

his attention to gigantic military movements and the opening out of struggles with the other nations, might look to the internal government of his own land and strive to put into practice—for the benefit of Russia, the Russians and the Czar—the lessons that he learned when abroad amongst the peoples of the earth. It does not absolutely follow that because the present Czar has been inclined to a policy of peace that his successor should necessarily be warlike. In fact we fail to see how those numerous correspondents of the great daily press of England and America can form any just estimate of the Czar's intentions or probable course. Still it is evident that France—so recently clinging around the neck of the Northern Bear and striving to keep the monster from using his paws—looks on with some anxiety and anticipates nothing good in the expected death of the Czar.

We are under the serious impression that no matter what dispositioned monarch rules in Russia, the day is not distant when that land will be swept by a political hurricane far more terrific than the storm which recently ploughed up the Sea of Asov.

### THE INQUISITION.

We have been writing about Galileo and St. Bartholomew, and we think that in the short space at our disposal we have most clearly shown that the accusations brought against the Catholic Church, in both cases, are entirely unfounded in fact. This week we will take up, in a few words as possible, that other "big gun" that is constantly turned against the Church of Rome—the Inquisition. In the first place we purpose dealing with the subject exactly as we did with the other two. We do not pretend for a moment to excuse individual Catholics for any wrongs they have done, no matter by what circumstances they were surrounded. While circumstances may often seem an excuse to deeds that might not be justifiable, still we are not pleading the cause of persons. If Catholics have ever committed wrongs, they are not to be excused on the ground that they belong to a certain Church; but the Church is not to be held responsible for them, simply because they happen to claim communion with her. We do not mean by this that we have any special accusations to lodge against members of our Church—far from it; we simply wish to again emphasise the difference between the practice of individuals and the precepts of the Church.

In order to get to the bottom of this vexed question of the Inquisition, we must firstly find out what was the object of that institution. History shows most clearly that it was founded by a Spanish King for a certain purpose. What was that purpose? It was two-fold; to resist the treason of Judaism and Islamism, and to oppose the immoralities of the Manicheans or Albigenses. We know that the social order of the Spanish Kingdom was endangered considerably by the combined efforts of Judaism and Islamism; while the Albigenses or Manicheans did all in their power to corrupt and degrade the morals of the people. Some of their teachings were the assertion that Christ was an evil being, that marriage was a sin and that the begetting of children was contrary to the law of nature. It is easy to foresee what results would follow if such doctrines were allowed to grow.

It is notorious that these people lost no opportunity of murdering—publicly and privately—the clergy, and of destroying Church property on all sides. Mosheim says: "Their shocking violation of decency was a consequence of their per-

nicious system; they looked upon decency and modesty as marks of inward corruption." The Council of Lateran, 1179, affirmed: "They respect neither the Church nor the monasteries; they spare neither orphans, age or sex." Nearly every power in Europe sent an envoy to the Council to aid in securing the obliteration of that sect—not on account of any heresy it taught, but on account of the immoral practices it created. The action of the Council in condemning them was considered on all sides as a measure for the safety of the public. The Church was not alone in this; all Europe combined to stamp out the abominable preachers of the most unholy of doctrines. If this can be called "religious persecution," then it was well for the world, at that time, that it was inaugurated. But it was far from being a religious persecution; it was a moral purification.

Taking the Inquisition in Spain—when it is generally supposed to have been the most powerful and cruel—it was not an entirely ecclesiastical institution; nor did it punish or condemn people for their opinions. It was a royal tribunal. There were thirteen laymen and two clergymen on the board of the Inquisition. And the records show that the two representatives of the ecclesiastical section were always in favor of a greater mercy. As an evidence that the teachings as well as practice of the Church are antagonistic to persecution, or to bloodshed, we have the powerful fact, staring us for centuries in the face, that the Church will not admit any man to the priesthood who has in any way been connected with the death of a fellow-being. A person who has participated in the execution of a sentence of death, as judge, as executioner, or as assistant in any form, cannot be ordained by the Church. And when the Jews were persecuted in almost every land and driven from almost every city in Europe, it was only in Rome that they found refuge and protection. The truth is that the Inquisition was actually a gigantic political engine, used by the state, in days when a species of barbarism was abroad in the world, when undercurrents of treason were rendering treacherous the streams of nationality, and when men in power trembled for their safety, to protect itself against the dangers that sprang up in all directions. Very naturally, when such sects as the Albigenses came upon the scene, the Church was interested—for the sake of public morals—to aid in checking them, and the State was only too glad to associate, with its officers, members of the ecclesiastical branch who could aid by their advice in the carrying on of the work for which the tribunal was created. And if, at times, the judgments were what to our modern eyes appears severe, it was invariably found that the ecclesiastical members of the court were against the severity. Guizot said: "L'Inquisition fut, d'abord, plus politique que religieuse; et destinée à maintenir l'ordre, plutôt qu'à défendre la foi."

One of the principal accusations is based upon the fact that Jews were punished by the tribunal. The author—Mr. Marshall—from whose synopsis of these questions we have quoted, says: "Accordingly the Inquisition only punished those relapsed Jews who persisted in trying to corrupt Christians; nor did it punish them at all, if they would repent; it even allowed them to leave Spain, though it did not suffer them to remain in Spain except on the assurance that they would be harmless. What other tribunal in the world ever dealt so leniently with rebels? What other tribunal ever said to a law-breaker,

"you can do penance if you will, you can frequent the sacraments, you can hear Mass; and if you do so, you shall be allowed to go scot free; but should you persist in your intention of breaking the law you shall either be banished or imprisoned?" The Count de Maistre considered the Inquisition "the most lenient tribunal in Europe." Montalembert said that "its compassion and forgiveness were always pushed to the farthest possible point." Marshall says again: "We should insist then, that neither in object nor in process, neither in spirit nor in act, neither in its beginning nor in its ultimate development, did the Inquisition—so far as Catholic authority was concerned—sanction religious persecution. And towards the end of its history, when the Popes ascertained that there was a danger of its original purpose being abused, they requested that it should cease altogether."

There are several other points from which we would like to treat this question, and which we shall take up in future articles. For this week, however, we must confine ourselves to the general statements above written. Therefore we repeat that the Inquisition was originally, and ever principally, a political institution. But it gave a very good pretext to the enemies of Catholicity to use its judgments as arguments against the Church. And as far as the ecclesiastical connection with the tribunal is concerned, cannot we say: since the Church is the sole depository and interpreter of revealed divine truth on earth, ought she not use every legitimate means to prevent the propagation of error? Yet the Inquisition never sought to force a profession of Christianity on infidels or Jews; in order that heresy should be punishable, it was necessary that a sufficiently instructed Christian should persevere in error, and manifest in action his opposition to the authority of the Church. To show that the crimes punished by the Inquisition were considered as civil and not religious, we will quote from the "Maestruzza"—a summary on the Sacraments and Commandments, written in 1338 for the use of the inquisitors, by the Dominican Bartholomew de San Concordio. With this we will close for this week. It runs thus: "According to the civil law, soothsayers and witches should be burned; but, according to the Church, they should be deprived of Communion, if their crime be notorious; if it is secret, they should receive a penance of forty days. (C. 42.) The inquisitors cannot interfere with soothsayers and sorcerers, unless heresy is plainly to be feared. Those who relapse into heresy after having abjured it, should be delivered to the secular power, (C. 91)." The inquisitor had only to declare the person a heretic and separated from the Church; from that moment the State took him in hand.

### THEOBALD MATHEW.

This is the 104th anniversary of the famous Irish apostle of temperance, the Rev. Theobald Mathew. In the course of his life that wonderful priest, patriot and reformer, administered the total abstinence pledge to over five millions of people. Perhaps in the annals of the world no greater reformer ever arose than Father Mathew. When the Christian faith was persecuted in the East and the tomb of Christ was under the heel of Mahometanism, it became necessary to awaken Christendom to a sense of the insults hurled against the Redeemer and the degradation to which the members of the Church, in the far Orient were reduced, God at once stirred up a man in the land, and Peter the Hermit went

forth, and with potent voice made Europe ring with the dangers that menaced Christianity.

The result was the mighty crusades that have caused so many brilliant historic pages to be written, and which proved to the world the power of faith. It was even so, when the infidel and destructive influence of alcohol swept over the land, took possession of the race of men, and succeeded in wrenching Christians from the tomb of the Savior in whom they alone found salvation, that the same Almighty Power was exercised, and that His Eternal arm was stretched forth to save humanity.

As of old He raised up Moses to guide the erring Israelites through the Desert of Sin; as he raised up Peter the Hermit to stir into life the latent Christian energies of monarch and peasant; so did He raise up Theobald Mathew to carry abroad the banner of temperance and to crush forever the hydra of drink that was poisoning the aspirations of youth and the hopes of age.

What a magnificent apostle was Father Mathew. Alone; with his cross in one hand and his pledge badge in the other, he went forth into the byways and highways of the land and checked the demon at its every step, and inculcated those grand, God-inspired, lofty principles of temperance that serve to make man a human being, breathing the spirit of God, his Creator, and not a mere creature reduced to the degradation of the brutes. Irrespective of creed, the name of Father Mathew shall go thundering down the vestibule of time. Of all the great reformers, certainly he was one of the mightiest, and God blessed his work and will eternally bless all who aid in its continuation and propagation! In our next issue we will speak more fully on this subject. But this being the anniversary we cannot allow it to pass without saying at least a word in honor of the noble Catholic Irish advocate and apostle of temperance.

FATHER DENIS MURPHY, S.J., whose name has long been connected with important work in the field of Irish history, has issued a little volume that will certainly be most instructive and useful. It is a sketch of Irish history from the year 2680, before Christ, down to the year 1893 of our era. The volume is small, but most complete. It is in the form of short paragraphs, each one upon a special topic. It is a chronicle of events, without comment, criticism, or bias. It will surely be acceptable amongst all those readers who have preconceived prejudices regarding Ireland and her history. We trust that this careful compendium will receive strong encouragement, a hearty welcome and a deserved success.

EVEN in France, infidel as the country's government is to-day, there are at times some glowing examples of credit done to those heroic workers in the field of existence—the nuns of the Catholic Church. At Pau, recently, the funeral honors paid to the deceased Sister Eufasia, Superiress of the Sisters of Charity, in that city, gave evidence of the respect and affection in which the illustrious religious was held by the people. A company of infantry, with flag and band, rendered military honors—for Sister Eufasia belonged to the Order of the Legion of Honor. Badges of mourning were worn by the most eminent civil and military authorities and the Mayor of Pau pronounced a glowing funeral ovation. It was a scene worthy the Ages of Faith.

The creation of a Legation of the Argentine Republic to the Holy See is affirmed to be immediately expected.