

ed them, he would not perhaps have been permitted to re-enter Spain, and to terminate his life peacefully in his own country.

Such was Llorente, a traitor to his country, and probably to his religion; who tried to play off, in Spanish affairs, the same part that Talleyrand did in those of France, but failed for want of his genius. He was in Spain the counterpart of Fra Paolain, Italy, and of Courayer and Du Pin in France.—Could we expect an impartial history of the Spanish Inquisition from such a man? He alters texts to suit his own purposes, and gives us only his own words for most of his statements. To show how little his assertions are to be relied on, in a pamphlet published in Paris in 1818, he boldly asserted that between the years 1700 and 1808, the Spanish Inquisition had immolated at the stake no less than fifteen hundred and seventy-eight victims. This is not only a gross exaggeration, but a manifest misstatement. (11) Since the accession of the house of Bourbon to the Spanish throne in 1709, it would be difficult to prove that one victim was so immolated, or suffered capital punishment in any other way, through the agency of the Inquisition; and neither Llorente nor any other man has furnished proofs to the contrary. During this period, and for a long time previous, the chief inmates of the Inquisition were state prisoners guilty of high political misdemeanors, who had either accused themselves of imaginary crimes against religion, to avoid the greater rigors of the civil courts, or had been sent there by the Spanish Government in order to prevent the *clat* of a public trial.—The terrible Inquisition thus became little more, under the Bourbon dynasty in Spain, than a department of the police.

Among the writers who have defended the Spanish Inquisition, besides the Abbe De Vayrac mentioned above, Count De Maistre, (12) and La Cordare, (13) are the most distinguished. The works of both these conspicuous men are already before the American public, and it is unnecessary to offer much comment upon them. La Cordare devotes two chapters of his work to the Inquisition, of which he treats only in its connection with his main subject, the defence of the order of St. Dominic. He adduces few facts or arguments, which had not been already handled by De Maistre, whose work has been considered by many as the best which has ever appeared on the subject. Its chief fault is its brevity. We rise from its perusal with a desire to know more. Perhaps too, the author has indulged rather too much in philosophic speculations, and has advanced some principles for the defence of the odious tribu-

11. Mr. Prescott detects many gross historical inaccuracies in Llorente, unconnected with the Inquisition, in pointing which, according to him, he was never at fault! See Prescott, vol. i, p. 159, note; vol. ii, p. 108, note.

12. In his "Letters on the Spanish Inquisition," republished with the excellent notes and illustrations of Dr. Fletcher, in the Religious Cabinet, &c., the first volume of this Magazine.

13. "Apology for the order of St. Dominic," 18mo, p. 142.

nal, which its enemies would scarcely admit. Had he been less apparently solicitous to defend every thing connected with the Inquisition, and had he given up certain things, which are wholly indefensible, his work would have carried with it a greater appearance of candor and plausibility. Catholicity never can be injured by the truth. There is also occasionally a certain vagueness, and something that savors of inconsistency. Thus, for example, in his last letter, he says, "The tribunal of the Inquisition is purely royal," and yet a little further on, he remarks, quoting from the reports of the Cortes: "These tribunals (of the Inquisition) are thus at once ecclesiastical and royal," &c. He meant to say what the truth of history warrants, that of the two tribunals of the Inquisition the royal is predominant, and generally paramount in its authority; but it would have been better to have been more explicit. With these defects the work of De Maistre is still excellent, and no one can peruse it without thinking better of the Inquisition.

The best compendious view of the subject which we have ever seen, is an essay by John Murphy, inserted in a late work published by him in London (14) But a full, fair, and extensive history of the Inquisition—one that might by its learning serve as an antidote to those of Limborch and Llorente, is still a desideratum to our Catholic literature. It requires the extensive learning and patient research of a Dr. Lingard, or a Dr. Wiseman, to dispel the clouds which have hung around that tribunal for centuries, and to present to the world, in the terse and condensed style of the one, or the copious and luminous details of the other, such a history as the importance of the subject demands.

Yet enough has been already published to enable us to detect many of the inaccuracies of Mr. Prescott, in his history of the "Modern Inquisition" in Spain. To attempt to review all of his statements in detail, would swell this article to an unwarrantable length; we will confine ourselves to certain general erroneous views, which pervade the entire history, cover the whole ground of the controversy, and include the minor inaccuracies. We have already endeavored to trace the sources of these errors in the authors whom he has chiefly followed.

Mr. Prescott views the Inquisition as a religious, and not as political institution; (15) ascribes its establishment, notwithstanding the repugnance of Isabella, to the importunities of the clergy, (16) and the fanaticism of the people, demanding the sacrifice of the Jews, through selfish motives and religious hatred of that race; (17) and he more than intimates that the tribunal, with all its laws and proceedings, was but a carrying out of the principles of the Catholic Church. (18) He presents

14. "A compendium of modern geography," 1 vol. 8vo. p. 363.

15. Vol. 1, p. 245, note. At least he asserts this in regard to the Inquisition established in Castile.

16. Vol. p. 248, 250, et seq.

17. See *Ibid.* pp. 243, 244, et seq.

18. Pp. 245, 249, and *passim* throughout the chapter.

(19) a very dark picture of its forms of the presumptive proofs of Judaism, of the various forms of tortures, and of the awful "autos da fe," giving only those details which were calculated to make the institution appear odious, and mixing up with his account of the original Inquisition established by Ferdinand and Isabella, many forms and abuses, which, if they ever existed at all, certainly belong to a much later period. To make the Catholic church appear in a much more odious light in the whole matter, (20) he says, that the Roman Pontiff, Sixtus IV, was moved to the publication of his first bull regarding the Inquisition, in 1478, by "the sources of wealth and influence which this measure opened to the court of Rome."

To these charges most of the others may be reduced. These are the shades; we will endeavour to exhibit some of the lights of the picture. The rest of this article will accordingly present very summary proofs of the three following propositions, which it will be seen are diametrically opposed to the assertion of Mr. Prescott: *Audi alteram partem.*

1. The Spanish Inquisition was a political institution, and the result of extraordinary political circumstances.

2. Its cruelties have been greatly exaggerated.

3. The Catholic Church is not responsible for the institution itself, much less for its abuses real or alleged.

It requires but a slight acquaintance with Spanish history to be convinced of the fact, that the Inquisition in that country was an instrument of state policy, employed under circumstances of high political excitement. The causes which led to its establishment had been steadily operating for nearly eight hundred years. In 741, the Saracens had invaded Spain, seized upon its finest province, driven the original inhabitants into the mountains of the Asturias, and fastened a galling foreign yoke upon the neck of a hitherto free people. But the Spaniards did not tamely submit to foreign oppression: with the stern unyielding perseverance which belongs to their national character, they maintained the unequal contest with the enemy which had overpowered them and crushed their liberties.

From the council held by the fugitive Spanish chiefs in the cave of Cavadongo, in 711, to the conquest of Grenada in 1492, the great struggle for the mastery continued between the two races with but little intermission. Never, was there a contest for so long a continuance, or which resulted in a political hatred so deep and abiding. It was a civil and a border war, between two races which could never amalgamate, because kept asunder by different religions, different temperaments, and different interests—The Spaniards were fighting for their liberties—for their firesides, and their altars; the Saracens sought to annihilate the one, and pollute and desecrate the other. All prisoners taken in war by the latter were sold into bondage in Morocco-

19. P. 255, et seq.

20. P. 248.

and religious orders were established by the Christians for the redemption of these captives. The war thus assumed a religious cast, and the military orders of St. Iago, of Calatrava, and Alcantara, were established among the Spaniards to keep up the crusade against the enemies of their country and of their religion.

#### Persecution of the Jews.

MR O'CONNELL'S OPINION. We published the other day an edict promulgated by the Holy Inquisition of Ancona against the Jews—Some anonymous correspondent having written to Mr. James Haughton on the subject, he requested Mr. O'Connell's opinion, which is given in the subjoined letter:—

Merrion-Square, Aug. 25th, 1843.

MY DEAR FRIEND.—I am sure I do not know whether the edict, purporting to emanate from what is called the Inquisition of Ancona, be a genuine document or a fabrication; yet, from some expressions in it, I have a strong conviction that it is, at least in part, fabricated. But you may be sure of two things, first that I detest its cruelty towards Jews as much as you do; and that I, as a Catholic, am as free to condemn it as you are. If it be genuine, it must have the sanction of the law-makers at Ancona, whoever they be; and its whole force of authority arises from those law-makers, and is binding—that is, so far as an unjust law can be said to be binding—upon those persons only who are subject to those law-makers. By the word, "binding," I mean "binding by legal authority" only; and by no means obligatory on conscience to them, but quite the reverse.

One thing is quite clear, that your anonymous correspondent would persecute Catholics if he had the power; which thank God! he has not. How ignorant the creature must be of the history of persecution which has been so preeminently a Protestant practice, infinitely beyond the practice of that crime by Catholics.—He is also brutally ignorant not to know that it was Catholics who first, since what is called the reformation, established freedom of conscience; and that Protestant states have not yet ceased to persecute Catholics, and, indeed, Protestants also, if the latter were not precisely of the same sort of Protestants as themselves. I believe that there is no Catholic country at present in existence in which there is any law in force for the persecution of Protestants. I am convinced there is not. Then, as to Ireland, the contrast between Protestants and Catholics is most disgraceful to Protestantism, and most glorious to Catholicity. The penal-laws were a disgrace to human nature, and were doubly so because inflicted in the most palpable violation of a solemn treaty. And there is this cruelty in addition—that Protestant bigotry, no longer able to slaughter our persons indulges its malignity in the endeavour to render our reputations.

You and I, my dear friend, have this consolation—that we concur in detestation of slavery of every kind mental and corporal, and, above all, that we detest any violation of the rights of conscience, and, in particular, every species of persecution.—In haste believe me to be, most truly yours,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.  
James Haughton, Esq., &c.