

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL 1849.

---

No. II.

---

---

ART. I.—*The Natural History of Man ; Comprising Inquiries into the modifying influence of Physical and Moral Agencies on the different tribes of the Human Family.* By J. C. Prichard, M. D. London : Baillere, 1843.

THE late decease of Dr. Prichard has given a death blow to the high hopes of farther contributions to the science of man, from his learned pen. If he had put forth no other work than this, it alone would have sufficed to give him an imperishable renown. The learning displayed in his work is not more remarkable, than the ability with which it is all brought to bear upon the particular subject before him, and the cool, quiet, and dispassionate manner, in which he conducts his inquiries, and grapples with the difficulties in his way. He has no preconceived, or pre-adopted theory to support. He takes mankind as they are, presenting certain phenomena. He seeks an explanation of these phenomena, which shall accord with philosophy, and pursuing a process of the most rigid induction, disdains to receive as conclusive aught that is not most thoroughly demonstrated ; or as evidence, what a sound philosophy would reject

up the argument through which he has so successfully passed, present a concise summary upon this particular point. He says:

“The nature of the hair is, perhaps, one of the most permanent characteristics of different races. The hair of the Negro has been termed woolly; it is not wool, and only differs from the hair of other races in less important respects. This subject has been discussed in the early part of my work, and I shall not repeat what has there been said. It may be seen that the texture of the hair affords in the animal kingdom no specific characters. In mankind we find it in every gradation of variety; and if we take the African nations, I mean the black tribes, who are apparently of genuine native origin, as one body, we shall discover among them every possible gradation in the texture of the hair, from the short close curls of the Kafir, to the crisp but bushy locks of the Berberine, and again, to the flowing hair of the black Tuaryk, or Tibbo. In some instances, indeed, it appears that the change from one to the other may be shown in actual transition.” p. 477.

The few remaining points, on which our author dwells, we regret that we are unable at present to notice. We have said enough, however, to show the great value of the labours of Dr. Prichard, enough also as we hope to induce our readers to procure it for themselves.

---

ART. II.—*The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated.* By Francis Patrick Kenrick, Bishop of Philadelphia. Published by M. Fithian, 72 North Second street.

ON the second page of this volume, after the title-page, are these words: “To the Hon. Roger B. Taney, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, as a small tribute to his eminent station, profound knowledge, incorruptible integrity, pure patriotism, and devoted attachment to the Catholic faith, the following work is respectfully inscribed by the author.” On this dedication, we observe, as citizens, that we have no objection to the Chief Justice being a papist, or to a papist being Chief Justice. We wish to see no favoritism or exclusion prac-

ticed towards any body of men, who may have a permanent interest in the welfare of this country. We believe Mr. Taney is an amiable man, a good lawyer, and an able judge. In all his good name we rejoice. The inscription of this work was made either with or without his consent. If without his consent, he is not responsible for it; nor do we know that it would be either dignified or proper in Mr. Taney to take public notice of it. But if Mr. Taney consented, in a formal or informal manner, that the volume should be inscribed to him, knowing its character, we cannot, in this case, admire either his taste or his judgment.

We do not object to our public men, who, holding permanent or temporary offices, openly sanctioning publications calculated to promote morals or piety. Nay, we should like to see them writing on such subjects. A work like Wilberforce's "Practical View," is an honour to its author and to his country. We should be delighted to meet a hundred works of the same spirit and ability from our own countrymen, who are not clergymen. A few pious laymen in this land have done well in this cause. And we happen to know that nothing but great infirmities and pressing official duties prevented the late Chief Justice Marshall from preparing a work on the Constitution and Government of the United States for children and young persons, fitted for the Sabbath School libraries of the country, and suited alike to all good citizens, who truly love their country and its institutions.

The acceptance of a dedication implies more or less of approbation. It is an avowal of sympathy between the author and his patron; and, in works dedicated to religion, is regarded as an acknowledgment of general coincidence of views. This being the case, much as we respect Chief Justice Taney, and reverence his office, we are constrained to express our surprise that he would lend the sanction of his name and station to doctrines which, in our judgment, are subversive of all liberty, civil and religious.

This work is divided into twenty-seven chapters, bearing the following titles: "Promise of the Primacy—Institution of the Primacy—Exercise of the Primacy by Peter—Interpretation of the Fathers—Peter, Bishop of Rome—Roman Church—Centre of Unity—Ancient Controversies—Guardianship of Faith—Governing Power—The Hierarchy—Deposition of Bishops—

Appeals—Patrimony of St. Peter—Civil Influence—Umpire—Ecclesiastical Censures—Deposing Power (as used against kings)—Crusades—Inquisition—Papal Prerogatives—Civilization—Literature and the Arts—Succession—Papal Election—Ceremonies—Lives of the Popes.” These several matters are discussed at such length as suited the author. When we began the volume, we thought of a brief review of each chapter. But the subjects presented are too important for that kind of notice. The question, which chapter shall be chiefly noticed, was not very easily answered. After a little reflection, we determined to confine ourselves principally to the twentieth chapter, which treats of the Inquisition. This is one of the long chapters, and is prepared with more care than most of the book. It affords a fair test of the spirit of the author, and brings out his views on a point of great importance. For audacious assertion it has few equals any where. Its attempts to gloss over the foul characters of persecutors are awkward. Its concessions are fatal to popery. We shall prove all these things before we are done, but every thing in its order.

THE INQUISITION, in some form, has long been an engine of Popery. We venture nothing in asserting that, for cold-blooded, systematic and sanctimonious cruelty, it is without a parallel in the history of the world. “Nothing but itself is its parallel.” We have studied this subject with no pleasure, nor do we expect to communicate pleasure to our readers. We promise to throw a veil over all that is improper for our pages. Yet this class of subjects constitutes a great part of the miserable annals of this bloody Moloch. Nor will we needlessly detail any thing of a horrible nature. The maxim, “*afflictio dat intellectum*,” as used by persecutors, is certainly not heavenly, but is at least earthly, and is strongly suspected of being infernal in its origin and spirit. The bible says, that “oppression maketh a wise man mad.” It does not give sobriety or acuteness to the mind. No man’s understanding was ever improved by the injustice, violence and cruelties practiced upon him. No one seriously pretends that during the days of the apostles, or for more than two centuries afterwards, Christians justified any form of persecution for conscience sake. They all maintained the great war with wickedness on the principle asserted by Paul: “The

weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of strong holds."

Respecting the Inquisition, we wish to say several things; and that we may not speak confusedly, we arrange them under various and appropriate sections.

What are the principal sources of information, easily accessible on this subject? In reply, we state that the articles on the Inquisition, in our best English Encyclopedias, contain valuable information. Most of our church histories also shed light on this dark and dreary matter. We have also several works on the Inquisition, written by Protestants. Among these we may mention a history of the Inquisition, written by William Sime, and the Ecclesiastical Researches of Claudius Buchanan, who enjoyed great advantages for gaining correct information while residing in the house of the chief Inquisitor at Goa. Besides these, we have the History of the Reformation in Italy, and the History of the Suppression of the Reformation in Spain. The first, third and fourth of these works have been published by the Board of Publication, 265 Chesnut street, Philadelphia, and can easily be procured there, or at their depositories. We hope they will be bought and read. We would specially commend the work of Mr. Sime as the most condensed and the cheapest. But there are other works on the Inquisition of still higher importance, because they are written by those who belonged to the Romish Church. First, there is the *Directorium Inquisitorium*, published at Rome in 1584. It is a large folio, and is indeed a directory. It contains minute directions for the work of wickedness and murder. It is worthy of notice, that Bishop Kenrick never once refers to this work. The reasons of this omission are sufficiently obvious. Very glad would he be if an American Protestant should never see the work. But we have got the work, and we mean to use it. We have also the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, or Body of the Canon Law, another book, which tells minutely when to tease, and fret, and torment mankind. We have also the statements of several men, reared in the Romish church, who were terribly familiar with the principles and practices of this dreadful tribunal. Dellon, a Frenchman, a writer of great perspicuity, once a prisoner of the Inquisition, the accuracy of whose general statements was admitted by the chief Inquisitor of Goa in 1808, has published a

narrative, which has long been well known. Candour and clearness are manifest throughout the work. We have also the statements of Gavin, once a priest in Saragossa, a man whose general good character, while in Spain, was publicly vouched for by Lord Stanhope, and other Englishmen of high character, who had known him in Saragossa, and who, after his flight from his country, was for many years a reputable clergyman in the church of England. We have also the writings of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White, formerly chaplain to the King of Spain, in the Royal Chapel of Seville. All these accounts, written by men once papists, are now in English, and have been, and perhaps still are, for sale in the large book-stores of the country.

But the small work of most importance on this subject, (now printed in English,) is perhaps that of D. Juan Antonio Llorente, who, when he wrote his History of the Inquisition of Spain, was an adherent of the church of Rome. He was a knight of the order of Charles III., Chancellor of the University of Toledo, Secretary of the Inquisition at Madrid during the years 1789, 1790, and 1791, and a member of the Royal Academy of History, for which he wrote a work on the Inquisition, which was published by that body. He was also a Counsellor of State to Joseph Buonaparte, when he was King of Spain. That he had no Protestant qualms, nor mawkish sensibility about the mere existence of the Inquisition, but was, by familiarity, dreadfully hardened to its scenes of horror, is evident from the work itself. On the last page of the English translation, (which is also abridged,) he says: "If they would make the proceedings public, and liberate the prisoners on bail, I confess that I should not be afraid to present myself to be tried by that tribunal." He closes with these words: "Since this article was printed, (in the Gazette de France, April 3d, 1816,) I have heard that the Inquisitor-general, Mier Campillo, is dead, and that Ferdinand has appointed Monseigneur Jerome Castillon de Salas, Bishop of Taragona, as his successor. God grant that he may understand the spirit of the Gospel, and the necessity of reforming the Inquisition, better than his predecessor." This cannot be called over-nice sensibility. The author does not even denounce the Inquisition. He merely asks that it be "reformed," and made conformable to "the spirit of the Gospel."

We notice this the more particularly, because Bishop Kenrick styles Llorente an "enemy." If he meant that Llorente was an enemy to the doctrines and worship of the Church of Rome, we can only ask, where is the proof? If he intended to produce the impression that Llorente was opposed to the Inquisition in every conceivable shape, as we glory in being, we put Llorente's words, just quoted, to prove the want of candour in the bishop. If he intended to say that Llorente was an "enemy" to the enormous wrongs and cruelties of the Inquisition, then he meant only to say that the Spaniard had still in his heart more justice and humanity after all he had seen and done in the work of cruelty, than has Bishop Kenrick himself.

To this, more than to any other one work, will truthful writers hereafter look for material in giving the history of the Inquisition. Its principles will always be found in the Directory of Inquisitors.

It is proper here to state very briefly the history of the Inquisition. The rise and growth of inquisitorial practices seem to have been contemporaneous with the rise and growth of the Roman papacy, until about the year 1203, when the Pope went regularly to work to establish it, and in A. D. 1208 it was fully organized. Bishop Kenrick admits that "Inquisitors were first appointed by Innocent III.," "at the commencement of the 13th century." He does not speak of him, indeed, as sanguinary, but calls him "this energetic pontiff." As to Guy and Ranier, (or Regnier,) the first Inquisitors, he says they were "charged to inquire diligently after all persons suspected of heresy." We have heard of men being imprisoned in this country on "suspicion of debt;" yet we believe that was only an attempt to be witty; but blessed be God, "suspicion of heresy" is not yet here a crime, for which freemen can be imprisoned. Bishop K. admits that Guy and Ranier "excited the zeal of the evil magistrates to use their authority in repressing the prevailing errors." Bishop, why cannot you speak plainly, and say that Guy and Ranier, your "two Cistercian monks," roused the fanaticism and inflamed the passions of the magistrates to murder unoffending and peaceable men, who had committed no crime?

The first prominent objects of the vengeance of the Inquisition, when fully organized and armed, were that great body of

witnesses of the truth, the Albigenses and Waldenses, of whom their rulers, at the time, acknowledged that they were "all peaceful and submissive subjects." Such was the testimony of the Counts of Toulouse, Foix, Beziers, Cominges, and Carcassone. And such was the number of these innocent people, that the nobles protected them because they saw how their country must, as it were, be depopulated, if these people were persecuted. From this time the Inquisition grew in power till it had strong holds in almost all Popish countries. In Spain it had eighteen distinct tribunals. It also had strong holds in Portugal, and in the Italian States generally; also at Goa, in the East Indies, and in Lima, Carthagena, Mexico, and other places on this continent. It is not easy to say when the Inquisition had obtained its greatest power, or filled the human mind with the extremest terror. It has never been abolished in the Ecclesiastical States. Bishop K. acknowledges this, and says that, "in the Roman States, by the concession of the Pontiff, they (the Supreme Inquisition) can punish by imprisonment, fine, or other civil penalty; but capital punishment cannot be inflicted except by the direct authority of the sovereign himself; and the tribunal has at all times maintained a character of great moderation." p. 341. Here we have three points admitted:—

1. The Inquisition has never been put down by any Pope in his own temporal dominions. He says, "It still subsists."
2. It still puts men in prison for years or for life. The late Bishop of Detroit, if not dead, is thought by many to be still pining away in its dungeons.
3. The Inquisition and Pope united, occasionally put men to death for heresy. At least they may do it; and we know that wolves, having tasted blood, will occasionally seize a sheep or a lamb, even in sight of the fold. In February, 1813, the General Cortes abolished the Inquisition in Spain, but it was re-established in July, 1814, and has ever since, with slight interruptions, and with diminished resources, been in operation. In 1815, it was in full operation in Mexico; but it there fell at the revolution. It has recently been re-established on the southern part of this continent, greatly to the joy of Romish priests. Its power, however, like that of the Pope, is much less than formerly; but it wields all the power it has, and eagerly grasps at more. In its operations, it is now more quiet and less imposing, but its hated dungeons, its horrible code of judgment

and its secret trials and punishments, still remain wherever Popery has sufficient power to maintain them. Nor can any man foresee when it will be utterly abolished. Bishop K. says: "It had lasted in the kingdom of Arragon for above a century, until the death of Nicholas Eymerrick, in 1393." "Upon his death the Inquisition remained in force in that kingdom; but gradually sunk of itself, upon the entire extinction of the Waldenses." In Burgundy, "this tribunal, by degrees, came also to nothing; because, when the Waldenses were extinguished, there were no others for the Inquisition to proceed against." In France generally, "it dropped of itself for want of heresies to proceed against." The Bishop quotes Llorente and Limborch as his authorities. On the above we remark: 1. That the Bishop is getting to be a pretty good witness, unwilling though he be. If we could keep him talking a while, he would do very well. 2. By his own admission, the object of the Inquisitors was the "extinction" of the Waldenses, and they thought they had done it. 3. Our author and Limborch, both, however unintentionally, make a wrong impression when they say that "in France generally, it dropped for want of heresies to proceed against." The Inquisition was never "generally" introduced into France, the French not liking it. Many attempts were made, but it did not gain favorers in the north of France sufficient to support it; and then it is not true that there were not "heresies to proceed against." According to the canon law and Trent, France has always been quite heretical. But power was commonly wanting. That is the true cause of its want of permanency.

We shall next state some of the laws and rules by which the Inquisition was and is governed. From the Directory of Inquisitors, which was published "by consent of the Superiours," "by command of the Cardinals, Inquisitors-General," dedicated to Pope Gregory XIII., and containing his printed approbation of the work, we extract the following:—"All believers in Christ, by the necessity of salvation, are subject to the Roman Pontiff, who carries the sword, temporal and spiritual, and judges all, but is judged by no man." "He is convicted of erring from the faith, who does not reclaim others from error." "He, who retains prohibited books, shall be deemed a favorer of heretics." "The property of heretics shall be confiscated and ap-

plied to the use of the church." "They who bury persons knowing them to be excommunicated, or their receivers, defenders or favorers, shall not be absolved unless they dig up the corpse, and the place shall be deprived of the usual immunities of sepulture." "Statutes, which impede the execution of the duties which appertain to the office of Inquisitors, are null and void." "Inquisitors must discard all fear, and intrepidly proceed against heretical pravity." "He is a heretic who deviates from any article of faith." "A heretic possesses nothing alive or dead." "He is a heretic who does not believe what the Roman Hierarchy teaches. A heretic merits the pains of fire. By the gospel, the canons, civil law and customs, heretics must be burned." "The property of heretics after their death must be seized. No part of their property shall be given to their heirs except for the sake of mercy." "All defence is denied to heretics." "For the suspicion alone of heresy, purification is demanded." "Magistrates, who refuse to take the oath for the defence of the faith, shall be suspected of heresy." "Indulgences for the remission of all sin belong to those, who are signed with the cross for the persecution of heretics." "The Pope can enact new articles of faith. The definitions of Popes and Councils are to be received as infallible." "Every individual may kill a heretic." "All persons may attack any rebels to the church and despoil them of their wealth, and slay them, and burn their houses and cities." "Persons who betray heretics shall be rewarded. But priests, who give the sacrament or burial to heretics, shall be excommunicated." "Prelates are called watchmen, because they persecute heretics." "They, who favour their relatives, who are heretics, shall not, for that cause, receive any milder punishment." "Those, who are subject to a master, or governor, or prince, who has become a heretic, are released from their fidelity, a wife may separate herself from her excommunicated or heretical husband. Children of heretics are discharged from parental authority." "Heretics may be forced to profess the Roman faith." "The testimony of a heretic is admitted on behalf of a Catholic but not against him." "A whole city must be burnt on account of the heretics who live in it. Whoever pleases may seize and kill any heretics." "A person contracting marriage with a heretic, shall be punished, because it is favouring a heretic." "Heretics enjoy

no privileges in law or equity." "Prelates or Inquisitors may torture witnesses." "Heretics persevering in error must be delivered to the secular judge." "He, who does not inform against heretics, shall be deemed as suspected." "He, who contracts marriage twice, shall be deemed as suspected." "He, who marries a person unbaptized, and deserts her to marry a baptized woman, is not guilty of bigamy." "Inquisitors may have a prison for the guilty, and for those who are accused to them, there to be detained or punished." "Prelates and Inquisitors may have a common jail for their prisoners." "Prelates and Inquisitors may put any person to the question by torture." "It is laudable to torture those of every class, who are guilty of heresy." "Inquisitors may lawfully admit perjured persons to testify and act in cases concerning the faith." "Inquisitors may lawfully receive infamous persons and criminals, or servants against their masters both to act and give evidence in causes respecting the faith." "Inquisitors may allow heretics to witness against heretics, but not for them." "Inquisitors may torture witnesses to obtain the truth, and punish them if they have given false evidence." And yet St. Ligorì says it is not mortal sin to tell untruth under torture.

Indeed in the ordinances of 1561, which have ever since been followed in the Spanish Inquisition, it is said (ord. 49) that, "experience has shewn that if he (the accused) is questioned on any subject when pain has reduced him to the last extremity, he will say any thing that is required of him, which may be injurious to other persons, in making them parties concerned, and producing other inconveniences."

But to return to the Directory of Inquisitors. "Inquisitors must not publish the names of informers, witnesses, and accusers." "Penitent heretics may be condemned to perpetual imprisonment." "Prelates ought, without delay, to deliver an impenitent person, guilty of heretical pravity, to the civil authority for the final punishment." "Inquisitors may provide for their own expenditures and the salaries of their officers from the property of heretics." "Inquisitors enjoy the benefits of a plenary indulgence at all times in life and in death."

The foregoing are but a small portion—a mere specimen of the rules laid down for the government of this tribunal. Were it our object to inflame the passions of our readers, we should

be at a great loss for words to characterize the code. But we have no such object in view. We rather wish them to be informed, to become inquirers after truth, and to let their present and future course respecting Popery be guided, not by passion, but by intelligence, sound information and a benevolent spirit. We cannot imagine that reading such documents can fail to excite emotion. Men must be worse than sin commonly makes them, not to feel deeply; humanity stands aghast at such a code of wickedness.

The foregoing rules and decisions are in the "Directory of Inquisitors" followed by the bulls of twenty-three Popes, all breathing the same spirit, and the volume closes with a disquisition by the "Auditor of causes at Rome;" "the officer on whose judgment depends the whole code of Papal Morality and Government." In this disquisition he declares that the rules, which have been quoted, and the bulls, which have been referred to, are of "the greatest utility, importance and authority, respecting the duties of Inquisitors of heretical pravity." In the same document he mentions these propositions as infallible truths:

"1. The Roman Pontiffs ever have exercised the greatest care in extirpating heretics. 2. All the decrees published against heretics are in force without change or end. 3. The Roman Pontiffs can command that the secular laws against heretics shall be observed. 4. Justinian coerced the execution of the laws against heretics. 5. The laws against heretics are not abolished through disuse, or lapse of time." These rules and bulls still remain unrepealed. No Pope nor General Council has ever repealed, revoked, repudiated or disowned one of them. Even Bishop Kenrick, bold as he is, does not venture to assert that. They all bind as firmly as ever, where the power to execute them exists. The Council of Trent confirmed all these things by her general adopting clauses. And every Romish priest adopts by a solemn oath the Council of Trent in whole and without mental reservation.

We proceed to notice a remarkable use of terms in the vocabulary of this tribunal. Itself is commonly called the HOLY OFFICE. By the holy office, commonly is understood either that of a minister of Christ, or some work of piety, as that of a child making great sacrifices, or incurring great hazards for a

parent, who is in danger or in sorrow. Some duty, like acts of kindness performed by Christ, might be called, without impropriety a holy office. But if any thing more unholy, less like the holy God, less like the holy angels or holy men, than the Inquisition, has ever existed, historians have not made mention of it. The principles which ruled in the reign of terror in France, were in no respect worse. What do our readers suppose an Inquisitor means by "an act of faith?" Those, who simply read their Bibles and pious books, suppose that by an act of faith is meant the committing of the soul or of some interest to God through Jesus Christ, and commonly under circumstances of trial. Thus a perishing sinner fleeing to Christ, a dying mother committing her babe to the holy keeping of God, and Abraham offering up Isaac, afford striking instances of an act of faith. But in the annals of the Holy Office, an act of faith, "*auto-da-fe*," means a great gathering of Inquisitors, Jesuits, monks, especially Dominicans, Franciscans, and Cistercians, people, and if possible, a prince or two, to see a set of poor, tormented prisoners led forth barefooted through the streets of a large city, in dismal and odious attire, some of it covered over with figures of flaming fire, of dogs, serpents and devils, with open mouths, to a place duly prepared, where some are disgraced in one way and some in another, and commonly some scores of others are roasted, (not burnt in a quick fire but) roasted to death very slowly with priests and Jesuits standing by them and telling them that the devils are waiting to seize their souls. An *auto-da-fe* took place in Mexico as late as December, 1815, and an account of it was published in the Madrid Gazette, of May 14, 1816.

What do our readers suppose an Inquisitor means by a House of Mercy? Surely we shall have something good now, something where ministers of mercy bind up the wounded, feed the hungry, clothe the naked, nurse the sick. No! a house of mercy in the vocabulary of the Holy Office, is a horrible prison, divided into little, low, damp and dark cells, commonly under ground, no inmate having permission to speak even to a fellow-prisoner, without books, without comforts. Bishop K. quotes Puigblanch as complaining that the cells were not well-furnished. "No other furniture is allowed in the cells of the prisoner than a wooden bedstead, clamped down, or built in

masonry, a table, one chair." Our American Bishop with the utmost *sang froid* dismisses the complaint with these words: "Perhaps this will not appear to others a just subject of complaint." And the kind bishop tells us on the same page (348) "that when the criminal bears with impatience the misfortune and infamy of his imprisonment, in such case the Inquisitor must endeavour to comfort him very often." Might not the poor prisoner in such case, without sinful impatience, say as Job, "Miserable comforters are ye all." Those shut up in these cells are put there for trial, for three years, for eight years, for life, or for an *auto-da-fe*. Our author says: "The sentence of perpetual imprisonment was reduced to three years in favour of penitents. When the sentence excluded the hope of pardon, *absque spe gratiæ*, it was still limited to eight years on repentance." He also tells us that poor Jerome Vecchietti having been imprisoned five years "was restored to his friends, on some appearance of weakness of mind." Bishop, why did not you candidly say that the cruelties of the Inquisition made him a madman and then an idiot?

Since our childhood relaxation has been to us a pleasant word. In our minds it is associated with childish plays, with little excursions, with cessation of toil and with the society of friends. But in the glossary of the Inquisition relaxation means being placed in a hideous dress on the top of a post ten feet from the ground, and a fire kindled at the foot of the post and kept burning until the skin bursts open and the juices of the human body drop down, and at last life is extinct. This is relaxation.

To put one to the question is to us not alarming. It sounds awkwardly to be sure. We suppose it means to put the question to one. Whether a man says that he hitched the horse to the cart, or hitched the cart to the horse, we still understand the same thing. But to put one to the question in Inquisitorial language means to torture a man or woman, when no questions are asked. For in the 49th of the Madrid Ordinances it is specially provided that "after it (the question or torture) has been decided on, he (the accused) shall not be examined on any particular fact; he shall be allowed to say what he pleases." We shall not attempt a description of the various modes of torture. It would harrow up the feelings of our readers, or send them to

a sleepless bed. We shall only attempt to give some idea of the thing. One mode of torture was to lift the tortured several feet from the ground by ropes fastened to the body or limbs and attached to machinery, and then suddenly let them drop until they nearly reached the ground, and then, having the ropes fastened, suddenly check the fall and wrench every joint and muscle. Llorente, giving an account of the auto-da-fe at Seville in the year 1560, concludes the chapter with this paragraph; "Donna Jane Bohorques was (at this burning) declared innocent, she was the legitimate daughter of Don Pedro Garcia de Xeresey Bohorques, and the sister of Donna Maria Bohorques, who perished in a former auto-da-fe. She had married Don Francis de Vargas, Lord of the borough of Hiquera. She was taken to the secret prisons, when her unfortunate sister declared that she (Jane) was acquainted with her (Maria's) opinions, and had not opposed them; as if silence could prove that she admitted the doctrine (of Luther) to be true. Jane Bohorques was six months gone with child, but this did not prevent the Inquisitors from proceeding in her trial, a cruelty which will not surprise, when it is considered that she was arrested before any proof of her crime had been obtained. She was delivered in the prison; her child was taken from her at end of eight days, in defiance of the most sacred rights of nature, and she was imprisoned in one of the common dungeons of the Holy Office. The Inquisitors thought they did all that humanity required in giving her a less inconvenient cell than the common prison. It fortunately happened that she had as a companion in her cell a young girl, who was afterwards burnt as a Lutheran, and who, pitying her situation, treated her with the utmost tenderness during her convalescence. She (the girl) soon required the same care; she was tortured, and all her limbs were bruised, and almost dislocated. Jane Bohorques attended her in this dreadful state. Jane Bohorques was not yet quite recovered, when she was tortured in the same manner. The cords, with which her still feeble limbs were bound, penetrated to the bone, and several blood-vessels breaking in her body, torrents of blood flowed from her mouth. She was taken back to her dungeon in a dying state, and expired a few days after. The Inquisitors thought they expiated this cruel murder by declaring Jane Bohorques innocent in the auto-da-fe of this

day." p 85. This is the testimony of a man, who on the same page declares that he "was not less attached to the Catholic church than any Inquisitor might be." This is the institution of which Bishop Kenrick (p. 347) says: "No circumstances of cruelty attended it" (torture,) and adds: "The prisoners were generally treated with great humanity and indulgence."

Another mode of torture was to stretch the accused on the wheel. Never having seen the process, and not having at hand an account of it, we cannot say certainly that this was it, but we will venture to say, relying on memory, that it was this or something as bad. A human being was taken and his hands and feet were drawn with force to four points on a wheel, as remote from each other as they could be (a posture of extreme pain,) and then made fast with cords. Then the wheel was turned rapidly round, and when the wheel stopped, the sufferers body and head and arms being heavier than the legs, the head, was downwards.

Another method of torture was wrapping cords several times around the body or limbs, and with a powerful machine tightening them until life was nearly gone. To this was added the Chevalet, Llorente (pp. 49, 50) says: "At Valladolid on the 21st of June 1527, the licentiate Moriz, inquisitor, caused the licentiate Juan de Salas, to appear before him, and the sentence was read and notified to him. After the reading, the said licentiate Salas declared, that he had not said that of which he was accused; and the said licentiate Moriz immediately caused him to be conducted to the chamber of torture, where being stripped to his shirt, Salas was put by the shoulders into the chevalet, where the executioner, Pedro Parras, fastened him by the arms and legs with cords of hemp, of which he made eleven twines around each limb; Salas, during the time that the said Pedro was tying him thus, was warned several times to speak the truth, to which he always replied, that he had never said what he was accused of. He recited the creed, "*Quicumque vult,*" and several times gave thanks to God and our Lady; and the said Salas being still tied as before mentioned, a fine wet cloth was put over his face, and about a pint of water was poured into his mouth and nostrils, from an earthen vessel with a hole at the bottom, and containing about two quarts; nevertheless, Salas still persisted in denying the accusation. Then Pedro de

Porrás tightened the cords on the right leg, and poured a second measure of water on the face: the cords were tightened a second time on the same leg, but Juan de Salas still persisted in denying that he ever said any thing of the kind; and although several times pressed to tell the truth, he still denied the accusation. Then the said licentiate Moriz, having declared that the torture was begun but not finished, commanded that it should cease. The accused was withdrawn from the chevalet at which execution, I, Henry Paz, was present from the beginning to the end. Henry Paz, Notary."

Yet Salas was innocent of any crime proven; but on account of "suspicion arising from the trial," he was condemned to the auto-da-fe, "in his shirt, without a cloak, his head uncovered, and with a torch in his hand; that he should abjure heresy publicly, pay to the Inquisition ten ducats of gold, and fulfil his penance in the church assigned."

Perhaps the most favourite and refined mode of torturing, was by the use of an image of the Virgin Mary, so made as to embrace the miserable victim with a squeeze as he, at the bidding of an official, kissed it; and it pierced him terribly. "When the vaults of the Spanish Inquisition were thrown open by the troops of Napoleon, an image of the Virgin Mary was discovered, which, on inspection, was found to be a torturing engine. She wore beneath her robes a metal breast-plate, thickly stuck with needles, spikes, and lancets. The familiar, who was present, was requested to work the engine, and he did so. As she raised her arms, as if to embrace, a knapsack was thrown into them, and in closing upon it, she pierced it through in a hundred places. To the living victim it would have proved instantly the embrace of death." This was probably the most exquisite of all tortures. Yet Bishop Kenrick says: "It is easy to draw pictures of culprits, stretched on the rack, suspended by pulleys, or otherwise tortured; but facts do not sustain these representations." But, Bishop, there are many living witnesses, who saw these things in Spain with their own eyes. Some of them reside in this country. One of them, who was a Colonel in Buonaparte's army, and whose regiment destroyed one or more of these torment houses, is now an honored minister of the gospel in the Lutheran Church in the United States, and has often described these things to the people of this country.

The Directory of Inquisitors says: "There are five degrees of torture; or, as Paul Grillandus writes, fourteen species of torture." It also declares that "common fame and one witness are sufficient to justify the torture;" again, "Common fame alone, or one witness alone, authorizes the torture;" and again, "Extra-judicial confession, which is reiterated under torture, must be considered as a ratification." The Inquisition has also secret modes of intentionally putting to death, as well as of torturing men and women to make them accuse themselves or others. They bake in the dry pan, and they destroy life by throwing the victim into pits filled with toads and serpents. When the Inquisition was thrown open by order of the Cortes of Madrid, "twenty-one prisoners were found in it, not one of whom knew the name of the city in which he was. Some had been confined three years, some a longer period, and not one knew perfectly the nature of the crime of which he was accused. One of these prisoners had been condemned, and was to have suffered on the following day. His punishment was to be death by the pendulum. The method of thus destroying the victim was as follows: the condemned is fastened in a groove, upon a table, on his back; suspended above him is a pendulum, the edge of which is sharp, and it is so constructed as to become longer with every movement. The wretched victim sees this implement of destruction swinging to and fro above him, and every moment the keen edge approaching nearer and nearer; at length it cuts the skin of his nose, and gradually cuts on until life is extinct. It may be doubted if the holy office, in its mercy, ever invented a more humane and rapid method of exterminating heresy, or ensuring confiscation. This, let it be remembered, was a punishment of the Secret Tribunal, A. D. 1820." (Llorente, p. 6 of the Preface.)

We proceed to notice the crimes of which the Holy Office took cognizance. These were indeed all summed up under the general term, heresy; but that term was made very comprehensive, and extended not only to all possible supposed errors in religion, but also to those of philosophy, natural and moral, to the science of government, to literature, &c. The classes of persons tried were four: 1. those slightly suspected; 2, those seriously suspected; 3, those violently suspected; 4, those convicted either by confession with or without torture, or

by witnesses unknown to the accused. The crimes of which the Inquisitors took cognizance, were every thing that their superstitious authorities chose to define as blasphemy; also sorcery, divination, baptizing a dead person, re-baptizing an infant, making use in sorcery of holy water, of the host or of consecrated oil; the invocation of demons, remaining a year excommunicated, denying the supremacy or authority of the Pope, and opposing, in any way, the Inquisition. Schism was another high offence, either with or without heresy. The concealers, favourers, or adherents of heretics were duly noticed also. Nobles, who had a hereditary attachment to their peasants, and declined to take an oath to drive heretics from their estates, —magistrates, lawyers, notaries, &c. &c., who failed to aid in denouncing, discovering, or exposing heretics, were regarded as suspected. Upon the poor Jews the storm was every where dreadful, and especially in Spain. Llorente says: "Facts prove, beyond a doubt, that the extirpation of Judaism was not the real cause, but the mere pretext for the establishment of the Inquisition by Ferdinand V. The true motive was to carry on a vigorous system of persecution against the Jews, and so bring their riches into the hands of government." "The immense trade carried on by the Jews had thrown into their hands the greatest part of the wealth of the peninsula, and they had acquired great power and influence in Castile and Arragon." A converted Jew was considered as relapsed into heresy, if he kept the Sabbath out of respect to the law, which he had abandoned. This was sufficiently proved if he wore better linen and garments on that day than those which he commonly used, or had not a fire in his house from the preceding evening; if he took the suet and fat from the animals which were intended for his food, and washed the blood from it; if he examined the blade of the knife before he killed the animals, and covered the blood with earth; if he blessed the table after the manner of the Jews; if he pronounced the bakara, or benediction, when he took the cup into his hands, and pronounced certain words before he gave it to another person; if he recited the Psalms of David without repeating the Gloria Patri at the end; if he gave his son a Hebrew name chosen from among those used by the Jews; if he plunged him, seven days after his birth, into a basin containing water, gold, silver, seed-pearl, wheat, barley,

and other substances; pronouncing, at the same time, certain words according to the custom of the Jews; if he performed the ruaya, a ceremony, which consisted in inviting his relations and friends to a repast the day before he undertook a journey; if he turned his face to the wall at the time of his death, or had been placed in that posture before he expired; if he washed, or caused to be washed in hot water, the body of a dead person, and interred him in a new shroud, with hose, shirt, and a mantle, and placed a piece of money in his mouth; if he uttered a discourse in praise of the dead, or recited melancholy verses; if he emptied the pitchers, and other vessels of water, in the house of the dead person, or in those of his neighbours; if he sat behind the door of the deceased as a sign of grief, or ate fish and olives instead of meat, to honour his memory; or if he remained in his house one year after the death of any person, to prove his grief." pp. 5, 19, 20.

Thus the "New Christians," for so Jews baptized, even by compulsion, were called—were hunted, and fretted, and put to death. Their table, their nurseries, their dying pillow, were snares. Those who would, under no threats and pains, consent to be baptized, were, in 1492, ordered to leave the kingdom. They might sell their stock, and carry away their furniture, but they were not allowed to carry away gold or silver. Andrew Bernaldez, in his *History of the Catholic Kings*, says that he knew of Jews giving a house for an ass, and a vineyard for a small quantity of cloth or linen. Mariana says that eight hundred thousand Jews quitted Spain at this time. "In 1530, the Pope gave the Inquisitor-general the necessary power to absolve all the Moors of Arragon as often as they should relapse into heresy and repent, without inflicting any public penance or infamous punishments. The motives expressed in the bull for this course were, that they were much sooner converted by gentle means than severity. It is natural to inquire why a different policy was adopted with respect to the Jews?" Llorente, p. 41. The answer is, the Jews were generally rich merchants, and the Moors were generally poor. Confiscation towards Jews would greatly enrich inquisitors and tyrants; but towards the Moors it would be very unproductive.

The Inquisitors seem always to have had a great abhorrence of learning and of learned men. Greek and Hebrew they par-

ticularly hated. Nothing was a surer introduction to the dungeons than to intimate that the Vulgate did not in all things tally with the Greek and Hebrew text. "Juan de Vergara was a canon of Toledo, and had been secretary to Cardinal Ximenes de Cisneros, and to Don Alphonso de Fronseca, his successor in the see of that city. His profound knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages was the cause of his misfortune; he had remarked some faults in the translation of the Vulgate, and thus gave the signal for persecution to some monks, who had only studied Latin and the jargon of the schools." His brother, Bernardin de Tobar, was also arrested. John Louis Vives, writing to Erasmus, says: "We live in a difficult time; it is dangerous either to speak or be silent. Vergara, his brother, Bernardin de Tobar, and several other learned men, have been arrested in Spain." Alphonzo Virues, one of the best scholars, especially in oriental languages, and preacher to Charles V., was also seized. All these men were cruelly imprisoned; yet Virues was by the Pope himself afterwards made a Bishop. All learning seems to have been very odious to the Holy Office. The Colloquies of Erasmus, his Eulogy of Folly, and his Paraphrase, were put under the ban. Bibles, in the common language of the people, seem always to have been very liable to be condemned and burnt. A Spanish Bible was a monster in the eyes of the Holy Office. Perez del Prado said: "That some individuals had carried their audacity to the execrable extremity of demanding permission to read the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, without fearing to encounter mortal poison therein." "The Inquisition also prohibited pictures, medals, prints, and a number of other things with as much severity as books. Thus fans, snuff-boxes, mirrors, and other articles of furniture, were often the cause of great troubles and difficulties to those who possessed them, if they happened to be adorned with mythological figures, which might be considered as indecent." The greatest charge against any man was opposition to popish dogmas. Thus, if a man said it was not sinful to eat meat on Friday, in Lent, or on other fast-days, or that God did not establish the religious orders, or that faith and baptism are sufficient to salvation, or that Lutherans will be saved, he was undone. Llorente, pp. 27, 41, 43, 46, 47. The Supreme Inquisition has prohibited the reading of the works of Lord Bacon,

Chief Justice Hale, John Locke, Milton, Addison, Cowper, Young, Algernon Sidney, Robertson, and nearly every book of high value in English Literature. It does still prohibit them without permission from a priest. Many abstained from the perusal of such works, to avoid a disputatious, temper-provoked persecution. At one time, for a Spaniard to sell horses to a Frenchman, brought on suspicion of heresy and imprisonment. Smuggling was duly noticed by the Holy Office. Rising merit was a great offence. Writing against the Jesuits was a crime. Writing a good treatise on mathematics brought on Bails the charge of materialism and atheism. To write a truthful history of one's country, to write a poem, with the usual poetical license, to translate Buffon, or to express belief in the Newtonian system of astronomy, was ground of imprisonment and disgrace. Any act of hospitality to a suspected person was a great offence. Learning in any shape was peculiarly odious, unless it were perverted to purposes of superstition. The whole world knows how Galileo was imprisoned, and how cruelly he was treated for asserting that the world turns round. When John Quincy Adams alluded to this fact, in his address at the laying of the foundation of the Cincinnati Observatory, a writer, said to be Bishop Purcell, expressed great indignation. We read the paper at the time, but have not a copy at hand, so as to be able to say exactly how far he went in denial. But Bishop Kenrick has noticed Galileo's imprisonment by the Inquisition (p. 346) in these words: "In all cases of importance, the process was formed with the assistance of an advocate; and where the accused was of considerable standing in society, the assessor of the tribunal, and personages of high rank intervened, as in the cases of De Dominis and Galileo." It seems, then, that Galileo was imprisoned, as Bishop Kenrick admits. Nor does he intimate, nor dare he say that Galileo was charged with any other heresy than this:—the earth revolves on its own axis. Paschal, in the 18th of his Provincial Letters, addressing Father Annat, Jesuit, says: "In vain did you obtain a decree from Rome against Galileo, which condemned his opinion respecting the motion of the earth. This will never prove that it stands still; and if it has been ascertained, from careful observations, that it turns, all mankind together cannot prevent its turning, nor prevent their being carried round with it. Do not imagine

that the letters of Pope Zachary, for the excommunication of St. Virgil for asserting we had antipodes, have annihilated that new world, though he declared this opinion to be a dangerous error."

The number of victims, who fell under the cruelties of the Inquisition cannot now be ascertained. In some cases the Inquisitors became crusaders, as against the Albigenses and Waldenses, and, in field fighting, sieges, and sacking and burning cities and towns, murdered thousands upon thousands. Bishop Kenrick says that "the number of persons who have suffered death in consequence of conviction before the Inquisition, although not by the act of its officers, cannot be ascertained." Yet he says: "We may hope that the number of those who suffered is far less than a tithe of what has been alleged." The Inquisitors are justly accountable for all the assassinations, murders, civil wars and wars of extermination, which their principles, preaching and practices brought forth no less than for the deaths caused by their tortures, by their dungeons and in their *autos-da-fe*. How many too must have died of terror, of a broken heart and of madness in countries where so iron a rod was held over the people, and where when a family separated at night, it was not certain that they would ever see each other again. Although we cannot give exact numbers, yet we have data for reasonable conjectures. Llorente, whose opinion on one point Bishop Kenrick quotes as the foundation of the "hope," expressed above, says: "The horrid conduct of the holy office weakened the power and diminished the population of Spain by arresting the progress of arts, sciences, industry and commerce, and by compelling multitudes of families to abandon the kingdom; by instigating the expulsion of the Jews and Moors; and by immolating on its flaming piles more than three hundred thousand victims." Preface p. 5. In the last three pages of his work he gives various facts and records, on which rests his estimate of the number of victims at 300,000. Those, who were burned in effigy, only saved their lives by flight and suffered confiscation. In 1481 two thousand were condemned to relaxation (burning) by the Inquisitors of Seville, and there were many effigies. One thousand seven hundred persons were reconciled. The Inquisition was once established in the Navy of Spain.

Salgado, who was as far from being a Protestant as any man in America, speaking of Inquisitors, says. "Three things they are notoriously busy about. 1. They murder fellow-subjects and damn their souls. 2. They rob families and leave them to poverty and shame. 3. They scatter the people and drive them out of the kingdom; where they seize one, many run away from their cruelty, and leave their own country desolate. In three things they are more unjust than heathens. 1. Concealing of accusers. 2. Present spoiling of goods. 3. Secret prisons. In three things they act like idolaters. 1. Expecting a veneration becoming saints, while they are devils incarnate. 2. Concerning the ignominious *san-benito* (yellow shirt for convicts in the *auto-da-fé*) making it a sacred vestment. 3. Placing them with the images of their saints in their churches. In three things they act like the devil. 1. They have a prison like hell itself. 2. Familiars like fiends. 3. Torments that exceed the power of any to bear them and live. They are the worst of tyrants, in three things. 1. Forbidding all converse with any; nay, stripping them (the prisoners's) wives of their bracelets and ear-rings. 2. They are both enemies to their persons, and judges of their cause, from whom no appeal is permitted. 3. All they do against innocents is justified with this, "The Inquisition hath done it, and since (pleased them,) it must not be complained of. They are savage as the most barbarous, without respect to sex; women are badly treated by them, virgins shamefully beaten, prisoners starved, and their debts not paid out of their estates confiscated. This is the true temper of these Inquisitors; they are made up of what is worst in barbarous, tyrannical, idolatrous, heathenish, and diabolical tempers. The particular view of this court of blood casts me into an amazement, that a king, with such counsellors as assist the Spanish king, should suffer so tyrannical and cruel a power, which without much noise, and without any justice, hath eaten out the glory, strength, and vanity of that monarchy, and like a fretting moth, hath marred all that was the beauty of it."

Bishop Kenrick seems to have had this passage of Salgado, or one like it in some other author in his mind, when he wrote the following (pp. 337. 338) "Ferdinand conceived, that by means of an ecclesiastical tribunal" (the holy office) "the dissimulation of false professors could be discovered, and many

might be gained over by mild persuasions ; and that the fear of royal vengeance would deter others from returning in secret to the superstitions, which they had abjured. The event proved that his policy was correct, since, by the aid of the Inquisition, the integrity of Catholic faith was maintained, and the contrary errors rapidly disappeared. The strength of the monarchy grew with the unity of national belief, and the glory of Spain in literature, as well as in arms and enterprise, spread abroad in the reigns of Ferdinand, Charles V. and Philip II., which is admitted by the enemies of the institution to have been the golden age of the Spanish nation." So it was but other things than priestcraft and murder were the causes. The opening of the mines of the new world, the spring to commerce given by Spanish colonies, the revival of letters in countries north of Spain, and the military skill of a few eminent Spaniards were the leading causes of the rise of Spain. These causes held her up for a time, notwithstanding the Inquisition and the superstitions of her clergy and people. Indeed, Bishop K.'s very next words are: "I do not claim for the Inquisition the praise of these results, which I advert to, merely with a view to silence an oft-repeated calumny, that it crushed the energies and blunted the faculties of the Spaniards and of every other people among whom it was enacted." The above sentences are peculiar to our author, and a set of men, who, having a bad cause wishing to say something, and not knowing exactly what to say, say contradictory things. He says, 1. Ferdinand's policy was correct. 2. The praise is not due to the Inquisition, which was his policy. 3. The Bishop wishes to silence a calumny by what he admits had no part in producing good results. The truth is that such were the prodigious advantages of Spain for a while, that had the Inquisition imprisoned half the people, she would still have been a splendid kingdom, but these causes were temporary. Superstition and the Inquisition were permanent causes, and wrought the prostration of Spain. Bishop K. admits that the Inquisition was not put down in Spain till some time after the commencement of the nineteenth century, (p. 342.) Where is the glory of Spain now?

The reader is now prepared for some extended notice of the Bishop's views of the Inquisition. We are not sure that we

understand them fully. But we engage not to make anything of doubtful import by the manner of quoting it. We will first notice some of his admissions. He admits throughout this chapter that there was an institution called the Inquisition, that the popes erected, sanctioned, and controlled it, made its laws, and appointed and removed Inquisitors, that "by abandoning the convict to the secular power, the Pope virtually sanctioned the legal punishment." (p. 331). On the same page he says: "It were vain to deny that the Popes, in appointing Inquisitors, had ultimately in view to suppress heresy by the aid of the civil power, when milder means had proved unsuccessful, and that they exhorted, and, by ecclesiastical censures, compelled princes to put in execution coercive laws." On p. 333 he admits that "Inquisitors handed over apostates to the civil power" and that they, "during a long period were members of religious orders;" and on p. 334, that the Emperor Frederick II., in the 13th century "decreed that the sentence of Inquisitors should be final," and "that manichees should be delivered to the flames." This act of the Emperor surrounded the Inquisition with those terrific attributes, which cause it to be regarded with so much horror." He also admits that in Lombardy from 1238 the Friars were Inquisitors: On page 335 he says that "from the chief matter of its cognizance, which is heresy, and from the character of the judges, it is plainly an ecclesiastical tribunal," that it was only by complying with the invitation of Inquisitors to accuse themselves, that men "were exempt from capital punishment, perpetual imprisonment, banishment, and confiscation of property," that "if they" [the accused] "could not rebut the charge, a sentence of condemnation followed," and that "such as were not imprisoned, were to enlist for a time in the crusades, and on Sundays and festivals to appear in church in the garb of penitents." On p. 336 he says: "Heretics condemned to death or perpetual imprisonment forfeited their property to the public treasury," and that "although no one suffered death by the decree of the Inquisitors, it cannot be questioned that many, convicted by their sentence, perished in the flames by the action of the civil authority; and the odium of these executions is necessarily shared by them." On pp. 341-2 he says that "the Pope, whose office as guardian of the faith constitutes him Supreme Inquisitor, presides (in the Supreme Inquisition) when

causes of high importance are under consideration, and decides them, with the advice of the council." On p. 343 he admits "the secrecy observed in this tribunal," and says it "was intended to prevent the loss of character, if the accused should be acquitted, or should abjure his errors, and to avoid excitement, and secure the ends of justice." "The ends of justice secured" by not letting a man know who his accusers were. On the same page he admits that "all the officers of the Inquisition and the accuser, culprit, witnesses and advocate were bound to secrecy." On the next page he says that "the day, and precise hour or room might be omitted" (in the process) "if these particulars were likely to lead to the discovery of the informant," and on the next, that "the solemnities of public trials were omitted, and the trial was summary and informal," and that if the accused "denied" the general charge, "the specific charge was communicated, without revealing his accuser." On pp. 346, 347, he admits that the rack was used, that the use of it "was borrowed from the ancient Greeks and Romans," and that "it was resorted to where strong presumptive evidence of heinous guilt had been received," and says, it was confined to such cases. The reader can look at the case of Jane Bohorques, and at hundreds of others, and see the exception here made is not sustained. He also says: "The threat of torture was frequently used without its actual application," and refers to Limborch for proof. Fine work this for priors, Dominicans, Franciscans, Cistercians, and Bishops to threaten people with the torture. He admits that one or more Inquisitors were present when the accused was tortured. He says that the Popes "gave prompt redress when any abuse came to their knowledge." We might ask what redress was sufficiently prompt, when the man was dead or his constitution destroyed? Besides, how was any abuse to come to his knowledge? The whole affair was in secret, and every one, culprit included, sworn to secrecy? On page 350 he quotes with approbation Macanaz as asserting that the torture was not applied until "after condemnation." But every body knows that this was not true. The Bishop himself has before admitted that it was applied where "strong presumptive proof" existed. But suppose a man condemned to death. Why torture him?

The foregoing admissions of Bishop K. are enough to brand

the Inquisitors, their bailiffs, their code, their favourers, their patrons, the Popes, with the blackest infamy forever. He is an enemy of human freedom and of man, who does not say so. Had Bishop K. said so, we should have felt that he at least loved his race and rejoiced in their happiness. But instead of this or any thing like it he becomes the apologist for these horrible men and their horrible practices. With him Innocent III. is an "energetic Pontiff," (p. 331) and on page 228, he speaks with perfect coolness of "the strong arm of Cæsar Borgia crushing the high pretensions of the princes or barons." His first defence, or excuse, or apology is (p. 331) that the Inquisitors "did not pronounce sentence of death." Yet he has admitted that their sentence was final. Then they delivered men up to be put to death without sentence! It is true, however, that the Inquisition, by its officers, arrested, put in jail, tortured, tried, pronounced something called "condemnation" by Bishop K., and the civil government came in and acted as hangman or rather burner. Suppose the prince had not declared heresy a crime, the Inquisitors would have told the Pope, and the Pope would have denounced "ecclesiastical censures" on him as the bishop has admitted. Then his kingdom would have been taken from him, unless he had repented and helped to exterminate heretics. If any subordinate magistrate had refused his aid, he would soon have found himself in the jail of the Inquisition, as one "suspected of heresy." We know, all the world knows that the Pope ruled princes and people. "He exalted himself above all that is called God." Besides, who were the princes that passed and executed these cruel laws but those who held the Pope's stirrup when he went to mount his horse, or kissed his toe when they came into his presence? The truth is this; no body of men on earth ever had an institution like the Inquisition but the Pope and Church of Rome and their adherents. Among them they have managed to murder hundreds of thousands of peaceable people. There the burden rests, nor can any thing remove this just charge. The second excuse is that "the Fiscal Promoter, that is the prosecuting officer must swear that none of the heads of accusation proceeds from a malicious design." (p. 334.) On this we observe that this officer is very well named Fiscal Promoter. It was his duty to promote the income by confiscations. Oaths

of office are but slight in their influence over bad men, whose trade is crime and cruelty. The Jesuit confessors could easily furnish a distinction between a "malicious design" and a covetous motive. So that if he did not hate a man outright, yet if he wanted his money, that was enough. And the informer might be malicious and the Fiscal Promoter not know it. As all was secret, there was no chance to prove malice, unless your enemy had been openly malicious, and you could guess who accused you. We have already noticed perhaps another apology on page 347, though for another purpose. It is that, "the threat of torture was frequently used, without its actual application." The reader must make his own comments on this. Another statement (p. 348,) is that the sick in the dungeons were allowed "a surgeon and physician, and the dying a confessor." What kind people. Yet Bishop K. on the previous page puts a note of admiration (!) to the sentence, in which he informs us that "some in the prison at Madrid complained to the Pope, as of a great privation, that a priest was not sent to celebrate mass for them!" But says the Bishop, (p. 349,) "the sentence of the Inquisition in the worst cases was to abandon the convict to the civil power, which was accompanied by a recommendation of mercy." Yet the Bishop knows, as well as we do, that this recommendation of mercy was a mere form, that it was made in all cases, and granted in none. Indeed the Bishop immediately adds: "This abandonment was made with a knowledge that the laws enjoined death for the crime, but the expression of the ecclesiastical judge was intended to show the reluctance with which the church beholds the shedding of human blood, according to the known maxim: *Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine.*" It seems then it was all "intended for show," and not to save life. The prince who should have pardoned one condemned to relaxation, would have found himself very speedily in bad odour with the Pope. Bishop K. knows this; all reading men know it. But says the Bishop, (p. 351,) "It is just to take into consideration the outrages and civil wars which have been prevented by the Inquisition." Yet he cannot show, because none but God knows what would have been, if there had been no Inquisition. He says as much himself. For when he comes to tell us what mighty mischiefs would have happened to Spain and Italy in the sixteenth century but for the holy office, de-

gency compels him to qualify it with a "probably." So that plea is "probably" good for nothing. Indeed the Bishop had just before quoted Llorente as acknowledging that the severity of the Inquisition abated in the fourteenth century. How it could do much in the sixteenth century then, he does not tell us. Besides, the Bishop does not seem to think this a very good way of reasoning, and we agree with him. He soon adds: "The prevention of calamities the most direful cannot, indeed, justify a law, which creates an imaginary offence; but heresy was not in former ages a mere error of the mind." Even that assertion is, if possible, surpassed by the last sentence of a paragraph on page 353. "The mercy of the Inquisition to penitent convicts is without parallel in any other tribunal." But says Bishop K., on the same page, "the general esteem in which the tribunal was held, does not suffer us to suppose that it was generally unjust or cruel. It was deemed a high honour to be numbered among its familiars or bailiffs. No one dares oppose the executor. If any one should, the mob would immediately run together to lend a helping hand," &c. Does the Bishop mean to say that an ignorant, priest-ridden mob, who hate men of standing and wealth, and who see an engine for pulling down the great to their own level, are good judges of what is unjust or cruel? As to the "general esteem," in which it was held, it is enough to say that it drove millions of people out of Spain, and sent three hundred thousand to eternity, and confiscated their estates.

The following sentences we forbear to characterize. They are so foreign from historical verity, that we simply quote them: "The Inquisition is not directed to the punishment of heretics, but rather to their conversion," (p. 329.) "It will be found on examination that it was generally in cases where the order of society was disturbed by acts of violence the severity of those times was exercised," (p. 332.) "The great and distinctive characteristic of the Inquisition, as an ecclesiastical tribunal, was its endeavour to reclaim heretics by persuasion and the assurance of pardon." "Avowed heretics were to be secretly examined in presence of a select number of prudent Catholics, and by mildness induced to abjure their errors," (p. 335.) "Every extenuating circumstance was brought forward, every motive for doubt was alleged, every thing unfavourable to the accuser,

and favourable to the accused was considered; and if the evidence were not altogether conclusive, time was taken for further inquiry," (p. 343.) "Cavils and mere technicalities had no place in the process, but facts and justice were always held in view," (p. 345.) "The accused was encouraged to defend himself freely." "The advocate aided the prisoner by his advice, and undertook his defence sincerely and earnestly." "Full liberty of conversing (with the advocate) and writing was allowed." "The process was conducted with the strictest regard to truth: the most patient attention was given to every circumstance that could militate in behalf of the accused; and conviction followed only when all doubt of guilt had vanished," (p. 346.)

The Bishop certainly undertook a very difficult work when he engaged to excuse the Inquisition. On page 337, he asserts that "the Inquisition itself, as a permanent and organized tribunal, scarcely existed before the close of the fifteenth century." On page 331 he admits that Inquisitors were appointed by Innocent III. and we know from the Bishop's own catalogue of the Popes, given at the end of his book, that Innocent III. sat from the 8th of January, 1198, until the 16th of July, 1216, yet to contradict both of these assertions, he has told us on page 350, that the severity of the Inquisition abated in the fourteenth century. How are these statements to be reconciled?

But the Bishop now and then waxes bold. He tells us on page 340 of the wonderful effects of force in converting men's souls. He says: "Many, no doubt, will deny the right of influencing religious opinions by allurements, or by terror, and will be disposed to regard the conformity produced in either way, as superficial and illusive; but as St. Augustine, in his day, testified that whole cities, Hippo among others, had passed sincerely from Donatism to the profession of the Catholic faith, under the terror of the Cæsarean laws, so history records the sincere and lasting conversion of thousands, who were terrified by the fear of civil punishment, and won by the proffer of pardon. Thirty thousand obtained pardon in Andalusia within the space of forty years, from 1481 to 1520, by availing themselves of the time of grace, and spontaneously abjuring their errors."

The following are specimens of ghostly whining which we have seldom seen equalled. He says: "The most beautiful

examples of a Christian spirit have been left by several of the Inquisitors. He then tells the story of St. Peter *de Castro novo*, and of St. Peter of Verona, two most furious and fanatical Inquisitors, who fell by the hand of assassins, one of whom dying prayed for his murderer, and the other dying recited the Apostles' creed. These are the chief proofs of their wonderful piety. pp. 333 334. But says the Bishop, "The Inquisitor and Counsellors began the examination (of the accused) with solemn prayer on bended knees, using the same formulary as is prescribed for the councils: '*Adsumus Domine*;' asking that in nothing they might deviate from the truth, but in all things preserve justice moderated by piety." p. 345. Such forms of devotion, when used to gloss over with a show of sanctity, the most cruel conduct, only serve to enhance its atrocity. After all this, our readers may be surprised to see the Bishop saying, on page 336, "For my own part, I am horrified with these awful exhibitions, whatever occasion may have been offered for them by the unhappy sufferers." The Bishop is horrified! but where does he put the blame? is the main question. So far as he puts it anywhere he puts it upon the "unhappy sufferers." On page 339 he waxes a little more bold and says, "that the religious unity and civil concord which the Inquisition maintained, were the panegyrics of national writers, during the whole period of its existence, and St. Theresa and St. Ignatius, of Loyola, and other holy persons, commended its influence and results. It rose with the Spanish monarchy, and gave it strength and durability; it fell by the act of a foreign military despot, and by the conspiracy of men false to their country and religion. It requires no depth of understanding to perceive that it was a Machiavelian stroke of policy to remove this guardian of the national faith, in order that with discordant sects and infidelity, disunion and strife might pervade the land, and Spaniards might lend a willing ear to the syren tones of the stranger, who, in the name of liberty, was seeking to enslave and oppress them." On page 352, he says, "In regard to the Inquisition, the Popes are fairly responsible for its origin and organization as an ecclesiastical tribunal, and they may be considered as approving the civil jurisprudence of the age, by which heresy was declared a capital crime." We thank you for the admission. What evidence can you give us that Popery has changed

in this respect, and has ceased to be persecuting in its spirit?

In the last paragraph but two, the Bishop says: "I abandon to the censure of the age, the principle on which the Inquisition was based, namely that heresy is a crime against society, punishable by civil penalties, and even by death." p. 353. Bishop K. is very nice in the selection of his words on some occasions. He is so here. He "abandons" the principle. A man may abandon a cause for two reasons; first, because it endangers something of more value, or secondly because he thinks it wicked. Not a word does the Bishop say, which intimates that he regards it sinful to punish men with death for heresy. He is "horrified!" But he does not condemn the Inquisition. He "abandons the principle," not because he thinks it wicked, but because Americans will not endure an open and stout defence.

In the last paragraph, p. 354. Bishop K. says, "If I cannot hope to relieve the memory of the Popes of the odium which has been cast on it, it should be shared with their age; and they should be credited for their efforts to secure mercy for the penitent." The Bishop's last sentence is in these words; "In whatsoever way it may please us to account for the change of civil jurisprudence, and of general sentiment, it is not just to embitter social feelings, by recalling the severity, or the cruelty of an institution, which has passed away, but acquiescing in the humane and liberal sentiments and laws of our own age, we should cherish kind feelings towards one another, and avoid all occasions of religious strife, which is most baneful to the common peace and weal."

The Bishop is very careful not to intimate any opinion as to the desireableness, on the whole, of the tolerant spirit of this age, over the spirit of the days of persecution. We account for the change in favour of freedom by the spread of the great Protestant principle of the right of private judgment. The utmost the Bishop seems willing to do is simply to "acquiesce" in the humane and liberal sentiments and laws of our own age. Protestants go further. They vindicate and glory in them. Let them never cease to do it. We like the Bishop's exhortation to "cherish kind feelings towards one another, and avoid all occasions of religious strife." But would it not come with a far better grace from him if he had not written twenty-five octavo pages for the purpose of defending, or excusing, or justifying

an institution founded, and through all its history conducted on principles of deep and essential malignity.

We do not hesitate to recommend Bishop K.'s book to all those faithful men, who are called to defend the truth in this land against papal superstitions and despotism. It will furnish them with powerful weapons of war. Its admissions are fatal to Popery.

---

ART. III.—1. *Baptism, with Reference to its Import and Modes.* By Edward Beecher, D.D. New York: John Wiley. 1849. 12mo. pp. 342.

2. *Infant Baptism a Scriptural Service, and Dipping unnecessary to its Right Administration; containing a Critical survey of the leading Evidence, Classical, Biblical, and Patristic; with special reference to the work of Dr. Carson, and occasional strictures on the views of Dr. Halley.* By the Rev. Robert Wilson, Professor of Sacred Literature for the General Assembly, Royal College, Belfast. London. 1848. pp. 534.

THE titles given above are those of the two most recent works of importance on the Baptist Controversy. The one first named treats only of the Mode, the other of both the Mode and the subjects of Baptism. But as Professor Wilson's work came to our hands after we had laid aside the former treatise for notice, we shall still confine ourselves to that branch of the subject which they treat in common.

Several considerations have led us to take a special interest in the labours of Dr. Beecher: the importance of the subject, the fact that the work has been done by a countryman of ours, and the additional fact that it has brought down upon him a shower of insolent vituperation as gratuitous as it is unchristian. We are no champions for Dr. Beecher; we disagree with him in some points; and he is well able to answer for himself: but we take pleasure in testifying that he has performed his task with the erudition of a scholar and the spirit of a Christian.

The First Part, occupying fifty-four pages of the present volume, originally appeared in the *Biblical Repository* of New