THE INQUISITION.

History of the Inquisition, in every Country where its Tribunals have been established, from the Twelfth Century to the Present Time. By William Harris Rule, D.D., London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1868. 8vo. pp. 464.

History of the Inquisition, from its Establishment in the Twelfth Century to its Extinction in the Nineteenth. By William Harris Rule, D.D. 2 vols., 8vo., pp. 367, 360. London, Hamilton Adams & Co., 1874.

THE Inquisition! Is it well to touch the subject? Is it not a subject better left alone, to die out with the dead past to which it belongs? No. So long as history is written and history is read, there remains the necessity of placing this matter right on the record, inasmuch as there will not be wanting those ready to place it wrong.

There is no subject which Catholics seek to avoid. Our doctrines, our principles, are distinct and explicit. That individuals have, at all times, in the long period covered by the history of the Church, been guided by the laws of absolute justice towards their fellow-men is not pretended; and the error, whether springing from an evil heart or misguided reason, can be honestly condemned.

Least of all need Catholics avoid the question of religious coercion, take what form it will. Every impartial mind must admit that there has been on the part of the Catholics, a bold, frank, manly course, doing openly what they did, and assuming the responsibility of their acts; while on the part of their enemies, there has been too often hypocrisy, tergiversation, underhand work, and cowardice. Take even, as an example, the Tudor sisters. In Mary there is a Catholic queen, who, on attempting to ascend the throne of her father and brother, finds a nest of conspirators and traitors arrayed to deprive her of her rights. The people rallied to her; the traitors were in her hands. Every one of them had forfeited his head; in any other reign every head had fallen. Mary pardoned their offence against herself; but for their offence against religion, she left them to be dealt with by the laws then in force. Her craftier sister sought to crush the still powerful Catholic body in England, a body embracing the masses of the people. To punish priest or noble, lady or scholar, for believing or praying as their ancestors had done for centuries, was rather a difficult point. Call it heresy she could not, so she assumed a hypocritical liberality. Catholics were not to be punished for their religion, but for high treason; and being a priest, saying mass, corresponding with Rome,

having documents issued at Rome, were made high treason in the priest; and in the people it was high treason to hear mass, go to confession, have Catholic books or articles of devotion; in a word, all that St. Augustine did in introducing Christianity into Saxon England, became high treason. On the scaffold, ministers took care to din into the ears of Catholic victims that they were not put to death for their religion, but for high treason; though, at the same time, life was offered at the price of apostasy.

Now let fair men answer, which sister's reign shows straightforward honesty, and which acted the lie. Catholics have not resorted to shams.

The question of religious coercion on the part of governments, leads back to the question as to the real object and scope of government.

Under the Roman empire, the emperor was not only head of the State, but as Pontifex Maximus head of the religion of the State; in their mythology he was a sort of demi-god, passing in due time by an apotheosis among the greater gods. With Constantine, the first Christian emperor, a new order began. In the new Christian world, the emperor was head of the State, but he was not pontiff, nor bishop, nor priest, nor deacon; he was simply a layman; religion for him had no greater sacrament, no holier rite, than she imparted to the humblest beggar; he was a member of the Church, not its maker or ruler.

But had the head of the State, as such, no duties in regard to religion? Was government instituted solely to regulate man as an animal? Did there lie upon the prince no responsibility for the salvation of his people? The example of the Jewish kings and sound reason established the principle, that the prince was responsible for the spiritual as well as the temporal well-being of his people, as much bound to guard their souls against a moral pestilence of evil doctrine, as to guard their bodies against an epidemic or plague.[1] The duty of the parent in his family was, on a larger scale, that of government.

In modern days the theory is advanced, though by no means absolutely carried out in practice, that government has nothing to do with the matter of the people's salvation; and that, so far from helping them heavenward, it may, if it will benefit trade, or the

[1] "The emperor, in virtue of being the protector and secular arm of the Church, now assumes the title of 'Episcopus ad extra,' and considers himself absolutely bound to punish by exile and other penalties, those heretics who should disturb the peace of the Church." Hefele, Life of Cardinal Ximenes, p. 277. Rule, in the first work at the head of our article, admits the same: "Constantine, *as a matter of course*, discouraged freedom of utterance where such freedom seemed inexpedient, and denied liberty of worship to idolaters and heretics. His edicts or constitutions became part of the civil law of Christian Europe." The second edition has substantially the same statement.

treasury, or officeholders, help them a little on the way to destruction. This, however, is an outgrowth of modern indifferentism in religion, as well as mistrust of governments. It was not the doctrine which prevailed during the greater portion of the period from the accession of Constantine to our century. During the whole of this period, government was regarded as responsible for the faith of the people.

Protestantism accepted this part of the common law of Europe; and, wherever it got power, compelled the people to renounce Catholicity, its creed, worship, religious orders, devotions, and to embrace the new forms by law established. Nowhere was it left to the choice of the individual or congregation to adhere to the old or embrace the new; and that new creed once embraced, no liberty was given to make further changes.

Where there is an infallible criterion of divine truth, what it condemns as error must be such. Yet Protestantism, in all its various forms, scouted the very idea of any such infallibility. It was and is still the boast of each Protestant sect that it is fallible, and therefore in its teaching possibly if not probably fallacious.[1] It consequently never could logically condemn anything as error, while it claimed that it was not itself undoubtedly free from error. And to punish dissent from its doctrines was contrary to all reason.

In the countries where Protestantism was free from dynastic influence, and a majority of the people, in numbers or energy, formed a new creed, as in Switzerland, Holland, and New England, the very idea of liberty and toleration was scouted. Servetus died at Geneva, not so much for his anti-Trinitarian doctrines, for Calvin himself avoids the question of the Trinity, but for gainsaying this power. Grotius at Lowenstein could scarcely have regarded his persecutors as champions of civil and religious liberty. And in that New England which anathematized a clergyman for feebly expressing a doubt whether Catholics might not be saved, the writer's earliest American ancestor, Nicholas Upshall, whom Longfellow depicts so estimably in his New England Tragedies, died—though the poet says it not—in prison for the crime of advising that the state should be tolerant.[2] It was then part of the common law of Europe, that the State should by its machinery preserve the people from religious error. Now, how was this to be done? The Church

[1] *Falsum*, after all, is only the supine of *fallo*.

[2] Protestantism has nearly abandoned religious coercion. Mr. Rule, with the fearful list of English atrocities against the English and Irish Catholics, with the excesses in Scotland, the oppression of the patriotic Catholic Netherlanders, the extermination of the heroic Dalecarlians, and the massacre of Glencoe, before him, candidly exclaims (1st edition, p. 101) when condemning Catholics: "I leave my readers to consider whether this punishment of an error of the understanding was consistent or not with the doctrine of the Gospel."

pronounced its decision as to the doctrine; the State fixed and inflicted the punishment. It remained then either to have courts for such cases, with recognized proceedings, judicial forms, appeals, and means to secure justice; or to leave such cases to the heated public opinion of the moment, the caprice of mob or legislator. No sane man will pretend that the former is not the proper course to attain the ends of justice. If then the charge is made: "No church but that of Rome ever had an Inquisition," it simply asserts that no other instituted tribunals to secure the due administration of justice, as the laws were then understood.

To secure justice, the laws in regard to religion must be precise, notorious, and clear; the court must be impartial and free, and its forms and legal proceedings recognized and established.

In the first matter, the Catholic religion, not confined to one state or country, was in regard to her doctrines fixed beyond state control; but Protestant States and governments, reviving the pagan idea of combining in the person of the prince the civil and pontifical powers, made and unmade religions, creeds, worships, and tenets at their option; and in consequence their laws were as uncertain and perplexing as they well could be. In Catholic States they were at least precise, notorious, and clear.

The penal laws against Catholics and even against fellow-Protestants passed in England and her colonies, in Scotland, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, and Germany have never been collected; such as have been brought together at times make a revolting picture, the study of which would change some popular ideas. Nevertheless, such a study is necessary to an impartial appreciation of the history of religious coercion. And yet, in these states Catholics were not men introducing new ideas, assailing existing institutions, or destroying aught; they were simply men who asked to be allowed to retain the faith and practices of their fathers from the very introduction of Christianity.

The ordinary courts were not even trusted in many cases with the proceedings against Catholics. Lawyers and judges are especially attached to precedents and strict construction. In England the government often feared to allow Catholics to appear before judge and jury, and resorted to that last device of tyrants, special tribunals, courts-martial, and the like.

Turn now to the Catholic States. The doctrines of the Catholic Church were known and distinct. The first labors of the printing press on its invention were to disseminate, in the language of the Church and in the vernacular, the Scriptures and works explaining Catholic doctrine. While in the Protestant States all was uncertainty and doubt, and a man in good faith might often be far removed from the State creed when he tried to approach it more

nearly; there was no doubt in Catholic States as to the faith. The laws of the State were, therefore, easily understood. What was condemned was apparent to the most unlearned.

Instead of packed juries, star chambers, courts-martial, there was a court of competent judges,—the Inquisition.

The question then comes, What was the Inquisition, when was it established, in what countries did it exist, and what has been its course?

A common assertion often met with, and specially refuted by the late illustrious Lacordaire, ascribes the Inquisition to St. Dominic. Rule admits that the charge is untenable. "We have also to note and to remember that the Inquisition was not the work of Theodosius, or Innocent, or Dominic, or the College of Cardinals; but that it grew up spontaneously." The penal laws of Constantine and his successors had with little variation been adopted by the governments of the states of renewed Europe, and the machinery for enforcing them was adapted to meet the circumstances of different countries. The Arian emperors, Constantius and Valens, not only used these laws to harass the Catholics, but were the first Christian princes to punish with death those who differed from them in religion. The first exercise by Catholics of capital punishment for heresy was at Treves in 385, and it excited such deep indignation that many bishops, like St. Martin of Tours, refused all fellowship with those who had so far forgotten the mild genius of Christianity as to take part in the proceeding.

As time went on, however, the general opinion sustained the right of civilized government to inflict capital punishment in cases of heresy.

For a long time there was little occasion for the enforcement of the laws or the infliction of penalties.

In process of time new heresies sprang up, and these differed from the earlier Eastern heresies in their whole character. Those of the East were intellectual, turning on abstract doctrines. The new heresies of the West embraced social and political ideas, and were rather civil outbreaks with religious pretexts, than doctrinal theories leading to natural results in the body politic.

Church and State alike assailed by Albigenses, Lollards, Waldenses, Hussites, made common cause against them; and in the strife that ensued it is not always easy, or possible even, to draw the line between the civil and ecclesiastical orders in their action. This state of things has continued to the present time.

The Albigenses in Gascony first led to new enactments and the institution of new proceedings. These heretics not only boldly proclaimed their errors, but made the overthrow of Catholicity by violence a principle. They attacked the Catholics, destroying churches,

shrines, and priests, and practicing great cruelties; "sparing," according to the recital in a decree of the Third Lateran Council, in 1179, "neither churches, widows, nor orphans." This council passed severe decrees, and that of Verona directed bishops to appoint three or four persons to denounce heretics, who were then to be summoned before the bishop's tribunal. In 1206 Peter de Castelnau and other Cistercians were sent to the south of France as apostolic missionaries and legates, to endeavor to regain to the faith those who had been led away by the Albigensian preachers. These Cistercians were joined by zealous Spaniards, among the rest by Domingo Guzman. This last, better known as St. Dominic, the founder of the order of Friars-Preachers, or Dominicans, is often regarded as the first Grand Inquisitor, but without the slightest foundation. His order, however, founded especially to check by sound preaching the further progress of error, extended from Spain to Southern France, and thus placed at the disposal of bishops, zealous, capable men suited for the work of reclaiming the erring. As the Inquisition took form, the Dominicans became identified with it, so that Innocent IV. in 1248 invested them with as full inquisitorial powers as bishops possessed.

The first real Inquisition was instituted by the Council of Toulouse in 1229. By Chapters I. and II., archbishops and bishops in their dioceses and exempt abbots in their districts were to appoint in all parishes a priest and several laymen of good repute, and to bind them by oath zealously and faithfully to search for the heretics in their districts, and to report them, as well as their abettors, to the bishop, the lord of the district, or their representatives. The third chapter calls on secular lords to find out the heretics and destroy their hiding-places. In this we see the result of a civil war just concluded, in which those who were rebels to the Church were also rebels to the State; and as their long opposition to the State had been in a measure the work of discontented nobles, provision was made to prevent a repetition. Chapter IV. threatened with a loss of their dominions those who harbored heretics knowingly. Chapter V. punished more lightly those who by negligence allowed them to find refuge in their dominions. Chapter VI. ordered every house to be razed in which a heretic was found. Chapter VII. punished severely negligent officials. Chapter VIII. protected the innocent or falsely accused. Chapters X. and XI. regulated those who returned to the faith. Chapter XII. prescribed an oath of fidelity and a promise to denounce heretics. Chapter XIII. made those neglecting to receive communion three times a year, suspected of heresy. The use of the Scriptures by the preachers of heresy in misleading the people led to Chapter XIV., by the provisions of which no layman was to have a Bible, or any

portion of the same except the Psalms, nor any other books save the Breviary and the Office of the Blessed Virgin."

In all these proceedings we see the action of local feeling under the exasperation of falsehood, violence, and rapine; but the fears of similar results in other kingdoms gave the course adopted at Toulouse a widespread influence. This council is, therefore, regarded as instituting the first real Inquisition, although it still left the bishops invested with judicial power. Inquisitors, with similar powers to those created by the Council of Toulouse, were appointed by Pope Gregory IX. in Italy in 1231, and in Germany by Frederic II. in 1239.

It will be necessary to see how far the stringent provisions of the Council of Toulouse were carried out. Rule, bigoted, violent, and prejudiced as he is, says: "The Inquisition as a permanent court was, at the worst of times, less conspicuous in France than in some other countries." . . . "Priests allowed Frenchmen, who fled from their dwellings for fear of the Inquisition, to take refuge in the churches, where by right of asylum they were safe." As established in Spain at this time, the action of the Inquisition seems to have been no less tempered with mercy. There are, even in Rule, no horrors to relate of heretics suffering at the hands of the Inquisitors. But while France had its political and social institutions racked by the violence of its civil and religious heretics, Spain was suffering from the immense power acquired by the Jews. That people had for centuries been a source of uneasiness to the Christians. Men like Rule, who are guided by blind passion and prejudice, will say, "they were the most industrious, and therefore the most wealthy people in those kingdoms;" "the artificers and merchants by whose means chiefly the prosperity and intelligence(!) of Spain were maintained;" but the history of that people wherever it has been scattered shows that these terms need explanation. Industrious as increasers of national wealth by agriculture or mechanical arts, the Jews seldom are; shrewd merchants, money lenders, inventors, and speculators in securities for money, they are and have been. Without labor they succeed in various lands in accumulating a wonderful proportion of the national wealth compared to their numbers; and on this point our own country is furnishing a striking example. The impoverishment of the many for the benefit of the few, whether that few be Jew or Christian, has caused and will cause popular hatred, and finally government action. The Gothic kings of Spain deprived Jews of many civil rights enjoyed by Christians, a system pursued till recently by Protestant England, which has only within a very few years opened to the Jews her colleges and legislative halls. The severe laws of the Gothic kings led to a conspiracy on the part of the Jews to bring in the Saracens. Its defeat saved

Spain, but deepened the distrust entertained towards the Jews, who, after the overthrow of the Gothic monarchy, sided warmly with the new Saracen rulers of Spain.

The decline of the Moslem power brought up again the Jewish question. On the one hand efforts were made by zealous preachers to win them to Christ; on the other, popular hatred led to mobs and riots against the usurers who drained the very life of the people. The cases before the Inquisition during this period were of Jews who relapsed into Judaism, or whose Christianity was merely a mask. Of these, by all accounts, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, there were many, some of these Hebrews actually carrying their hypocrisy so far as to be admitted into the ranks of the clergy.[1] The feeling of horror in a Catholic community, to find that the holiest rites of the New Law had been a mockery performed by Jews whose hearts were filled with hatred of Christ, would naturally lead to punishment that knew no mercy. Yet, even with this, the severities charged on this earlier Inquisition in Spain are not great. To atone for this historical deficiency Llorente was sadly at a loss; but one arithmetical rule he had studied thoroughly, and that was multiplication. The author, whose work has led to these remarks, deserves as well the name of Mathematical Rule, for he adopts the monstrous assertions of the Spanish author. "Llorente," says he, "estimates the number of Jews who perished under the fury of mobs in the year 1391 at upwards of one hundred thousand."[2] The massacres of history pale before this unheard-of slaughter, and yet for events occurring at the very entrance of the century that witnessed the invention of printing we might expect some regard for probability, if not for truth. There is not a particle of contemporaneous evidence of any such slaughter of the Jews in Spain.

Nor is the Inquisition of this period in Portugal arraigned. Italy, even Italy of the popes, furnishes little matter for denunciation. To such as Rule, a relapsing Jew, Pagan, or Saracen would be one of "Our Lord's martyrs," had he but died at the hands of the Inquisition; for, with a generosity without restraint, he requires no other mark of conversion. What must have been the state of the case when of Italy he writes: "It is to be regretted that we have no means of enlivening and hallowing the present sketch by recit-

[1] Borrow, Bible in Spain, ch. xi. Grace Aguilar in many of her writings. Rule apparently has too lax ideas to condemn this. He censures John Philibert (2d ed., vol. 1, p. 50) for hesitating to swear to his disbelief in Albigensian doctrines, in which he really believed. "His conscience, more scrupulous than enlightened, could not submit to a judicial abjuration." If this means anything, it means that in Dr. Rule's opinion a man with an enlightened conscience may swear to a falsehood.

[2] Second ed., vol. 1, p. 122. It is unwise in a follower of Wesley to make it a crime in a clergyman to excite a mob to violence against religious opponents. Mr. Rule should not have thus condemned John Wesley for his part in the Lord George Gordon riots.

ing any triumphs of our Lord's martyrs, *for some such there must have been.*" He can gather but a few cases, and then admits: "The Inquisition in Italy was nearly dormant from the time of its last effort in Piedmont (1307) until the reign of Pope Calixtus III." (1458).[1] Then a new movement was made against the Waldenses.

Of this earlier Inquisition, then, after the excitement of the time and place where it arose, there is nothing to distinguish its operations from those of the laws of Constantine, except the form of tribunal and the introduction of a system of detectives. Had there been nothing more to be charged to the Inquisition than this, we should hear little denunciation of it. In all the manifold writings of the early reformers of the sixteenth century, and the religious organizations they established, not one took the ground that the Church had not the right to condemn error, and to hand over the obstinate and impenitent to the secular arm for punishment, even to the extent of taking life. Not one denounced the use of torture in such cases. Nor do those who attack this earlier Inquisition pretend that the findings of the court were not sustained by evidence; indeed, they admit that the doctrines charged were really entertained.

Yet in all countries where the Inquisition has existed, except in Spain and Portugal, it has existed as thus organized.

Protestantism accepted it really though not in name. Calvin, and Beza, and Coligny stimulated the killing on the spot and mutilation of the Catholic clergy and religious, waiving all trial; and in the writings of the Reformers, and their early disciples, there is no condemnation of the constantly occurring murders of Catholic priests and religious at the altar and elsewhere, or of the pillage and destruction of Catholic altars and shrines. The disciples of the Reformers learned from them, and believed that they had an absolute right to do these things. England had its pursuivants, its priest-takers, its mock priests as detectives, its torture-chambers, and its rack; and, when even penal laws seemed too lax, organized special tribunals to execute by martial law. Not a principle or practice connected with the Inquisition lacks Protestant sanction.

Of course, in our times, when all this is condemned, there is the constant endeavor to forget all that had ever been done in the name of the Reformation, to make this dark picture disappear beneath some convenient veil; while the scenes in which they can sympathize with the sufferers, or denounce the actors, receive new and glaring colors. But this will not do. The thing is either right or wrong. Government has power to coerce in religion, or it has not. If New Hampshire may justly punish the obstinate Catholic by denying to him the right to hold office, as New York and other States have

[1] Vol. 2, p. 161.

done, she then revives the Inquisition in principle. New Jersey and Ohio may justly by law enact that all Catholics, in their penal or eleemosynary institutions, must be deprived of the opportunity of attending their own worship, being instructed in their own religious doctrines, and receiving the ordinances of their Church; or if these States have not in reality the right to do this, then they revive the Inquisition in principle without any logical ground to base it upon. Virginia in the last century punished Catholics with a host of penalties, double taxes, privation of the elective franchise, and of the right to hold office, and even of competency as witnesses. The right to inflict these punishments involves the right to go further, and if Virginia could impose these, she could add imprisonment and death. Massachusetts, in the case of the Quakers, so held and so acted. The followers of Fox were arrested, put to torture, and executed. New York condemned any priest to imprisonment for life, and if he escaped and were retaken, to death. Our own land, therefore, affords evidence of the Protestant claim that the civil power has jurisdiction in matters of religion, may have trial of such kind as seems fit, may use torture, may punish with loss of civil rights, imprisonment, or death.

In Spain and Portugal, however, the Inquisition as revived in the time of Ferdinand and Isabella took, it will be said, a new and terrible form, and while acting on the principles and in the modes sanctioned by the laws of the past thousand years and by the actual practice in Protestant countries, carried out its sentences with a ferocity and to an extent unparalleled.

What, then, was the Spanish Inquisition, and what was its influence on the Inquisition as already existing in other countries? Are the statistics given of its victims historic or merely polemical, cooked up for the special purpose of making a sensation in order to attain certain objects? With an investigation of these points we will close.

Ferdinand and Isabella, while at Seville, in 1477–8, were solicited by Philip de Barberis, Inquisitor of Sicily, Alonzo de Ojeda, prior of San Pablo, in Seville, and Diego de Merlo, a magistrate, to reestablish a tribunal for the trial of those charged with heresy, or relapse into Mohammedanism or Judaism. On the 1st of November, 1478, Pope Sixtus IV. authorized the sovereigns to establish a tribunal for searching out and punishing heretics, which was to consist of two or three dignitaries of the Church, who might be either seculars or regulars, according to the wish of the sovereigns, provided the said dignitaries were at least forty years of age, of pure morals, bachelors of theology, or doctors of canon law. This preliminary Bull was issued on a very imperfect representation of the royal intentions, and evidently anticipated only a revival of

the tribunals already known. When the whole plan of the proposed tribunal was made known, the Pope condemned it as contrary to the decrees of the holy Fathers and the general practice of the Church.

Here, then, came a point of divergence. Sixtus approved an inquisition as contemplated, but censured the Spanish Inquisition when it took its distinct form, as something at variance with the common law of the Church. The Spanish Inquisition therefore stands apart. As to its character, Catholics as well as Protestants are divided. Among Catholics, some incline to regard it as exclusively a political institution. Of this school is Hefele, the author of an admirable life of Cardinal Ximenes, and a favorite with the Protestants from his attitude in the Vatican Council. In support of his view that it was a political institution, preserved and encouraged by kings and queens, for no other object than to advance the interests of the State, he cites the authority of the philosophic Count de Maistre, and of the Protestants Ranke and Guizot. But as Canon Dalton observes, this view is not held by Spanish writers, and seems not sustainable by facts. "That the Spanish Inquisition was not merely a political institution, but ecclesiastical also, seems to be a general opinion of most Spanish writers." Balmes (ch. xxxvi) asserts that it would be wrong in this affair to attribute all to the policy of royalty; the contemporary historical writers draw no such distinction; the later ones, with Lafuente, the general historian of Spain, on the very ground of a total want of historic support, reject the idea that the "Catholic sovereigns in re-establishing the Inquisition were influenced by political considerations, and intended to harmonize religious unity with political unity."

That it was an institution peculiar to Spain all admit; that it was established under the express censure of a pope; that it assumed almost absolute independence of Rome, prevented appeals, disregarded counsel, advice, exhortation, and even threats, is no less true. For the action of this tribunal the popes cannot be responsible, as they stand on record the earliest to protest against its excessive severity. Prescott, who blindly follows Llorente, when as an historical scholar he must have laughed in his sleeve at the bare idea of accepting such a man as authority, is very violent in his denunciation of this Inquisition, yet admits that in principle it was sustained by the theories of the time. But it was too much to be explicit. He involves it thus: "However mischievous the operations of the Inquisition may have been in Spain, its establishment in point of principle was not worse than many other measures which have passed with far less censure, though in a much more advanced and civilized age." (*History of Ferdinand and Isabella*, chap. xvi.)

The writer who has treated most fully of the Spanish Inquisition

was a Spanish priest, by name Juan Antonio Llorente, who was unfaithful to his duties alike as a patriot and a priest. Just before the close of the existence of the celebrated tribunal he was for a few years connected with it, and this gave weight to his pretended researches and documents as to its history. One fact stamps his work as a romance, and leaves Prescott, who wrote generally on transcripts of original documents from the Spanish archives, without the paltriest excuse for following such a man. This one fact is the statement made by Llorente himself, "that he burnt nearly all the official reports connected with the Inquisition, with the exception of those that related to the history of some of the most remarkable persons." (Edition 1818, p. 145.) Now, all who have made the slightest inquiry know that the Spanish archives are extremely rich, and that for a court which existed between three and four centuries the documents would be such that an ordinary lifetime would not suffice to go through them. The archives at Seville, relating to the colonies, are, for the earliest period, so ample that the late Buckingham Smith, a gentleman who spent years among them, and furnished Prescott himself with valuable material, told the writer, hopelessly, that the archives bearing on America seem inexhaustible, although scholars have been laboring among them for years. Prescott knew full well that Llorente could not have gone through the archives of the Inquisition in the most cursory manner in the time he devoted to the preparation of his work.

He had little or no documentary evidence. Hence his scheme to avoid being called upon to produce his authorities. Of all shallow and improbable stories commend us to this Llorente trick. Our late minister at Berlin issued, not long since, a volume of his *History of the United States.* It was received with violent opposition from some descendants of men of the Revolutionary era, who deemed their ancestors unjustly treated. Now, had Mr. Bancroft said in reply: "I wrote from documents in my hands of the highest authenticity, and followed them implicitly; nearly all these I have now burnt"—what a storm of ridicule would have greeted him! Did it ever enter into the head of Prescott, or Bancroft, or Motley, or any other historian, to destroy the documents he uses? On the contrary, they are often printed at length, sometimes reproduced in fac simile, to enable the reader to judge for himself of the handwriting, or of the real reading of the original.

In courts of law, one party may call on his antagonist to produce some paper in his hands, and on his neglect to do so, may prove by other testimony, what the contents of the paper were; but he would not be allowed to go on the stand to prove the contents of a paper which he himself had deliberately destroyed.

Certainly then Llorente is no authority. His book stands self-

condemned, a mere sensational work, sure of a market, and intended to reap the benefit of that market.

That Prescott used the book as authority, cites it page after page as an authentic work, is the greatest stigma on his character as an historian. He knew that the book was unworthy of his confidence.[1]

Of this Spanish Inquisition, the first objects were the Jews. The severities which caused the remonstrance of the Pope, caused opposition in Spain. If we believe Llorente, Prescott, Rule, and writers of that stamp, the Jews were always the best citizens and most devoted patriots in all countries, and especially in Spain at this time. But contemporary Spanish writers give us a different account, and represent the Jews at this period as guilty of the most terrible crimes; they acquired such strength and boldness as to attempt, in 1485, to capture Toledo, and massacre the Christians. How decide between contemporary writers, and men writing three centuries later, full of a certain philosophy of history? In our mind's eye there rises a school in 2100, pathetically describing the holy death of Joseph and Hiram Smith, and the fierce and sanguinary Protestant inquisitors of Illinois, calumniating, persecuting, and murdering the blameless saints. How grandly will the Llorente of that day push aside contemporary testimony as prejudiced!

We must believe that there was some foundation for the charges. There were good and upright men in Spain and in the Spanish government, who would have lent themselves as tools to no hypocritical massacre. The difficulty was that the whole body of the Jews was made to suffer for the misdeeds of individuals, not only in the prosecutions under the Inquisition, but in the final terrible blow, which drove all the children of Israel from Spain, exiles even from a land of exile. But even among us the Jews as a body

[1] For example, Llorente asserts that in 1481, the Inquisition of Seville ordered no less than 2000 to be burned in the two dioceses of Seville and Cadiz. Prescott adopts the statement, yet admits in a note that Marineo, a contemporary author, diffuses the 2000 over several years. Llorente cites Mariana, yet Prescott was familiar with Mariana, and knew that this is given by Mariana as the whole number burned under Torquemada, not in two dioceses, but in the two kingdoms of Castile and Arragon. Pulgar also (edition, 1787, p. 137) makes it the number burned at different times, and in certain cities and towns. Most of Llorente's general estimates are based on data similarly distorted, and in this way he calculates those burned at the stake by Torquemada at 10,220, exclusive of Jews, when contemporary accounts make only 2000 in all. Rule, as a matter of course, follows Llorente, and cites Mariana as though the text of Mariana supported this perversion of truth. "What shall we say of a sham that can only hope to be kept alive by perverting the known truth?" (Rule, as amended by us.) Yet all Rule's figures for Spain are drawn from Llorente, and he adheres to them as he says, "notwithstanding the customary charges of exaggeration and untruth, laid against him by modern admirers and apologists of the Holy Office." It is an index of this man's mind, that no one can question the authority of his favorite author without becoming an admirer and apologist of all the acts of the Spanish Inquisition.

suffer for the faults of evil individuals. General Grant for the irregularities of a few Jews, expelled all from his lines. Insurance offices make Jew risks a class which they shrink from taking. Yet these countrymen of the Blessed Virgin number many, whose probity, generosity, and sincerity entitle them to friendship and esteem.

The Jews in Spain suffered terribly. This forced exile, the loss on all that they had to sell, their hardships as they sought a new home, were such as to deserve the sympathy of all. Pope Alexander VI., Spaniard though he was, and not one whose name receives much honor in history, deserves credit for his reception of such of these poor fugitives as reached his States.

Ferreras, a careful Spanish historian, from statistics in the several provinces, makes the number exiled one hundred thousand, fewer than England annually drives of Catholics out of Ireland.

Llorente, however, says 800,000, citing Mariana, who mentions it simply as an exaggeration. Rule follows his leader without examination.[1]

Those Jews who remained in Spain did so by renouncing the Synagogue, and embracing Christianity. There would be but little reality in such wholesale conversions. The law which drove men to this hypocrisy, then set to work to discover and punish it. Among themselves they were still Jews, and in secret the prayers and customs of the Jews were observed. This backsliding, this relapse brought them within the jurisdiction of the Inquisition. Many acts, harmless in themselves, were regarded as signs of relapse and a denial of Christ.

After the revolts of the Alpujarras, the Moors too were exiled as a body, in 1572, and only such remained as chose to renounce Mohammed. Their conformity was generally only external, and frequent relapses into Islam made many cases for the Inquisition. It was established at Grenada by Diego de Deza, Grand Inquisitor after Torquemada, in order to prevent the relapsing of the Moriscos. The proceedings under it were, however, very lenient, and successive monarchs made every effort to render the Moors really Christians, but they were never thoroughly converted, and revolted repeatedly. This led to their final expulsion in 1609.

Rule is at a loss in this matter of the Moors. "I cannot relate," he says,—"for there is not, so far as I know, any record extant—the particulars of the inquisitorial persecution; but it is certain that,

[1] Vol. 1, p. 150. He complains, p. 149, that the synagogues "were turned into *mass houses* (sic) without any compensation." Now a certain mass house, called Westminster Abbey, was turned into a Protestant church without any compensation, as well as numbers of other Catholic mass houses. Catholics are willing to receive the proper compensation, if Protestants are ready to pay.

closely leagued with the royal power, the Inquisition crowded the dungeons, and fed the hearths."[1] So that if the terrible Spanish Inquisition condemned many relapsing Mohammedans, history is silent, and we are to believe imaginary horrors, because we must of necessity make out the Inquisition to be monstrous.

When the religious innovators in Northern Europe began their vagaries, and Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Cranmer, each introduced his new patent religious medicine for the cure of the world's ills, the authorities in Spain, both civil and ecclesiastical, marked the progress of the new politico-religious movements. Destruction of churches, chapels, monasteries, seats of piety and learning, the plunder of shrines and altars, the murder of priests and religious, marked their course as that of a new race of Goths or Huns. Where the new ideas once entered a country, the government had either to adopt them and lead the innovators on, or prepare for a struggle in which every element of ferocity would be called out, and in which the sovereign must crush or be crushed.

Navarre, on the Spanish frontier, adopted the new ideas, and Catholicity was exterminated. The Low Countries, under the same impulse, rose against Spain. To save itself, Spain put forth every effort. The Inquisition already in existence, and so severe as to have been censured by the popes, became still more stringent, and was, in the hands of the Spanish monarchs, the great engine for preventing the growth of the new ideas in the peninsula. To their eyes it was the only hope. The Protestant corsairs of France and England swooping on the rich Spanish fleets, as cruel as their fellow-believers on land, made the Spaniard deaf to mercy; and the Spanish Inquisition attained its most terrible form. But it was essentially a State institution. Its object was the security of the Spanish throne, and the kingly power scarcely acknowledged the Church in the matter. "The Inquisition was," says Ranke, "the means of completing the absolute authority of the king." It was entirely dependent on the king, who appointed the officers. Guizot takes the same view. "The Inquisition was at first more political than ecclesiastical, and destined rather to uphold order than to defend the faith."

In the form it then assumed, and the course it then adopted, the Church cannot in the slightest degree be held accountable for the Spanish Inquisition. It was as absolutely a State institution as Bismarck's ecclesiastical courts and Falk laws; imprisoning, confiscating, banishing. But we have the direct disapprobation of the popes. Before the Reformation, Pope Sixtus IV. remonstrated in the most forcible manner with Ferdinand; limited the power of the Inquisi-

[1] 1st ed., p. 126. 2d ed., vol. 1, p. 163.

tion to acting in concert with the bishops, and in 1483 established a judge of appeals from its decisions. Both Ferdinand and Charles V. endeavored in every way to thwart appeals to the Holy See, and at last demanded that all appeals should be addressed to the royal Minister of Justice. The popes interfered, too, to obtain clemency for the condemned, and to save their property for them and their children. Every effort was made to baffle the intervention of the popes, and appeals to them, so as to require, on the part of the Holy See, the most stringent action, as when Leo X. excommunicated the inquisitors of Toledo. It was the same under subsequent popes, who prevented the extension of the Spanish Inquisition to Italy. In view of all this, the Church at large or the sovereign pontiffs cannot, without a violation of all historic truth, be made responsible for the acts of the Spanish Inquisition. The burden lies with the absolute monarchy of Spain, with which it originated and with which it fell.[1]

Another point should be borne in mind. Those whom the popes honored for their piety and zeal for religion, even those whom the Church subsequently canonized as models for all Christians, were not exempt in life from the persecutions of the Inquisitions of Spain and Portugal. The Jesuits were from first to last obnoxious to the Inquisitions of the peninsula. The hostility seen in the arrest of St. Ignatius, the persecution of St. Francis Borgia, friend of Carranza, the arrest of the Provincial, and the attempt to censure the whole Order, in 1586, the action against the Bollandists, the persecution of Vieyra, the action of the Portuguese Inquisition against the Society of Jesus, and the burning of Father Malagrida; the hostility evinced in all these is too clear and positive to be questioned. And strange as it may seem, Jesuits help to swell the numbers of the sufferers for whom Llorente, and such blind followers as Rule, evoke the tears of Protestants. St. Ignatius, in forming his "flying camp" to attack the hosts of the Reformation, never dreamed that Protestants would one day be called to sympathize with him as a sufferer from the Inquisition.

Of canonized saints, not only St. Ignatius, St. Francis Borgia, but even St. Teresa was denounced to the Inquisition. Nor has any Grand Inquisitor or official of that later tribunal since the origin of Protestantism been beatified or canonized by the Church. The Church is the Church. The attempt of the Inquisition to set itself up as a church, an *imperium in imperio*, was crushed. Among those whom it persecuted, the Church found men to raise to her highest honors, but never conferred them on the persecutors. St. Francis de Sales, St. Vincent de Paul, St. John Francis Regis, Blessed

[1] Llorente's work admits clearly these efforts of the Pope to check the Inquisition in Spain.

Peter Canisius, Blessed Peter Faber, men who endeavored to regain those who fell away, but regain them by mildness, by reason, by exhortation; such are the men whom the Church publicly honors.

The Inquisition, whether in Spain or elsewhere, took cognizance not only of false religion and relapse into it, whether Judaism, Mohammedanism, or heresy, but also of all offences against religion, sacrilege, falsely personating the priesthood, witchcraft, blasphemy, crimes against nature, bigamy, perjury, and in some places purely civil offences, such as coining.

The attempts to introduce Protestantism into Spain attracted the attention of the Inquisition about the year 1541, and took form eighteen years later. Since the middle of the sixteenth century it has consequently been a name of horror in Protestant countries, and no exaggeration was too great to describe the number of the victims, the injustice of the judges, or the cruelty of the whole system. Historical calmness or impartiality, sound criticism, careful collation of authorities were all neglected, and the Spanish Inquisition is judged, even now, by many in comparison with the ideas and practices of the nineteenth century, not with those in which it flourished.

The course of proceeding employed by the Inquisition began with a public announcement of a time of grace, "during which every one, who, conscious of apostasy, presented himself and did penance, was to be absolved and saved from heavy punishments." Those under twenty might avail themselves of this opportunity even after the time had elapsed. The accused who did not appear, to avail themselves of this, were then subject to arrest. But the dungeons of the Inquisition, which play such a part in romances that pass for history, were models for their time. While even at a later date Howard found the prisons of Europe generally filthy and noxious; when the prisons in England were so vile that on one occasion the bringing of the Catholic prisoners to the bar caused a pestilence that swept off the judges, lawyers, and no small portion of the population, the prisons of the Spanish Inquisition were, as Llorente admits, "well-vaulted, light, and dry rooms. No prisoners ever groaned under the weight of chains, handcuffs, and iron collars."

The order of arrest could be issued only on the joint action of two inquisitors: one a jurist, the other a theologian. If the accusation were the use of heretical words or expressions, and the purport was not clear, it was referred to *qualificators*, to report whether they were really heretical.

The examinations were in the usual Spanish style, with long detailed written interrogatories, to which answers were required. But, it will be said, torture was used to compel the accused to answer

fully. This is undoubtedly the case; but it was no peculiarity of that court. It was part of the course of judicial investigation in all European countries. England used to claim that torture was never used, and the assertion of Catholics, that their clergy and laity were frequently tortured, was met by a bold denial, and the charge cited as showing to what wickedness Catholics would go in their accusations of Protestants. Lord Coke, Chief Justice of England's highest court, long attorney-general, declares positively in his printed works that he never knew a case of torture in England. The state papers of England have become accessible in our time. Jardine, an English writer, and not a Catholic, investigated this very question of the use of torture in England, on which he published a well-known work. He found numbers of examinations of prisoners taken under torture, found examinations taken by Lord Coke himself, with marginal notes directing the answers to be garbled when used in court. That was the English use of torture, and Llorente cites nothing in the Spanish Inquisition to match it.

The accused was allowed to have an advocate, and to compare the depositions with the act of accusation. The inquisitors were required to collect material for the defence, and aid the accused in his search for testimony. The sentence of the provincial tribunals was subject to the revision of the Grand Inquisitor and Council. One alleged defect in this judicial system was that the names of the witnesses were not given to the accused; but Ranke, in Germany, and Le Normant, in France, find reasons for withholding censure even on this. The accused had the right of naming personal enemies against whose testimony he protested.

It will be said that, wise as the precautions were to obtain justice and a prompt administration of it, they were often avoided. This is certainly the case, and the frequent appeals to Rome prove it, as they prove the wisdom of the popes in withholding their approval from the whole system.

Spain gave great publicity to the execution of the judgments of the Inquisition. In 1559 she began her Autos de Fe, "Acts of Faith," solemn parades of the convicted in a form to strike terror into all. Those condemned merely to do penance came in black coats and trowsers, bareheaded, and barefooted; the more guilty in a yellow sanbenito with a red cross; those condemned to death wore a sheepskin sacque with flames painted on it, and a pointed paper cap. On arriving at the appointed place the sentences were pronounced, and the guilty were handed over to the civil officers, who then inflicted the punishment. The first Auto de Fe in Spain took place at Valladolid, May 21st, 1559, when fourteen were burned. Two others took place in the same year. They continued more or less frequently to the close of the century, but in 1604 an

Auto was stopped by the king; and in that of 1621 no one was put to death. Rule admits (1, p. 289) that in the latter part of the last century sentences to death had nearly ceased.

Of the whole number who perished by the Spanish Inquisition it is not yet easy to obtain accurate data. Llorente estimates that from the institution under Torquemada to the year 1809, 31,912 were burnt, besides which 17,659 were burnt in effigy, and 291,450 were penitents. But we have seen already how recklessly Llorente applies numbers given for several years and different places to one year and one place, and then augments this for the kingdom, and again for a reign. His figures are utterly visionary, and if the number who perished in the Autos of the first year, 1559, be taken as an average, 39, and it is certainly above it,[1] the number from 1559 to 1759, when the executions may be said to have ceased, cannot exceed ten thousand, and probably falls far below it. If from this be deducted those who suffered for other causes than heresy, the number will not exceed, if it equals, that of Catholics put to death for their religion in the British Isles during the same periods, without taking into account the numbers of Catholics slaughtered in Ireland under Cromwell, which alone far exceed the numbers of burnt effigies and penitents of the Spanish Inquisition for its two centuries. The puerility of Llorente and Rule in parading as victims those burnt in effigy, and the adding of the great number of penitents can escape no man of sense.[2]

Spain extended the Inquisition to the New World in 1520, but not in definite form. Fifty years later three central tribunals were established at Lima, Mexico, and Cartagena. The first Auto took place in Mexico in 1574, but the number condemned to the flames was small; none were burned in the Auto of 1648, and only one in 1659. Drake, Hawkins, and other buccaneers were, in the earlier day, plundering the Spanish-American ships and seaside towns. Any of these pirates that fell into the hands of Spaniards were turned over to the Inquisition; but the blindest fanaticism will scarcely turn these ribald freebooters into martyrs of Christ.

The Portuguese Inquisition was established in 1536 by King John III., but the Pope, Paul III., soon complained of the severities and injustice that stained its course, and it required the absolute exertion of the papal authority to check the fury of the king, as

[1] Llorente himself gives 34 a year as his estimate for the reign of Philip V., not as based on any returns, but in his favorite way of calculating. The real average must have been undoubtedly much less.

[2] Among those who put a stop to the proceedings of the Inquisition, whether government or mob, there has been always a suspicious haste to destroy records. Many have thus perished unexamined, but the records of cases, and the issuing of death-warrants, must still exist in the central archives of the Spanish government.

Rule admits. This author admits that he can find no authentic matter for a sketch; there was no Portuguese Llorente to multiply endlessly the number of victims. One of his few cases is from Fox's Book of Martyrs, the case of a man who attacked a cardinal while saying Mass in the Cathedral. But the popes sought to abate the rigors of the tribunal in Portugal, and Clement X. addressed a brief to his Nuncio urging him to prevent, if possible, an intended Auto de Fe. Here, too, the Jesuits signalized themselves by their earnest labors to mitigate the rigors of the tribunal, and they became in the highest degree obnoxious to those who were bent on carrying out its system. From Portugal the Inquisition extended to Brazil and India, and the acts of the tribunal at Goa are best known to English readers by Dellon's account, which Rule implicitly follows.

It is not pretended that those convicted of holding Protestant doctrines really did not hold them. On the contrary, it is admitted and claimed that in most cases they did, and that the conviction by the court was sound in point of fact. Cases undoubtedly occurred in this as in all other courts where innocence suffered and guilt escaped; our own times are not strangers to cases where poverty was an obstacle to the proof of innocence, and wealth makes it difficult to convict men of guilt.

When a person was convicted the punishment was death, imprisonment, or public penance. It is generally believed that, even for those times, the punishments inflicted by the Inquisition were unusually severe. That they were not, it will be necessary simply to compare them with the penal codes of other countries. The English penal code was terribly severe. The array of offences then punished with death, in its horrible forms of burning, half hanging, quartering, and disembowelling, is a fearful one. Even in these colonies the severity was great. Pressing to death was inflicted in New England; in New York, down to the Revolution, sacrilege (and stealing a book or a handkerchief in a church was sacrilege) was punished by death; and men were repeatedly convicted and sentenced under the law. The Carolina, a penal law of Germany under Charles V., enumerates execution by fire and sword, quartering, the wheel, gibbet, drowning, burying alive, the use of red-hot pincers, the cutting off the tongue, ears, hands, etc.

All this is repugnant to modern ideas, but it was once generally accepted as part of the criminal code, and the sentences inflicted by the Spanish Inquisition are really mild for their times.

The Inquisition in Italy, and especially in the Roman States, always retained more of its earlier form, and the bishops exercised more power. Its first operations were against the doctrine of the

Waldenses, but in the proceedings against them the Inquisition does not hold a conspicuous place.

When the Protestant movement began in Germany the courts of the Inquisition were aroused to meet the new errors, and prevent their introduction into the peninsula. Yet the cases that arose were comparatively few. Italy did not show any disposition to embrace the new views. Here and there a member of some religious order, or a professor in some university, would attempt to diffuse them, but the attempt was speedily arrested, and the people generally were so faithful to the Catholic Church that they were averse to a formal inquisition. Just after the summoning of the Council of Trent, Pope Paul III., in July, 1542, established a General Inquisition at Rome.

In its operations we find none of the characters of the Spanish Inquisition. There were executions for heresy from time to time, as there were in England at the same time executions for being priests or Catholics. Some of those punished for extravagant doctrines in Italy would have gone to the stake for them in England under Edward VI.

Of those who suffered in Italy, De Dominis, Giordano Bruno, and Aonio Paleario are best known to English readers. The bugbear of Galileo's sufferings comes, by his own letters, to have been very gentle dealing from a sovereign whom he had caricatured. Some of those punished in Italy, as in Portugal and elsewhere, were English fanatics, maddened by the teachings of the Reformers, who attacked priests at the altar, at the consecration, or in processions of the Blessed Sacrament. Priests were even assassinated by such zealots. It required no Inquisition to punish such violent offenders against the religion of the country in which they happened to be.

The Inquisition was reared for a time in the Low Countries to uphold the Spanish power, but fell with it.

Such is briefly and in outline the history of this famous tribunal and its extent. A full, impartial, critical history, based on research and trustworthy documents, would be of great service. It is a subject that can be treated as White has treated the St. Bartholomew, and afford a work that men of all schools of thought and belief could consult and recognize.

Rule had the opportunity of rendering a real service to historic truth, but he is utterly devoid of the qualifications for the task he has undertaken. He has not even the tact to hide his blind fanaticism and put on the semblance of impartiality. Passages like these show the temper of his mind: "If Romanism were Christianity and not idolatry" (vol. 1, p. 145 n.). "Drunken with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus, popery raged in this age" (p. 236); "murderous police" (*i. e.*, the Jesuits), (p. 288).

His historical accuracy may be seen in vol. 2, pp. 208–9, where he says: "About this time," A. D. 1570, "the Bartholomew massacre was contrived partly at Rome, during a visit of the Cardinal of Lorraine, and partly by the instigation of the Inquisition at Madrid." It will be enough to refer to White's St. Bartholomew, a Protestant work, reprinted in this country by the Harpers, to show that there is not the trace of a foundation for this charge, or for implicating the Church at all in the design. Then, too, p. 209, he makes Pius V. celebrate it with public rejoicings, when that Pope was actually dead.

His theological knowledge may be conjectured from his note (vol. 1, p. 290), where, speaking of Scio, the Spanish translator of the New Testament, he says: "But he could not obliterate the false readings of the modern Vulgate," and in his second volume, Appendix, p. 329, heads "Inquisitorial Ignorance," a passage from Archbishop Sotomayor. If he knows anything of the Biblical studies of the century he must know that the collation of ancient Greek manuscripts has made the received Greek text, which Protestants have blindly followed, utterly untenable, and has so substantiated the accuracy of the Vulgate as representing a still earlier class of manuscripts, that Protestants must now, if they retain the woman taken in adultery, retain it on the authority of the Vulgate.

Speaking of Borri, Rule says: "He taught that the Blessed Virgin was born of St. Ann in the same manner as Jesus Christ our Lord was born of Mary. He called her the only daughter of God, conceived by the Holy Ghost;" then he adds in a note: "The reader needs not to be reminded that *this* idle and unscriptural figment under the management of Pius IX. is now made . . . . an article of faith." It is impossible to conceive ignorance or bad faith greater than this. The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, as a moment's reading would show him, is that Mary from her conception, like Eve before the fall, was free from the original sin, and that neither in the Decree nor elsewhere is her conception held to be an exception to the ordinary rule of nature. In fact Catholics, knowing both her father and her mother, profess it distinctly.

What his own religious views are, apart from a most unreasoning hatred of Catholicity, it is not easy to define. He treats the conversion of Jews to Catholicity as apostasy (vol. 1, p. 145), and justifies it in a note. He cannot, therefore, believe faith in Jesus Christ as the Messias necessary for salvation. In fact he seems to exclude this and all other doctrines held by the Catholic Church, and must consider such of them as are held by the Protestant sects in common as unnecessary for salvation. As we have seen, he holds that a man with an enlightened conscience may swear to the reverse of truth. He justifies those countrymen of his who attacked priests

at the altar or in procession as "filled with that horror and indignation which they only can conceive who have felt the same, as if they had passed into a region of blasphemy, where the people were in open revolt against the majesty of heaven."

Finding that bigamy was punished by the Inquisition, he makes the Church responsible for not having banished bigamy from earth; as though Luther had not justified it, and our country, Protestant in its tone, legalized it by its lavishly granted divorces, so relaxing the marriage tie that Mormonism, with polygamy as a doctrine, is firmly fastened on the land.

It may be said that it is impossible for a Protestant to read the atrocities of the Inquisition, and write calmly. White wrote his *History of St. Bartholomew* without being led into ignorance or uncriticalness by the cruelty of the act to his fellow-believers. Challoner in his *Missionary Priests*, and O'Reilly in his *Memorials* of those who suffered for the Catholic faith in Ireland, have given the lives of those Catholic priests and laymen put to death for their faith, in England and Ireland, without any such violence of language or thought as characterizes Rule. With a field that he might have made peculiarly his own by accurate scholarly research, Rule unfortunately brought to his task a blind religious hate, vagueness of religious views, great ignorance of Catholic doctrine, and a partial, uncritical, credulous mind.

As we have seen, he follows for the Spanish Inquisition the work of Llorente, repeating his errors without examination, even where Protestant writers had called attention to them. With Limborch it is the same. He makes no attempt to sustain these authors by citing passages in full, by documents, or by contemporaneous annals, the only way in which a history can be properly written. He takes Llorente's wild system of figures, perverting some general statement so as to limit it in time and space, then multiplying indefinitely to get figures for the whole kingdom. He ignores the numbers punished by the Inquisition for crimes against nature, bigamy, witchcraft, and the like, and swells out the numbers to hundreds of thousands by his enormous numbers of penitents.

Where he has not Llorente to follow, his account is vague and unsatisfactory. He is constantly appealing to imagination, thus; "We find everywhere stated that public executions were no less frequent in Portugal than in Spain, but we do not find authentic matter for a true sketch."

The mild form of the Inquisition in Italy he eludes, and the efforts of the sovereign pontiffs and of the Jesuits to mitigate the rigors of the tribunal in Spain and Portugal are never fairly stated; and what is reluctantly said is weakened at once, by insinuations and imputations of bad faith.

A person may read the work from first to last without finding the question of religious coercion distinctly treated; without finding an admission that Protestant countries punished with death and minor punishments as well Catholics who refused to enter the Protestant State Church as dissenters who wished to leave it. For a century and a half after the revolt of Luther, punishment for disagreeing with the state established Church was universal; it was the rule in England and Germany as in Spain or Italy. After that period, as men grew less in earnest in their religious views, the severity was relaxed. Indifferentism gave place largely in the last century to infidelity, and the spirit of the governments of the nineteenth century is one that ignores God. With the fall of Rome the Inquisition even in name ceased to be an institution in any way connected with the Church. Religious coercion is no longer her act; but it exists, and governments, whether Russo-Greek, Lutheran, Anglican, Liberal, or simply Masonic, claim the right to coerce; they no longer attempt the hopeless task of crushing Catholicity by force; they claim the right to regulate her faith, her worship, her hierarchy, the instruction of her laity, her rules of membership, and punish all opposition to their strange wild usurpation by fines, imprisonment, and Siberian horrors. The real Inquisition of this age, is the war of Czar, Kaiser, Commune, and Republic, against the Catholic Church, which they honor with their hate, as being the only real representative of the religious idea.

It is, therefore, to be deeply regretted that our times should produce such a shallow, pretentious work on a subject upon which a really critical and honest book is needed, the subject of religious coercion by the civil power.