

lic subjects. England the land of the free! Catholic Emancipation is not yet a quarter of a century old! England the land of the free! The whole tyranny of the Inquisition, though without its order, was introduced into the Kingdom. Not one English Catholic member elected to the British House of Commons.

NOT DISLOYAL.

But let no one for a moment suppose that in denouncing the intolerance of our English Inquisition, I am disloyal to the land of my birth. No! It is the English Inquisition that has subverted the institutions of my country, and therefore I denounce it. No! I love England; and because I love her, would cut her to the quick in order to make her more just and more fair to her Catholic subjects. I love her, and because I love her, I would open to her, that first page of her history, which charlatan historians seek to hide from her view.

COMPARISON.

The Spanish Inquisition extended from the year 1481 (when Ferdinand and Isabella reigned in Spain—Richard III, in England—and Sixtus IV. held the Papal throne) until its final abolition by the Pope in the beginning of the present century. The English Inquisition extends from the year (1531) when the Parliament of England declared the uxorious Henry its Pope, down to the dis-establishment of the Irish Church—or indeed down to the present moment, since its penal laws still stand unrepealed upon our statute books, and new ones are being made from time to time.

1st. You are each and every one of you guilty of high treason, and liable to be hanged bowelled and quartered—all ye good people who have rosary beads in your hands or reliquaries in your possession. (This is an old law.)

2d. Every priest in England, who for the comfort of his toes wears a coat down to his ankles, is liable to pay a fine or go to prison. (This is a new law, not 30 years old.)

3d. I am guilty of a crime every time I say to an English Catholic Bishop! "My Lord Salford—my Lord Shrewsbury," or the like; and letters thus addressed will not be delivered at the Post Office.

Does not the English Inquisition still exist in England?

The Spanish Inquisition may be divided into three periods.

1st. As used against the Saracens and Jews.

2d. As used to prevent the introduction of Protestantism into Spain.

3d. As used to prevent the introduction of the infidel works of Voltaire.

1st. Its use against the Jews and Saracens, as well as against Voltaire, was prompted by a deep reverence for revealed religion and the divine principles of Christianity; and like the Temperance movement of the present day, was an appeal to legislation, where legislation has no locus standi.

2d. Its use against the introduction of Protestantism into Spain is vindicated by every act of the English Inquisition. If Protestantism was only to be introduced into Spain by means of the same atrocities which attended its introduction into England, Protestantism had no right in Spain, and the Spanish Inquisition did well in repelling it. It was only indeed one inquisition preventing the introduction of another.

And herein is one of the differences of the two inquisitions. 1st. The Spanish was used in preserving the institutions of the country. The English in subverting them.

2d. The Spanish was conservative; the English revolutionary. 3d. The Spanish was the strong hand of law maintaining order—the English was the usurping hand of tyranny introducing bad laws.

4th. The Spanish was the will of the majority binding the minority. The English was the will of the minority binding the majority.

RECENT EVENTS.

The question of the Inquisition, old as it is and as we supposed dead, assumes fresh importance from recent events. Bismarck in Germany and the liberals of Italy and Switzerland have revived it. But with this improvement. The Spanish and English Inquisitions gave some sort of trial at least to the accused. Bismarck and the Italian liberals dispense with all this. When Dr. Hurley—a resolute member—was condemned to death after the torture of the tin boots, the English inquisition, failing the ordinary laws of the country, invoked at least the convenient aid of Martial Law. Our modern Inquisitors are not so sensitive. Bismarck banishes the Jesuits of Germany, without even the formality of a specific accusation. It is wonderful how history repeats itself—like the ebb and flow of a mighty tide events come and go, and return again. The English Inquisition, with its fines and imprisonments, and confiscations, is recurring again in Germany; and English noblemen and English prelates are found to applaud its coming. Verily, the English Inquisition is worse than the Spanish, if in naught else but its long-livedness.

THE RACK.

Allow me to introduce to you that amiable piece of torture, the rack. I am induced to do so, because English historians of sensational tendencies tell us (with a delightful innocence) that the ships of the Spanish Armada were loaded with racks, wherewith English Protestants were to be tortured into Catholicity by the officers of the Holy Spanish Inquisition. If this assertion be true (and as the said ships are still at the bottom of the sea, I see no way of disproving it), it is of no small importance, as showing the Spanish Inquisition's ignorance of "rights merrie England" under Good Queen Bess. Had the Holy Inquisitors of Spain entertained any such design as that of racking Englishmen into orthodoxy, they might have saved themselves the trouble of transporting these cumbersome machines, as they would have found on landing that our English Inquisition had already a plentiful supply on hand, of most approved pattern, in excellent order and daily use. The rack made of best English oak had been for years in full play under the able direction of the Reverend Fathers of the English Inquisition racking poor Papists into Protestantism.

Picture to yourself a young and beautiful woman lying upon her back upon a prison floor (wo shall meet with a case of the kind just now), her tender hands bound together by a long cord, whilst a similar cord binds her feet; above her, raised about 3 feet from the ground and some 7 or 8 feet apart are two rollers attached to a heavy frame of oak. Round these rollers the executioners have wound the ends of the ropes that bind the maiden's feet and hands: one rope round one roller; the other rope round the other roller. Levers are attached to the rollers, and strong men hold themselves in readiness for the word of command. The officer on duty gives the word—the rollers revolve—the cords shorten—the body of this tender woman rises in the air until it is stretched out as a banner on a level with the top beam of the frame. Questions

are now put, and if not found satisfactory, the levers are again set in motion, the cords tighten, the sinews of the poor victim's body crack, and the bones of the arms and legs are torn out of their sockets. Such is the torture of the Rack.

1. When Father Campion was being put to the rack by the English Inquisitors, the executioners facetiously remarked that a little more would make the good Father six inches taller.

2. When Ann Ascue was being tortured, the Chancellor ordered the Lieutenant of the Tower to stretch the rack still further; but as that officer refused, the Chancellor took the matter in hand himself so energetically, that he almost tore her body asunder. I am aware that Dr. Lingard throws discredit upon this story, though I think on insufficient grounds. He asserts, on the authority of Jardine, that there is no example in history of a woman being put on the rack. I hope it is so; but I give it on the authority of Hume. If he is correct, we must put it down to the extra severity of the English Inquisition.

OBJECTION.

"Oh! but Ann Ascue suffered under Henry VIII., and he was a Papist." Well, really, my dear sir, I hope you are not going to throw this amiable gentleman of so many wifes and such pronounced opinions back upon our hands. We don't want him, I can assure you. Nor have you any right to discard him. When King Hal (of happy memory) put Ann Ascue to death, he had already begun the work of the "Glorious Reformation" (after his own peculiar way), and appears to me to have been, at that time, one of the most splendid specimens of "your modern liberals" extant. He held the State to be above the Church; and, like Bismarck, he was determined (all your Tudors were determined) to make it so. Keep him, my dear Mr. Critic; I pray you, keep him. He had "liberal ideas," and you are welcome to him.

THE SCAVENGER'S DAUGHTER.

The second engine of torture used by the English Inquisition upon poor Papists to make them appreciate Protestantism was the Scavenger's Daughter. Under this mode of torture the victim was first doubled up (or trebled up, if I may use the expression) and then bound with an iron hoop, like a bundle of shingles. In this condition he was left upon the prison floor. From Rishton's Diary we learn that, on the 10th December, 1580, Thomas Cottam and Luke Kerbye, prisoners in the Tower of London (I am intimately acquainted with the relations of these men) suffered compression in the Scavenger's Daughter for more than an hour for the heinous crime of being Priests. Cottam bled profusely from the nose.

IRON GAUNTLETS.

Another engine of torture was the Iron Gauntlets. Under this torture the victim was held suspended with his arms stretched out in the air from bracelets screwed tightly round the wrists. Priest White, lying in bedwell on the testimony of Topoliff (the Priest hunter), besides other cruel treatment, was hung up for eight hours together by the hands in iron manacles to oblige him to confess in whose houses he had said Mass. Father Gerard, another sufferer, thus describes the sensation: "I felt the chief pain in my breast, belly, arms and hands. I thought that all the blood in my body had run into my arms and began to burst out of my finger-ends. This was a mistake; but the arms swelled till the gauntlets were buried within the flesh. Thus I continued hanging for the space of five hours, during which time I fainted eight or nine times."

LITTLE EASE.

The fourth kind of torture used by the English Inquisition was a cell called "Little Ease." This cell was so small that the prisoner could neither stand, sit nor lie down in it. He was compelled to draw himself up in a squatting position and thus remain many days.

TIN BOOTS.

Whether we must put the Tin Boots down to the account of the English Inquisition I know not. Certain it is they were used in Ireland on Dr. Hurley; and as the invention was sent there from England, the probability is they were already in use there. Any way, we shall be safe, I think, in putting them down as a

SPORADIC VARIETY.

Of the four ordinary kinds of torture—the rack is common to both Inquisitions. The Scavenger's Daughter, the Iron Bracelets, Little Ease are, I believe, peculiar to the English. Of the comparative severity of the two Inquisitions in the matter of prison accommodation we may form a certain idea from two facts.

1st. When Galileo was confined in the Italian Inquisition he was never put to the torture (of that we are now certain), and he had the best apartments of the palace assigned him. Nay, part of the time he was visiting a Cardinal friend.

2d. When Father Gerard was seized by the English Inquisition, he was kept for weeks in the cell—Little Ease—until he was overrun with vermin and stifled with stench.

FREQUENCY OF TORTURE.

Of the frequency of these tortures some idea may be gained from Rishton's Diary of the doings in the Tower during his short stay.

1st. 1570, Dec. 10th. Thomas Cottam and Luke Kerbye, priests suffered compression in the Scavenger's Daughter for more than an hour. Cottam bled profusely from the nose.

2d. Five days later Ralph Sherwine and Robert Johnson, priests; were severely tortured on the rack. Next day Ralph Sherwine was tortured a second time.

3d. Sixteen days later John Hart, priest, who had been chained five days to the floor, was led to the rack. Also Henry Orton, a lay gentleman.

4th. Three days later Christopher Tompson, an aged priest, was brought to the Tower and racked the same day.

5th. Eleven days later Nicholas Roscaroe, a lay gentleman was racked. Pretty good, for a single month, in jail, in a single city of England. Truly poor Catholics must have had torture sufficient to make them esteem most deeply the heaven-born principles of the "Glorious Reformation."

Of the comparative frequency of torture Cobbett says:—"From its first establishment to the present hour the (Spanish) Inquisition has not committed so much cruelty as this ferocious Apostate committed in any single year of the 43rd of her reign."

"Making allowance for Cobbett's declamatory style there is a certain degree of truth in this!" So far then for the different modes of Torture used by the English Inquisition in its attempt to convert poor Papists. Let us now see what punishments it had in store for Papists or Recusants as they were termed: (or as Calvin called them "Stubborn people in the superstition of the Antichrist of Rome.")

TWO MODES.

The English Inquisition had two modes of capital punishment—the one common to it and the Spanish Inquisition—the other peculiarly its own. They were the stake and the halter.

THE STAKE.

The stake or death by burning was the punishment peculiar to Heresy in those ages, and is a disgrace to Christendom. It was common to both Inquisitions, but to the credit of Catholicity be it said that Protestant England and Puritan Massachusetts preserved it for the punishment of witches and heretics long after it had been forgotten by the Catholic nations. The English Inquisition used it freely.

In 1533 it was death by burning to be guilty of heresy (the Inquisition being orthodox) and to refuse to recant.

In 1543 it was death by burning to preach anything against the King's instructions, made or to be made.

In 1543 Ann Kymo (Ascou), Adam, a tailor, Ot-

terden, Priest, and Lascelles, a gentleman at court, were all burned for holding opinions on the Blessed Eucharist, different from those held by the Grand Inquisitor and Head of the English Church.

The historian Hume points out in this condemnation one difference between the English and Spanish Inquisitions, which does not certainly redound to the credit of the English. In the Spanish Inquisition mercy and acquittal always followed recantation or a promise of silence. In the English Inquisition this was not the case.

"The denial of the Real presence in the Eucharist subjected the person to death by fire and to the same forfeitures as in cases of treason, and admitted not the privilege of abjuring—an unheard of severity and unknown to the (Spanish) Inquisition."

In 1538, Stowe tells us, John Nicholson, a priest condemned for holding an opinion against the bodily presence of Christ, had judgment at the King's mouth and was burned at Smithfield.

In Henry's condemnation of Lambert (alias Nicholson) we have a somewhat amusing illustration of this extra severity and want of order of the English Inquisition. The Inquisitors before whom Lambert was tried were Henry, Cranmer, Gardiner, Tunstall, Stokely, Sampson, and two others (all bishops; but Henry, and he had been made Pope.) After each Inquisitor had separately disputed with the accused, Henry asked—what sayest thou now after the instruction of these learned men? Art thou satisfied? Wilt thou live or die? The prisoner replied that he threw himself on the mercy of his majesty. Then, said the King, thou must die, for I will not be the patron of heretics. Cromwell, as Vicar-General, pronounced the usual sentence, and Lambert, alias Nicholson, was duly burned to death. Hume was right when he asserted that "the whole tyranny of the Inquisition, without its order, was introduced into the kingdom."

JOAN BOUCHER.

But it is in the reign of Edward VI., and from the lips of Joan Boucher, that we learn the true nature of the English Inquisition as distinguished from the Spanish. Henry's Inquisition was between two fires—it had to "hang, draw, and quarter" the poor papists who refused to acknowledge Bluff King Hal (of uxorious memory) for their Pope—and to keep in check (by burning) those ultra reformers, who were carrying reform principles too rapidly to their legitimate conclusions. Under Edward, however, the reformed party had it all their own way though Joan Boucher does appear to have gone too fast even for them. Joan had been a tract distributor to the reform party under Henry. She now found herself brought to trial by that same party for being too fast in her opinions. Joan (following her private judgment) denied with a kind of incoherent jargon that Jesus Christ was truly incarnate of the Blessed Virgin (it became fashionable to deny it later on) and was brought before the English Inquisition. Cranmer, as Grand Inquisitor, excommunicated her and ordered her to be given over to the secular power—in plain English—to be burnt. Joan's reply to Cranmer when he condemned her to the flames, is more forcible than respectful to English Inquisitorial consistency.

"It is a goodly matter," she said to the Archbishop, "to consider your ignorance. It was not long ago that you burned Ann Ascue for a piece of bread; and yet came yourself soon after to believe the same doctrine for which you burned her; and now forsooth you will needs burn me for a piece of flesh, and in the end will come to believe this also, when you have read the scriptures and understand them."

The deputy Inquisitor, Dr. Scory, received no greater reverence at her hands, when at her burning he undertook to convert her.

"He lied like a rogue," she told him, and had better go home and study the scriptures."

Joan hit hard against the English Inquisition and in favor of the Spanish. She was right. If the Spanish Inquisition condemned heresy, it had at least a settled code to defend; the English Inquisition, on the contrary, had fresh doctrines for every moon. What was heresy, with burning, hanging, ripping and quartering to-day was orthodox of the most approved color and shade on the morrow.

As further illustration of this continual change of doctrine it is curious to remark, that of the three men (Taylor, Barnes, and Cranmer) who brought Lambert (alias Nicholson) to the stake, two certainly professed later the doctrine for which they condemned Nicholson—and all three perished by the same law. Those were stirring times!—those days of the English Inquisition. One had to keep moving in one's religious opinions, and at the same time to take care not to move too fast, if one wanted to keep one's arms and legs and had upon one's body, or not to be made cinders of at the stake.

MARTIAL LAW.

As in Ireland against Dr. Hurley—so in England (Edward VI.) against the Catholic insurgents in the southern counties Martial Law was vigorously evoked by the English Inquisition. In the single county of Devon alone, when the commoners rose up demanding the restoration of the mass and the monasteries, 4,000 men perished in the field or by the hands of the executioner, so vigorously was martial law enforced.

CURIOUS TALES.

Some curious tales are related of the factious manner in which this law was carried out. King Henry's mantle (as worn at Nicholson's trial) had evidently descended on the shoulders of some of the commanding officers sent by the English Inquisition to tame poor Catholics. Amongst these Sir Anthony Kingston deserves special notice as being the very Punch of Commanders.

1st. Having dined with the Mayor of Bodwin, whom he suspected of Catholic leanings, he asked him after dinner, if the gallows he had erected were sufficiently strong? The Mayor replied he thought they were. "Then," said Kingston, "go up and try," and forthwith had him hanged without further ceremony. (Here I think we have the tyranny, but without the order.)

2d. On another occasion, having reason to suspect a certain miller of casting sheep's eyes towards Popery, he proceeded to the mill and not finding the miller, he hanged the man, bidding him "be content for it was the best service he could render his master." (Speed Hayward.)

3d. Even the Inquisition was factious. When the men of Devon rose up 10,000 strong, Lord Russell, Privy Seal, was despatched with a small band of troops and three preachers (Gregory, Reynolds and Coverdale) to disperse them. Queen Elizabeth thought two or three preachers enough in a nation! The English Inquisition thought three sufficient to rout 10,000 men!

OBJECTION.

But my friend, Mr. Critic will say, what right have you, a God-fearing man, to object to martial law being used against insurgents? And what right have you to couple the exercise of this law with the English Inquisition?

In the present case I have every right; eleven out of every twelve men in the Kingdom were at this time Catholics. [This is evident from a confidential letter from Paget to the Protector dated July 7th, 1540. "The use of the old religion is forbidden by law and the use of the new is not yet printed on the stomachs of eleven out of twelve parts of the realm."] The Catholics, therefore, were the nation; and being the nation, could not be insurgents; and not being insurgents, had no right to be treated to martial law; and the exercise of any act of restraint upon their religion is a veritable inquisition. The Catholic Church was in possession, and if you want another church you must get another Christ, and another Crucifixion, and another Resurrection, and another Ascension before you can expect us to accept it. Show me your credentials for all these butcheries? Have you another Christ and another death of a God Man upon the cross? Nay even if

you had, I would believe him a pseudo-Christ, an Anti-Christ; if his religion had to be founded by such atrocities. No! the new religionists were only one-twelfth part of the nation, and if they succeeded in crushing out Catholicity, it was to that hypocritical cry of the Jews of old "we have found this man perverting our nation and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar," it was because the English Inquisition brought in German, horse, and Italian, arquebuses and martial law, and the Rack, and the Scavenger's Daughter, and Little Ease, and hanging, bowelling and quartering, and fines and imprisonments, and confiscation of property and civil disabilities to drag him down and destroy it; When I consider the great number of Catholics at this time in England as compared with the new religion, I feel inclined in my heart to despise my fellow-countrymen for that they succumbed so pusillanimously. When I consider the means used by the reformers to crush out Catholicity, my wonder is, not that the nation succumbed, but that one single Catholic Englishman was to be found in the country.

HANGING, DRAWING AND QUARTERING.

The second mode of capital punishment used by the English Inquisition was hanging, drawing and quartering.

"Do not imagine, ladies and gentlemen, that death by hanging was the same affair under the English Inquisition that it is under our modern sheriffs.—Far from it. The English Inquisition was as energetic in its punishments as it was pronounced in its enactments. The victim was to be ripped open as well as hanged, and when they could no longer torture him alive, his bowels and heart were given to be kicked about by the crowd, and his limbs and head (stuck on spears) were distributed about the city as laughing stock and a mockery to the new religionists, and an object of veneration to the old.—Any one who did not kick the entrails or heart of the victim was marked out as a Catholic and therefore as a traitor by the spies.

The victim, after having had all his joints dislocated by the rack in prison, was jolted on a hurdle to the place of execution. Of this hurdle Blackstone says: a sledge hurdle is allowed to preserve the offender from the extreme torment of being dragged on the ground or pavement. Very considerate! certainly of the English Inquisition, to supply so commodious a way of travelling, and very naive of our "greatest English lawyer" to suppose that (failing this hurdle) there could not possibly be found any other mode of taking a Papist to execution than by dragging him along the pavement! (But then Papists were mere dogs in the eyes of the English Inquisition.)

Arrived at the place of execution the unfortunate victim was first partially hanged, was then cut down, and whilst yet writhing in agony, had his bowels cut out with the ripping knife and thrown to the spectators. His body was then cut into quarters to be stuck on poles to grace different parts of the city walls. Stowe tells us that Harrington, a Priest, was drawn from Newgate to Tyburn and there hanged—cut down alive—struggled with the hangman, but was bowelled and quartered. Many instances are on record of the missionary priests having spoken after their hearts were plucked out by the executioner. Hentzner, the Dutch Ambassador to Queen Elizabeth's court, wrote home affirming that he had counted 300 human heads stuck on pikes on London Bridge. Harrison, (Protestant chaplain to Lord Brooke) writing as a contemporary, computes the number of persons who suffered death by the executioner in Henry VIII's time, at 72,000!!

Now, as your University class book quoting Llorente gives the total number put to death by the Spanish Inquisition during the whole three centuries of its existence 3as 1,912, it follows that in Henry's time alone there was twice as many and a third as many executed by the English Inquisition as by the whole Spanish Inquisition. Well might Schlegel in his Philosophy of History say, the era of the Reformation was truly a barbarous era.

BURNING IN EFFIGY.

Your University class book credits the Spanish Inquisition with a mode of torture much indulged in by little Protestant boys of amiable disposition in England on the 5th of November, viz: that of burning in effigy; 17,659 persons (it tells us) were burnt in effigy by the Spanish Inquisition! This highly innocent amusement was evidently unknown to our sterner; and more practical English Inquisition. Had they been acquainted with it, though it might have been detrimental to much of the old clothes of the community, it would doubtless have saved many precious lives.

This death by hanging was peculiarly the punishment of Papists. The Tudors were Popes as well as monarchs, and they meant to be acknowledged as such. Let us take a single mouth of hanging for denying the Tudors to be Popes.

In November, 1539, Hugh Farington, abbot of Reading, and two priests, Rug and Onions, at Reading. At Torre Hill, Richard Witing, Abbot of Glasbury, on same day suffered the same fate for the same crime of denying the Supremacy. Also on same day John Beck, Abbot of Colchester. So for the Pains; let us now see the Penalties inflicted by the English Inquisition in its warfare against the Catholic Church. The first penalty was that of DEPRIVATION.

Under Edward—Bishops Bonner, London; Tunstall, Durham; Gardiner, Winchester; Day, Chichester; Heath, Worcester; Vesey, Exeter; were deprived of their Sees; whilst the common clergy were reduced to such poverty (as we learn from Bishop Latimer's sermons) that they were often glad to get situations in gentlemen's kitchens.

Under Elizabeth—14 bishops, 6 abbots, 12 deans, 12 arch-deacons, 15 masters of colleges, 50 prebends and 80 priests were deprived of their livings in one year for not accepting the new Ritual; in fact, through these deprivations and the sweating sickness of the previous year, Dr. Heylin tells "there were not a sufficient number of learned men to supply the vacancies which had to be filled up with cobblers, weavers, tinkers, fanners, card-makers, tapsters, fiddlers, tailors, bag pipers, &c. What wonder if the sheep were scattered when the shepherds were thus put to death.

But lest you should look upon this statement of the atrocities of the English Inquisition as an *ex parte* statement, I will give you Hume's: "The Ecclesiastical commissioners, of whom three made a quorum, were directed to make enquiry, not only by the legal method of jury and witness, but by all means they could devise; that is, by rack, by torture, by inquisition, by imprisonment. When they found reason to suspect any person, they might administer to him an oath called *ex-officio*, by which he was bound to answer all questions, and might be obliged to accuse himself or his most intimate friends. The fines that were levied were discretionary and often occasioned the total ruin of the offender, contrary to the established laws of the kingdom. The imprisonments were limited by no rule but their own pleasure. They assumed a power of imposing on the clergy what articles of subscription, and consequently they might inflict were according to their wisdom, conscience and discretion: In a word this court was a real inquisition, with all the iniquities, as well as cruelties inseparable from that tribunal." (Vol. iii., p. 126.)

This is sufficiently fair for a Protestant historian though it does not cover the whole ground. Had Hume used a nicer balance he would have seen, 1st, that the infamous oath *ex-officio* did not enter into the Spanish Inquisition. 2nd, That the fines and imprisonments, being already settled by the civil power were not "discretionary" nor "limited by no rule but their own pleasure." 3rd, That the Span-

ish Inquisition had no power to impose what new articles of Faith it thought proper. In other words, the English Inquisition did just as it liked—the Spanish was amenable to the ordinary laws of the country. Evidently the English Inquisition out-heroded Herod. Well-might Hume say the whole tyranny of the Inquisition, though without its order was introduced into the kingdom.

APPEAL TO ROME.

And there is another point of difference between the two Inquisitions.—

1st. Against the decisions of the English Inquisition there was no appeal.

2nd. In the Spanish Inquisition the accused could always appeal to Rome.

Luther, you remember, appealed from the Pope III. advised, to the Pope well-advised, and from the Pope well-advised to a General Council.

The Governments of Europe always endeavored to do away with this appeal to Rome. Ferdinand and Isabella expressly demanded it of the Pope. To this dangerous demand the Court of Rome would never accede, fearing doubtless the abuses to which so excessive a power might be prostituted. The importance of this appeal to a foreign power and to judges outside the pale of excited feeling, engendered by local jealousies and animosities cannot be over estimated, since it must at all times have acted as a wholesome restraint on excessive severity and must have ever tempered justice with mercy.

But in the English Inquisition we have nothing of this. The Parliament of 1533 forbade appeals to Rome; and hence the English Inquisitors were absolute. They could impose (Hume) what fines they wished—their imprisonments were unlimited, nay, as Hume says they could even make crimes to suit the occasion!—and when they could not find any crime, they made laws, as in Dr. Hurley's case to hang a man with a supple-jack! Verily these were hard times for Papists! Verily the English Inquisition was a dangerous institution! Verily the era of the reformation was a barbarous era!

This appeal to Rome was a strong check. The number of appeals during the first 50 years of the Spanish Inquisition is countless, and Rome always inclined to mercy. There is not, I believe, one case to be found where the appellant did not obtain easier terms. At that time, the same sad contest was being waged against the Ghuroh, that is being initiated at this day. Kaiser wished to be Pope; the State struggled to be above the Church. Human Law thought to set itself up above the Divine Law. Hence the English Parliament made Henry VIII. Pope—hence two years later it forbade appeals to Rome.

So well known was the clemency of the Popes, that when the Kings of Europe could not prevent appeals they sought at least to have those appeals tried in their own domains. Dr. Inigo Manrique Archbishop of Seville was the first of those judges appointed to try appeals in Spain, but even this power had soon to be withdrawn, so many were the appellants that even yet fled to Rome to seek greater mercy at the feet of the Popes (Bull dated 2 Aug. 1433.) Again, the English Inquisition was always on the side of arbitrary power. The Spanish cared as little for King as for peasant.

A certain royal confessor—Fra Diego de Chaves—had preached from the pulpit of St. Jerome in Madrid, the Tudor doctrine of the divine right of Kings. He had said "Kings have an absolute power over the persons of their subjects as over their property."

This monstrous doctrine (a doctrine, ladies and gentlemen, by which you and I would be given over on the moment to Queen Victoria—body and bones, hat, coat and shoes) would not do for Spain. Tudor Sovereigns might claim it, and have their claim allowed, but the Spanish Inquisition rejected it with scorn and summoned the ultra-royal Preacher before it. Found guilty of the charge, he was ordered publicly to retract; and was made to read from the same pulpit in the same church the following morose orthodox but less loyal doctrine.

"Kings have no more power over their subjects, than what is given them by the divine and human law—they have none proceeding from their own free and absolute will."

This condemnation (under Philip II. of Spain) does as much honor to the tribunal which commanded it, as to the Spanish Monarch who consented to it; and shows the different degrees of civil and religious freedom enjoyed under the two Inquisitions. It was Hernando del Castillo, Consultee to the Spanish Inquisition, who dictated the terms of this recantation. Had any English Consultee under our Tudor Queen dared to do so, he would have very soon been summoned before the English Inquisition and would have been presently hanged, bowelled and quartered, for denying the Queen's Supremacy.

NO FAMILY PRAYERS.

It is Dean Swift, I believe, who defines orthodoxy to be "my doxy; and heterodoxy to be "any body else's doxy." This was also the English Inquisition's idea. It did not believe in any other "doxy" but its own, and it did not intend that there should be any other. Under Henry none were to preach without license from the Inquisition. But the irrepressible Puritans were not to be put down. If they could not preach openly, they could at least preach in barns and private houses. But this did not suit the English Inquisition; and Cranmer issued a proclamation forbidding even family prayer when any were present except the family. The Inquisition, with Protestantism, was advancing. Hitherto it had taken notice only of public acts, now it penetrated even into the bosom of families.

CROWNING INQUIRY.

We come now to the crowning iniquity of the English Inquisition. You may burn a man for not thinking as you do, and have done with him: You may "hang, bowl and quarter" and it won't take long to do it. You may torture a man on the rack—but to send a man to hear a sermon—that does not want to hear—every Sunday—and to charge him three hundred dollars every time he does not go; that at least is the crowning iniquity of all that at least is the

TORTURE OF TORTURES.

Seriously—this enactment obliging all to go to the Protestant Church or pay a fine, is one of the most grievous as well as disgraceful penalties inflicted by the Inquisition. Better, far better the fiendish death by "hanging, bowelling and quartering"—better, far better to burn at the stake—than to be made to live a life of slow and continued martyrdom by these continuous fines and imprisonments.

Any one above the age of sixteen—remaining away from the Anglican Church during a lunar month, was subject to a fine of £20 (a sum, if we may believe Cobbett), equal to £250, or £3,250 of our modern money. The Inquisition was precise on this point. There were to be 13 months in the year (Pickering's Statutes) and sickness was to count as recusancy, if the sick person had not been to church immediately before (or after) his sickness.

The effect of this law was curious. It kept the Catholic recusant continually moving from place to place, in order to render it more difficult to prove his absence from church and it was cheaper to travel than to pay recusancy fees.

This law was iniquitous, and was as iniquitously carried out. For the first years of James' reign it had been somewhat relaxed. But when, through the savage cries of the new religionists for Papist blood, it was again enforced—arraignment was enacted to the last farthing.

COMPOUNDING.

There is another feature in the law, which it will not do to pass over. James was surrounded by a crowd of needy fellow countrymen.

To satisfy the most clamorous of these he— from time to time—transferred his claims on some

(CONTINUED ON SIXTH PAGE.)