocent blood."

This is worthy of the late Mr. Stockdale himself. In fact, the Catholic reader may easily persuade himself from the writings of the modern infidel school that, even where belief in Christ has long since been lost, the phantom of the Pope as Antichrist has not yet vanished.

In face of this sweeping assertion of "one of the most moderate and judicially fair of modern philosophic historians," a few words, from pages immediately following, will aptly illustrate the religious animus and habit of thought of the tolerant state-functionary who cites it. Speaking of Galileo, Mr. White says that the archbishop of Pisa was probably "the vilest enemy of the human race"; and that his "cathedral is more truly consecrated by the remembrance of Galileo's observation of the lamp swinging before its altar

than by all the church services of a thousand years." All which sounds to a Catholic ear as much like coarse and reviling blasphemy as would its exact counterpart: "Calvary would have been more truly consecrated by the remembrance of an astronomer's observation of the eclipse of the sun at the moment of our Lord's death than by all the sufferings of the Son of God for the sins of men."

To escape this, it is not enough to leap alertly back from science to the old Protestant ground and declare the Mass no true sacrifice, but only a "blessed muttering" and idolatrous superstition. This may do for purely religious controversy. But the writer of history is supposed to take into account the faith which was the prime fact of the age in question. He may blaspheme what he knows not; but why should he judge what he ignores?

These later times, indeed, have shown that there is no depth of ignorance to which the average man of science may not sink whenever there is question of theology or philosophy, or of history. And it is not out of the way, since the Inquisition is an example ready to hand, to insist on how far professed men of science appeal to the mass of Protestant traditions and prejudices, when the Church chances to cross their path. Once more, they no longer believe even in a Protestant Christ; but they hate the Catholic Pope and dearly love meat on Friday.

The "International Scientific Series," originated by the late editor of the "American Popular Science Monthly," has had among its contributors such representative men as Prof. Tyndall, Mr. Herbert Spencer, Dr. Maudsley, Prof. Bain, Mr. Romanes, the notorious Paul Bert, besides others scarcely less pronounced on the hostile relations pretended to exist between science and religion. To this question the whole twelfth volume of the series was devoted—a history of the "Conflict between Religion and Science," by John William Draper. Since the death of the author an attempt has been made by his school of science to forget this work.<sup>1</sup> This is in the right direction and might prove successful, were it not that certain tactics of their own are, to use the felicitous phrase of President White, "truly consecrated by the remembrance." From cover to cover there is perhaps not a single sign of any effort made to find out, we do not say the truth, but the elementary conditions of any one among the hundreds of questions raised. It is not pretended that the author was possessed of a miraculous intuition of things. It also seems prudent to believe that his only acquired training fitted him for far other lines of thought. In any case no evidence is ever placed by the author before his reader, enabling the latter to review the judgments set down for his acceptance.

---

<sup>1</sup> See remark in Necrology of English scientific journal, *Nature*, at the time.

Professor Draper was no friend of the Protestant system. He said pertinently enough: "So far as science is concerned, nothing is owed to the Reformation. The Procrustean bed of the Penta-teuch was still before her."<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, no man, perhaps, has shown such skill and industry in diverting the great stream of the Protestant tradition against Rome into infidel channels.

Especially complete is his presentment of the case against the Inquisition. After a great deal of previous violent and rather absurd historical incrimination, he says: "As the thirteenth century is approached, we find unbelief in all directions setting in. . . . To withstand this flood of impiety, the papal government established two institutions: 1. The Inquisition: 2. Auricular confession—the latter as a means of detection, the former as a tribunal for punishment."

This, spoken in the name of science, really is enough to take our breath away. We defy any one to find its match in grotesque absurdity among all the tales recounted of foreigners by the Chinese literary men to their lowest countrymen. But the Professor continues, and neither his mythology nor his unconsciousness of absurdity grows less:

"In general terms the commission of the Inquisition was to extirpate religious dissent by terrorism, and surround heresy with the most horrible associations; this necessarily implied the power of determining what constitutes heresy. The criterion of truth was thus in possession of this tribunal [!] . . . With such savage alacrity did it carry out its object of protecting the interests of religion that between 1481 and 1808 it had punished three hundred and forty thousand persons, and of these nearly thirty-two thousand had been burnt [!]."<sup>2</sup> Here follow in the space of a page—"the air was full of fearful shadows"—"unscrupulous atrocities"—"a frightful statement of its conduct and appalling cruelties"—"this disgrace of Christianity and indeed of the human race." All this is bravely said, but what follows caps the climax. "The necessity of private confession to a priest—auricular confession—gave omnipresence and omniscience to the Inquisition [!!!]. Not a man was safe. . . . His wife and his servants were turned into spies. . . . No accuser was named; but the thumb-screw, the stretching-rope, the boot and wedge, or other enginery of torture, soon supplied that defect, and, innocent or guilty, he accused himself."

The Professor has no misgivings. Not so Mr. Stockdale, who three-quarters of a century ago published the like sounding tales, if, indeed, he is not the chief authority of our man of science. He thus expresses a feeling which for some time doubtless has been

---

<sup>1</sup> Page 215.

<sup>2</sup> Page 207.



stealing over the reader and which seems seriously to have troubled the apprehension of that doughty antagonist of the Church of Rome.

“It may be objected to me, that society could not exist under the control of an authority so tyrannical, nor could so many centuries have elapsed of blind submission to the power of a tribunal which trenched, in so flagrant a manner, upon the rights and interests of mankind.” Hereupon the sapient Mr. Stockdale appeals to “the bloody and atrocious rites of Canaan, Tyre and Carthage,” and then wisely remarks that “the frame of society is of a more stubborn texture than most people imagine.”<sup>1</sup> Clearly, among the few of imagination strong enough to take in the stubborn texture of society’s frame, must henceforth be numbered Professor Draper and President White. The reader will probably prefer, as an honest man, to be set down in the commoner category of “most people.”

What we have cited is a sufficient specimen of the entire case as made out again and again by a recent man of science against the Church. Perhaps the author relied on the pages intervening between his different charges to prevent the cursory reader from discovering that they are so like because they are all ground from the same mill. No mention is ever made of the serious and successful attacks on the veracity of his chief authority, Llorente, who is followed unhesitatingly, and styled simply “the historian of the Inquisition.” To a sober and fair mind, familiar with the authentic extremes of despotism and anarchy, the whole story is at first sight so unparalleled in the history of man as to be in the highest degree improbable, if not impossible. The evident and violent partisanship of the narrators in every period of the controversy does not tend to reassure him. In fact, he fully concurs with the closing sentiment of the scientific professor, though from far different motives. “With unutterable disgust and indignation, we learn [that is, are taught in this mockery of learning] that the papal government realized much money by selling to the rich dispensations to secure them from the Inquisition.”

#### IV.

We have now briefly reviewed the three great periods of this strange but popular controversy. We have seen that, while positive beliefs are changing around it, this odious mythology ever holds its ground. The reason is not far to seek. It offers all the enemies of the Church, whether Protestant or infidel, a popular weapon, the force of which will easily be felt among minds who

---

<sup>1</sup> History, etc., Preface, xi., xii.

could never grasp a theory. With recent infidels, as in the case of Professor Huxley in other questions of religious controversy, the Christianity of Protestantism may be rejected, but never its protest against Rome.

From all this it might be hoped that those non-Catholic students who live beyond the heat of disputation should, on many points of the controversy, side with the Church and with the Inquisitors themselves. This, in fact, is the case. There are obvious reasons why their testimony can never be complete or satisfactory. But such as it is, it points clearly to the fact, on which we have insisted all along, that this odious mythology, to call it by its right name once again, is kept before the public, not for purposes of truth, but as a weapon of partisan hatred against the Church.

Writers of this dispassionate school very commonly acknowledge that the abuses of the Inquisition have been exaggerated for party purposes, were independent of the lawful use of this tribunal, and owing to individual ignorance, imprudence, illusion and false zeal, or even vice.<sup>1</sup>

Thus Ranke, though stating facts incorrectly and misunderstanding their import, depreciates the authority of Llorente and seems to think that the Inquisition in Spain was "only a royal tribunal, furnished with spiritual weapons." This is not a quite exact statement of the case, but it indicates the trend of thought, with which alone we are occupied. In this Leo and Guizot in the main agree. Such authors, and even the ultra-Protestant Neander, naturally attribute much to the necessities of an age formed by centuries of rude warfare and in which the breaking up of religious unity was a subversion of the existing social order.

It is a curious fact that, in the agitation preceding the Vatican Council, the small historical clique which afterwards fell away altogether from the Catholic faith gave forth many doubtful utterances on our controversy. Janus and Huber connected the Inquisition with the doctrine of Papal Infallibility in order to bring odium on the latter. Schulte declared it "a product of the Papal doctrine of faith and morals," which it certainly was not. This insufficiency of the impartial non-Catholic school, and the spitefulness of certain half-Catholic writers trimming between the Church and the world, show what the Catholic student has to expect. He might as well wait for those who reject the authority of the Church to defend the infallibility of the Church's head, as to look for a really final vindication from them of the Church's action when it is used, as in the present case, in virtue of her authority.

---

<sup>1</sup> See, in the excellent essays of a Catholic author too much neglected by his own brethren, Muzzarelli, *Il buon uso della Logica in materia di religione*, t. iv.

It is well, however, to put down a few special reasons why the non-Catholic student of the history of the Inquisition is not likely to reach far below the surface. These are not so much owing to the nature of the question as to the student himself; and in their wide application to other religious controversies, they amount to a general answer to the objections made all along the line against the Church. Armed with this answer, even the Catholic who is uninstructed in the controversy can give a true and trustworthy reply whenever attacked. It is that of the Apostle already cited: "*You blaspheme what you know not.*"

In the first place, the student in question is not at all likely to possess the necessary training in theological terms and canon law to understand the very documentary evidence in his hands. Cardinal Newman's remonstrance, in a somewhat similar case, has its application here, and, as we have said, all along the line of religious controversy.<sup>1</sup>

"Men fancy that, though they have never seen Clement or Ignatius, or any other Father before, they are quite as well qualified to interpret the words *λειτουργία* or *προσφορά*, as if they knew them and their brethren well. How different is their judgment in other matters! Who will not grant, except in the case of theology, that an experienced eye is an important qualification for understanding the distinction of things or detecting their course and tendency? In politics, the sagacious statesman puts his finger on some apparently small or not confessedly great event, promptly declares it to be 'no little matter,' and is believed. Why? Because he is conceived to have scholarship in the language of political history, and to be well read in the world's events. In the same way, the comparative anatomist falls in with a little bone, and confidently declares from it the make, habits, and age of the animal to which it belonged. What should we say to the unscientific hearer who disputed his accuracy and attempted to argue against him? Yet, is not this just the case of sciolists, or less than sciolists in theology?"

Akin to this first defect of knowledge is the strange ignorance, almost sure to be found, of the piety and higher influence of religion in the age whose history is in question. How many historians of the Spanish Inquisition even dreamed of those deep and lasting developments of the spiritual life of the whole people, appearing at that very time round such saints as the Carmelites Teresa and John of the Cross, the Franciscan Peter of Alcantara, the Dominican Lewis Bertrand, the Jesuits Ignatius Loyola, Francis Borgia, and the crowd of missionaries who, in the footsteps of St. Francis Xavier, sealed the faith with their sweat and blood

---

<sup>1</sup> Essay on Development, c. vii., 5.

among all the races of the earth? Yet here was the human family, from kings to people, far more vitally affected than by the Inquisition itself; and with an action still modifying the whole course of civilization. It is not to be wondered at that, with such ignorance, a whole age, and much more the workings of a single ecclesiastical tribunal, should be totally misjudged.

It may be added that so rare is an entire absence of prejudice that the facts themselves, known only in part as they are, will regularly take on a color not their own, but due to the jaundiced eye of the observer. Thus it has been well said of the historian Prescott: "In opposition to all history, he still asserts that St. Dominic was the founder of the Inquisition, or at least maintains that if he was not, in point of fact, he *ought* to have been." Again, "Mr. Prescott detects many gross historical inaccuracies in Llorente unconnected with the Inquisition, in painting which, according to him, he was never at fault!"<sup>1</sup> Besides all this, the essential elements of the ecclesiastical problem will regularly be missed, as was the case with Ranke.

Another of the immediate and most general results reached by the Catholic student, who has carefully gone over this ground, is a well-founded distrust of much pretentious historical research.

One of the very latest writers on the early Inquisition in the south of France, in a documentary work of more than five hundred pages, starts off abruptly from the Council of Toulouse in the year 1229.<sup>2</sup> This was the time when a permanent tribunal was first established, but it was also the time when the work was already leaving the Church's hands. During the seventy preceding years measures had been devised in fifty-two councils, of which two were general, for stemming the evils of the times. The official proceedings of these councils, with the contemporary writings of preachers, pontifical legates, theologians, bishops, Popes, and chroniclers, as well as of the revolutionary heretics themselves, are perfectly accessible to the conscientious historian. But this new trumpeter in the name of modern science against the fair fame of the Church has not even taken the trouble of making himself acquainted with these documents. This is undoubtedly more convenient, but it can scarcely be called reasonable. It is certainly characteristic of a strange kind of science.

Catholic history, therefore, in a question so closely bound up with religion, can, at best, hope to gain from non-Catholic students some corroborative testimony to the truth, with an occasional rectification of facts and frequent clever political views. But with those engaged in direct religious controversy things will be evidently at the worst. Inquisition, early or late, Episcopal or Do-

<sup>1</sup> Abp. Spalding's *Miscellanies*, xi.

<sup>2</sup> Molinier.

minican, Roman or Spanish, papal or royal, will be to them the same as one. And they will deridingly point to their heap of undigested facts, partially stated, exaggerated, added to, taken from, ridiculously misinterpreted, confused, falsified, and ask, Where is the Holy Ghost?

President White may appear in this rôle, so unworthy of his position. Enlarging on the "idea" "that the Pope, as *pope*, had never condemned the doctrines of Kopernik and Galileo, . . . that they were condemned by the cardinals of the Inquisition and Index" (which was the simple fact), he declares: "Nothing can show the desperation of the retreating party better than jugglery like this."<sup>1</sup>

Yet treatises on the condemnation of theological propositions, written before Galileo's own day, might have told Mr. White when the power of the Church in defining matters of faith is used, and when it is not. How, too, can he charge "Monsignor" Marini with "the pious fraud of suppressing documents or interpolating pretended facts,"<sup>2</sup> when he himself, if his words have any meaning, declares loudly that the decision in the case was "made by the Pope and the Church," and yet omits to say, what surely he was bound to know before writing on such a subject, that not one of the conditions necessary for a definition of Catholic faith was present? Moreover, he pronounces, *ex cathedra*: "The Inquisition itself, backed by the greatest theologian of the time, Bellarmine, took the same view." Yet Bellarmine himself, years before the famous trial, in the second chapter of his fourth book on the Roman Pontiff, had given the answer to so gratuitous an assertion, which, besides, his published correspondence on the occasion directly refutes.

After this, no surprise need be felt at the absence of all mention of the most essential facts in the case—such as the strain on the minds and hearts of men in authority during those troublous times, when revolutionary heresy was ever impending from the North, or Galileo's own intimacy with the treacherous Fra Paolo Sarpi, or the inopportuneness, lack of judgment, and insufficiency of his arguments. Perhaps, however, this may be the result of President White's earnest desire not to imitate Monsignor Marini, and thus, by telling the truth, "to blacken the memory of Galileo and save the reputation of the Church."<sup>3</sup> It seems, also, to have been more convenient to leave out of sight the fact that Galileo retained his faith, even after the condemnation of his astronomy, and does not seem to have dreamed of the consequences against the Church's teaching which his admirer so indiscreetly undertakes to draw.

---

<sup>1</sup> Page 60.

<sup>2</sup> Page 52, note, and elsewhere.

<sup>3</sup> Page 53.

But it is time that we should finish with these hateful specimens of a mythology, carried on with unheard-of violence and disregard of all truth and honesty, out of pure partisan hatred of the Church. It is again President White who, in his own words, shall give a final specimen of the ignorance and prejudice and dull blundering confusion of ideas, mixing what is acknowledged to be human with what is claimed to be divine, which characterizes the whole controversy. The extravagant vulgarity of the language is also characteristic in its way. "It is most suggestive," to Mr. White, "to see in this crisis of the Church, on the eve of the greatest errors in Church policy the world has known, in all the efforts and deliberations of these consecrated leaders of the Church, at the tomb of the prince of the Apostles, no more sign of the guidance or presence of the Holy Spirit than in a caucus of New York politicians."<sup>1</sup> There is nothing new in all this. For thousands of years similar farragos have been foisted on Catholics, regardless of all their protests, by those who reproach the Church, "*while they say to her, day by day: Where is thy God?*"<sup>2</sup>

We have thus attempted a general review of the different aspects, from the worst to the best, of the historical controversy concerning the Inquisition. This, from the "Reformation" down, has been one of the most popular weapons of attack against the Church, and assuredly the horrors of its mythology are well adapted to imprint themselves on the popular imagination and resist all refutation of reason. It is a comfort to find that frank and candid study leads to truth, even along this unpromising path. By this way came to the very door of the Catholic Church Hurter, in his study of the history of Innocent the Third—the great Pope on whom, whether for odium or for love, rests the responsibility of the early Inquisition.

---

<sup>1</sup> Page 44.

<sup>2</sup> Psalm xli. 11.