

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

The Philippine Inquisition: A Survey

F. Delor Angeles

Philippine Studies vol. 28, no. 3 (1980) 253–283

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

The Philippine Inquisition: A Survey

F. DELOR ANGELES

The evidence is clear that a Philippine Inquisition existed; to prove this is not the task of the contemporary historian.¹ His task is to attempt the reconstruction, in historical dimensions, of the different aspects of that inquisition. The first thing to be noted is that the phrase "Philippine Inquisition" denotes geographical location, not an independent institution, for the Philippine Inquisition was a mere district of the Mexican Inquisition, which in turn was a branch of the Spanish Inquisition.² This essay will treat first of how the Philippine Inquisition developed, then of its aim, its manner of processing its cases, and finally its jurisdiction and procedures.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PHILIPPINE INQUISITION

As in Spanish America, the inquisition in the Philippines evolved through two or three stages, the number of phases depend-

1. The earliest published work containing references to the Philippine Inquisition is *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* by Antonio de Morga, printed in Mexico in 1609. His was an eyewitness account. What appears to be a Philippine school textbook around 1897, José Alcazar's *Historia de los dominios españoles en Oceanía; Filipinas*, freely discussed the Inquisition case of Governor Salcedo. The only existing monograph on the Philippine Inquisition, authored by José Toribio Medina, appeared in 1899. Finally, in 1911, a work in English, David P. Barrow's *A History of the Philippines*, did not omit the Philippine Inquisition. A generation of Filipinos, however, went through high school and college in the late 1940s ignorant that a Philippine Inquisition existed because their textbooks (Benitez's and Zaide's) never mentioned it at all. See F. Delor Angeles, "Bibliographical Data on the Philippine Inquisition," *Silliman Journal* 23 (Third Quarter 1976): 239-60.

2. Richard E. Greenleaf, *The Mexican Inquisition of the Sixteenth Century* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1969), pp. 158-60; Henry Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition* (New York: New American Library, 1965), p. ix. See also Henry Charles Lea, *The Spanish Inquisition in the Spanish Dependencies* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908), pp. 319-26.

ing upon the historian. Richard E. Greenleaf, the acknowledged American historian of the Mexican Inquisition, identifies three stages in New Spain: (1) a monastic or friar inquisition; (2) an episcopal inquisition; and (3) a tribunal inquisition.³ On the other hand, Seymour B. Liebman, who has done the most work on the Jewish victims of the Holy Office in Mexico, employs only two classifications: the episcopal and tribunal inquisitions. Liebman's reason for omitting monastic inquisition is that the friar-inquisitors actually acted under episcopal powers.⁴

José Toribio Medina, who published in 1899 the only existing monograph on the Philippine Inquisition, thought that the Islands experienced only episcopal and tribunal inquisitions.⁵ He found no evidence of friars practicing inquisition in the Philippines.

MONASTIC PHASE

As a matter of fact, however, a monastic period did precede the episcopal. During the first stage in the Philippines, Francisco de Sande, lieutenant-governor and later captain-general of the colony, performed inquisitorial functions around the period 1577-80, along with magistrates of the audiencia of Manila and some friars. Carlos Quirino and Abraham Laygo, who published a catalogue of Philippine manuscripts in Mexico's Archivo General de la Nación (AGN), refer to Sande as *comisario de Manila*, an identification they copied from the Ramo de Inquisición indices in the Mexican national archives.⁶ But an investigation of the AGN manuscripts from this period fails to prove conclusively that Sande held an inquisitorial title or a formal appointment to an inquisitorial post in Manila (although he was previously legal counsellor to the Mexican Tribunal). Sande appears to have been a mere civil servant supervising the prosecution of cases of faith and morals in the Philippines in cooperation with the Holy Office in Mexico.⁷

3. Greenleaf, *The Mexican Inquisition of the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 8, 74, 158-59.

4. Letter of Seymour B. Liebman to the author, 23 February 1977.

5. José Toribio Medina, *El tribunal del Santo Oficio de la Inquisición en las Islas Filipinas* (Santiago de Chile: Imprenta Elzeviriana, 1899), pp. 11-12.

6. Carlos Quirino and Abraham Laygo, eds. *Regesto guión catálogo de los documentos existentes en México sobre Filipinas* (Manila: El Comité de Amistad Filipino-Mexicana, 1965), p. 96.

7. México, Archivo General de la Nación (AGN), MS, Carta de Doctor Francisco Sande, comisario del Santo Oficio, refiriéndose a las supersticiones de los frailes y acompañando un proceso, Manila, 1577, Ramo de Inquisición, Tomo 131, Exp. 7. See also AGN, Inquisición, Exp. 9 and Tomo 131, Exp. 10.

In addition to Sande's, a few other names appear in the archival records covering the "civil/monastic inquisition." There was Fray Pablo de Jesus, a Discalced Franciscan, who in 1580 presided over the Gibrleon witchcraft case in Manila. A number of other friars investigated alleged instances of sorcery in Cebu, then reported the results to Manila. Also, in another Philippine document dated 1580, which deals with the trial for bigamy of Juan López de Azocar, two other inquisitorial officers are mentioned as dealing with the case: the fiscal, Andres de la Tuvilla, and the notary, Antonio de Espinosa. It is impossible, however, to tell from the manuscript if the two were secular officials or friars.⁸

On the accomplishments of monastic inquisition in the Philippines, the national archives in Mexico yield six cases, all occurring between 1577 and 1580. The most sensational of these was the arraignment of Doña Inés Álvarez de Gibrleón, widow of Governor-General Labezares, for sorcery and witchcraft. Also indicted for witchcraft were the *alcalde* of Manila and his wife. According to Zaide, proceedings in the cases "resumed" in Mexico City, but Doña Inés was "acquitted" because of her "politico-social position and lack of evidence." But the facts of the case indicate that the inquisition was no respecter of persons. In reality, the Mexico

8. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 131, Exp. 11; Tomo 134, Exp. 6. To the ministers we have already enumerated, a popular Filipino historian, Dr. Gregorio F. Zaide, adds yet another figure in claiming that "the inquisition of Mexico extended its power to the Philippines in 1578 when Archbishop Zumárraga authorized Fr. Miguel de Benavides to represent the Inquisition in Manila." See Gregorio F. Zaide, *The Republic of the Philippines* (Manila: Rex Book Store, 1963), pp. 86-87. This is perplexing since Zumárraga lost the office of apostolic inquisitor in 1543 and died in 1548. In the year of the alleged appointment of Benavides, the apostolic inquisitors of New Spain responsible for inquisitorial appointments in the Philippine Islands were Licentiate Alonso Fernández de Bonilla and Licentiate Granero de Avalos, not a deceased Zumárraga as alleged by Zaide. See Greenleaf, *The Mexican Inquisition of the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 74, 82, 118; also Julio Jimenez Rueda, *Don Pedro Moya de Contreras, primer inquisidor de México* (México: Ediciones Xochitl, 1944), pp. 17, 37-42, 78, and 94, as well as José Toribio Medina, *Historia del Tribunal del Santo Oficio de la Inquisición en México* (México: Ediciones Fuente Cultural, 1952), pp. 72-78, 103, 105.

The Dominican chronicler, Fray Diego Aduarte, in his chronicle on the Dominicans in the Islands, published in 1640, mentions the role of Fray Benavides in the founding of the Philippine province of the Holy Rosary; his work among the Chinese; and his appointment as archbishop of Manila; but does not say that the friar performed inquisitorial duties. See Diego Aduarte, *Historia de la Provincia del Sancto Rosario de la Orden de Predicadores en Philippinas, Japon, y China* (Manila: Luis de Beltran, Colegio de Santo Tomas, 1640), pp. 311-12. Emma Blair and James Robertson, *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898* (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark, 1903-1909), Vol. 51, p. 303 lists Benavides as the third archbishop of Manila.

(AGN) manuscripts state that only the *alcalde* of Manila was acquitted; that the lawsuit was decided and ended in Manila; and that the women were found guilty, fined three quintals of wax each for church use, and asked to pay the costs of the trial.⁹ Doña Ana de Monterey, wife of the *alcalde*, was also fined 200 *pesos de oro*. No archival evidence appears that the case was ever appealed to Mexico. Who would have risked the long, hazardous voyage to Acapulco to appeal the fine of three quintals of wax and court costs?

Another sensational case of monastic inquisition was that of Diego Hernández de Ávila.¹⁰ Diego, the eleven year old son of a *conquistador* in the expedition of Hernán Cortes, was seized with violent fits while in Cebu. Consequently, he was charged with "blasphemy, superstition, and sorcery" in Manila; found "guilty"; exposed to *verguenza* or "public shame"; tarred and feathered; and finally sentenced to the galleys. But authorities in Mexico City must have intervened, because the boy was sent to the viceroy, who gave him back to his mother.

By dismissing the Ávila case, the Mexican tribunal in effect rebuked Sande and the friars in Cebu and Manila: "The boy is only a minor"; "This Tribunal has no jurisdiction"; and "He was crazy." We may draw three observations from the Ávila case. First, while the Spanish Inquisition could be rigid even with influential citizens, it was capable also of flexibility. Second, in an age when modern psychiatry was not yet known, the Spanish Inquisition was able to draw the line between a form of insanity and "sorcery." Third, the Holy Office's law of evidence considered mitigating circumstances in lawsuits.

Civil/monastic inquisition in Manila, despite its stern handling of the Gibrleon and Ávila cases, also demonstrated some flexibility. In a report to the Mexican tribunal, for example, Sande suggested that other denunciations of witchcraft and like offences during his term did not develop into lawsuits. Either he dismissed persons examined with simple reprimands or was content simply to submit general observations of Philippine colonial society. One

9. Gregorio F. Zaide, "Filipiniana Treasures in Mexico's Archives," *Bulletin of the Philippine Historical Association* No. 6 (December 1958): 52. See also Zaide, *Republic of the Philippines*, p. 86. The Gibrleon witchcraft case is in AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 131, Exp. 11.

10. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 131, Exp. 10.

possible explanation is that, in the early days of Spanish colonization, there were relatively few colonists to work with and Manila could not afford to incapacitate too many people by jail or other injurious penalty. A second possibility is that Sande, as colonial executive, had enough of the familiar problems of government and may have reasoned that it was best to treat indulgently the majority of religious infractions, provided that they were casual and insignificant. There exists a third possibility, that the alarm noted in the Sande reports resulted from public hysteria over witchcraft and sorcery; no legal evidence was yet available and, therefore, no reason for indictment.

EPISCOPAL PHASE

With the departure of Sande from the Philippines in 1580 or 1581, monastic inquisition in the Philippines ended. The first bishop of the colony, Fray Domingo de Salazar, arrived at about this time to take charge of his see. Adding the role of inquisitor ordinary to his ecclesiastical functions, the bishop processed lawsuits of faith, thus launching the second inquisitorial — and episcopal — phase.¹¹

11. The bishop took zealous interest in *encomendero* abuses against natives. The late Fr. Horacio de la Costa, S.J. devoted much space to the "Las Casas" role of Salazar in an article in the *Hispanic American Historical Review* where he noted that the bishop delivered *encomenderos* accused of maltreating indigenous Filipinos to the newly established Holy Office in Manila from ecclesiastical court. Dr. Charles Henry Cunningham corroborates everything that the Jesuit historian says except that he identifies the defendants vaguely in an article as "certain civil offenders" and not as *encomenderos* [Charles Henry Cunningham, *The Audiencia in the Spanish Colonies; as illustrated by the Audiencia of Manila* (New York: The Gordian Press, 1971), p. 431]. In this regard, the Mexican national archives has two cases of erring *encomenderos* in the *Ramo de la Inquisición* submitted to Commissioner Muñoz in 1588 and 1592, respectively; but they offer no definitive clue to having been transferred by Salazar. We do know, however, that the bishop gained the reputation of having been the "Las Casas of the Philippines" for defending indigenous Filipinos from abusive Spanish colonists [Horacio de la Costa, S.J., "Church and State in the Philippines during the Administration of Bishop Salazar, 1581-1594," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 30 (August 1950): 326. The pertinent archival records are AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 140, Exps. 5, 21, 25; Tomo 213, Exp. 13]. The Salazar cases in the AGN, which constitute those which he surrendered to the commissioner of Manila in obedience to royal command, do not include a single lawsuit against *encomenderos*. They are cases processed by him in 1582-84. But the possibility that manuscripts of additional Salazar cases exist outside Mexico is not remote; Medina found one such manuscript in the old Archivo de Simancas (now in the AHN), that of the lawsuit against the bishop's servant, Diego de la Vega, for conspiracy with indictees, disobedience, and violation of the secrecy of the Inquisition.

The AGN cases attributed to Salazar's inquisition are as follows: bigamy against Manuel Rabeo; heretical proposition against Martín de Goiti the younger and against Francisco de Zuñiga; solicitation of women in the confessional against Canon Francisco de Pareja; and fraternization of a soldier, Marcos Quintero, with "Moors" and "Indians" in Manila. The Azocar bigamy case, which was heard by the civil/monastic inquisition the year before the bishop's arrival, was also among the Salazar cases transferred to the Holy Office.

The Quintero case was rare in Spanish inquisition annals. It would be difficult to find a similar case in the histories of tribunals in Latin America, although this may not be impossible with reference to Spain. Both Spain and the Philippines have Moslem communities, which Latin America did not have during the colonial period. The Quintero case amounted to one of "guilt by association" because the "offences" charged Quintero (wearing a *sarong*, dancing, eating, and drinking with Manila "Moors") were nonreligious activities, or at least, the process papers so indicated.¹²

Although the bishop served as a *calificador* or examiner of the Mexican tribunal before coming to his diocese in Manila, he did not act like a skilled inquisitor in this case. Comparison with the professionalism of Mexican inquisitors suggests that they would not have prosecuted the Quintero case as Salazar did.

There is another, and more severe, criticism of Salazar. It is evident that, unlike Zumárraga of Mexico, the first bishop of Manila exercised inquisitorial functions without prior authorization. This prompted Medina to accuse him of delusions of grandeur.¹³ As reports filtered into Mexico of Salazar's inquisitorial activities in Manila, the Holy Office in the viceregal capital became agitated. Here another familiar aspect of inquisitorial history is encountered, that of conflicts over jurisdiction. Salazar and the Mexican tribunal clashed over it. Then, later, the Holy Office in the Philippines quarreled with ecclesiastical and civil authorities to protect its jurisdiction; and sometimes, as in Mexico, it also invaded secular areas of competence.

12. Medina, *Inquisición en las Islas Filipinas*, pp. 28-32. Archival sources for Salazar cases are AGN, *Inquisición*, Tomo 19, Exps. 4-5; Tomo 120, Exp. 5; Tomo 126, Exp. 3; Tomo 133, Exp. 30; Tomo 134, Exp. 6; Tomo 135, Exp. 2; and Tomo 141, Exp. 42.

13. Medina, *Inquisición en las Islas Filipinas*, pp. 14-15.

The Mexican tribunal, for all its failure to establish promptly a representative branch in the Philippine colony, was unwilling to surrender its rights and prerogatives to the ecclesiastical establishment in Manila. Hurriedly, it appointed a commissioner for the Islands, an Augustinian, Fray Francisco Manrique, advising the bishop to cease inquisition and to submit his remaining lawsuits to the duly appointed agent of the Holy Office. Fray Salazar did, but not without a fight. He refused at first to recognize the commission of Fray Manrique and resorted to harassment. He brought before the court officials and residents of Manila who dared to support Manrique, including the lieutenant-governor, Licentiate Juan Converguel Maldonado. In vain, Santiago de Vera, president of the audiencia of Manila, offered to mediate the dispute.

Consequently, the question was elevated to Philip II who commanded Salazar in 1585 to give way to the Holy Office. The bishop obeyed. However, during the reading of the edict of faith in the Cathedral of Manila on the first Sunday of Lent in 1588, the old prelate demonstrated his ability to call the last shot. As preacher on the occasion, he attacked Fray Diego Muñoz, successor to Manrique, for "encroaching upon the bishop's authority," although the commissioner himself had invited Salazar to deliver the sermon!¹⁴

In summary, two observations may be made of monastic and episcopal inquisitions in the Philippines. First, as in Latin America, civil government in the Islands shared jurisdiction with friar inquisitors. Second, rivalry and conflict over jurisdiction accompanied episcopal inquisition in the Philippines just as in Latin America.

TRIBUNAL PHASE

The third and final stage, tribunal inquisition, lasted from 1583 to the abolition of the Spanish Inquisition in 1820 (1821 in the Philippines because of slow communications). The monastic and episcopal inquisitions were rudimentary, temporary devices which functioned until the tribunal or its agency was installed in a Span-

14. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 142, Exp. 58. See Medina, *Inquisición en las Islas Filipinas*, pp. 24-27; also AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 139, Exp. 1; Tomo 140, Exp. 35; Tomo 141, Exp. 45.

ish domain. Under the Tribunal of the Holy Office of the Inquisition, the Philippine Islands became an inquisitorial commissariat administered by a head commissioner or commissary (*comisario*) who was responsible to the tribunal in Mexico City. The jurisdiction of the Mexican tribunal covered the whole of New Spain, and the Philippines was one of its districts, together with Puebla, Guadalajara, Zacatecas, Veracruz, Yucatan, Acapulco, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, and others.¹⁵

The commissioner initiated an inquisitorial case, investigated, collected evidence, and delivered the offender to the tribunal in Mexico City when given the order and authorization for it. Afterwards, the Mexican tribunal conducted the trial of the accused and laid down the sentence.¹⁶ The last stage in the pyramidal process was for convicted persons to appeal to the *suprema* in Spain. Also, under the pyramidal structure of tribunal inquisition, the Philippine commissioner referred difficult questions and problems, primarily on interpretation and application of law, to the Mexican tribunal. In turn, when decision-making proved difficult, the Mexican inquisitors consulted the Inquisitor General in Spain on the problems referred from Manila.

A detailed view of the functions of the commissioner may be seen in the "Instructions of the Mexican Tribunal to the Philippine Commissariat."¹⁷

The following quotations from these "Instructions" serve to illustrate the limited powers of the Philippine commissioner.¹⁸

He [the commissioner] should take great care not to exceed his commission, which he shall fulfill, guiding himself by these instructions and other particular orders on the procedure for approval of attestations, ratifica-

15. AGN, Inquisición, Índice, Tomo I.

16. Medina, *Inquisición en las Islas Filipinas*, pp. 40-43; also Medina, *Inquisición en México*, p. 86.

17. Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, Vol. 5, pp. 256-73, and Medina, *Inquisición en las Islas Filipinas*, pp. 171-86. The English translation, however, which was made by the late Herbert E. Bolton of the University of Texas, has some errors. For a more accurate version, the reader is referred to the Spanish copy which forms the appendix in Medina's monograph on the Philippine Inquisition. Also, primary sources of the Instructions are found in the Archivo General de la Nación in Mexico City, the Archivo General de Indias, and if the archival source used by Medina has survived, in the Archivo Histórico Nacional in Madrid.

18. Translation by the author of the "Instructions" in Medina's *Inquisición en las Islas Filipinas*. Numbers in this essay do not correspond to article numbers in the Instructions.

tions of witnesses, and inspection of sea vessels, which shall be remitted to him later.

The commissioner shall duly notify the tribunal of the results in each particular case so that punishment by example, according to the social status of the person and the extent of his disobedience, may be given.

The power to order an arrest does not belong to the commissioners; and, therefore, they must not and can not make an arrest except in particular cases, supported by a special order against a given person.

The commissioner shall dispatch a suspect under detention by ship on the first chance offered; the transfer of the prisoner to the skipper's custody shall be noted down in the registry.

At the beginning, the inquisition in the Philippines had only a commissioner and a notary. For enforcement of Holy Office warrants and injunctions, they relied for assistance upon civil authorities. By 1800, there was a more elaborate administrative and procedural apparatus.¹⁹ Then, the chief commissioner (*comisario principal*) was Father Nicolás Cora, a Dominican. Under him was an assistant who held both the posts of deputy commissioner and examiner. At other times in this period, there were actually three commissioners in Manila, in pyramidal relationship, to provide for ready succession in case of death or other incapacity of the senior officer. Cora had five other examiners, one Recollect and four Augustinians. There were six notaries who doubled as constables (*alguaciles*) and inquisition police (*familiar*).²⁰ Two other notaries doubled as censors of literature (*calificador* or *expurgador de libros*). A Dominican provided legal counsel (*consultor*) and a lawyer with a doctor's degree was defence counsel (*abogado de presos*). Also there were commissioners for provincial jurisdictions in Pangasinan, Cagayan, Ilocos, Cebu, Cavite, Marianas Islands, Zamboanga, etc. The Jesuits must have enjoyed some influence because they were granted special commissioners whose task exclusively was to deal with the inquisitorial cases of the Society. At one time, this special minister was a secular priest; at another, a Franciscan. The petition for this privilege was filed around 1688, three Franciscans being named special commissioners for the order in

19. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1370, Exp. 23, Fs. 202-203.

20. Kamen identifies a familiar as a lay associate of the Holy Office, but Greenleaf says it was an Inquisition police officer. See Kamen, *Spanish Inquisition* (New York: New American Library, 1965), p. 329, and Richard M. Greenleaf, *Zumárraga and the Mexican Inquisition, 1536-1543* (Washington, D.C.: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1961), p. 21.

1740; but the Jesuits forfeited this arrangement with their expulsion in 1768 from the Islands.²¹

From the preceding, specialists in the Spanish Inquisition may note that the organization of the Holy Office in the Philippines followed patterns already established in Spain and Latin America.

AIM OF THE SPANISH INQUISITION

Dr. Greenleaf stated the aim of the Spanish Inquisition as follows: "The Holy Office of the Inquisition in Mexico had as its purpose the defense of Spanish religion and Spanish-Catholic culture against individuals who held heretical views and people who showed lack of respect for religious principles."²² If Greenleaf assigned the aim of the Spanish Inquisition to the Mexican Inquisition, clearly the same should be done for the Philippine Inquisition.

What may stir up controversy, however, is the inclusion of a secular element in the aim of the Spanish Inquisition by this American scholar of Tulane University. But one should inquire further into Greenleaf's writings on the Mexican Inquisition: these will reveal that in stating its *raison d'être* he had brought together *de jure* and *de facto* elements.²³

Which of the twin elements in Greenleaf's statement on the Holy Office's aim is *de jure* and which is *de facto*? The opening declaration in a warrant of arrest issued in 1661 by the Mexican tribunal ought to be the *de jure* aim: "We, the Apostolic Inquisitors, who stand against heretical perversity and apostasy in this city and archbishopric of Mexico, states and provinces of New Spain, Guatemala, and Philippine Islands, by apostolic authority, etc. — hereby command. . ."²⁴ Regarding the elements in Greenleaf's observation, the warrant statement corresponds to "the defense of the Spanish religion."

21. Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, Vol. 28 pp. 111, 185; Medina, *Inquisición en las Islas Filipinas*, p. 144; AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 847, f. 243. See Conrado Benitez, *History of the Philippines* (Manila: Ginn and Company, 1954), pp. 221, 252.

22. Greenleaf, *The Mexican Inquisition of the Sixteenth Century*, p. 1.

23. Richard E. Greenleaf, "The Mexican Inquisition and the Enlightenment, 1763-1805," *New Mexico Historical Review* 41 (July 1966): 181-91.

24. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 582, Exp. 1, Foja 66.

This *de jure* aim can be further underscored by citing an observation by Dr. John A. O'Brien, a Catholic scholar, to the effect that the Spanish Inquisition "was predominantly an ecclesiastical tribunal. . . with judicial authority concerning matters of faith."²⁵

The *de facto* element in the role of the Spanish Inquisition, understandably, should challenge the interest of Philippine scholars more. Let Greenleaf elaborate on it:

Many scholars have called attention to the fact that the Holy Office of the Inquisition was a political instrument. What has not been examined in detail is the relationship that existed between heresy and treason during the three centuries of Spanish and Spanish colonial Inquisition history. The belief that heretics were traitors and traitors were heretics led to the conviction that dissenters of any kind were social revolutionaries trying to subvert the political and religious stability of the community.²⁶

Greenleaf's views are not new. In fact, in the late nineteenth century, the political aspect of the Spanish Inquisition was vehemently debated by various scholars, among them the German historian, Leopold von Ranke, who alleged that the Holy Office was a "mere political agency."²⁷

What Greenleaf did was to clarify the issue, substituting the category "political instrument" for that of "political agency." Stated in another way, the Holy Office was not a secular tribunal, but it served as a "political instrument" of the Spanish kings. The historical evidence Greenleaf offered is plausible. The Hapsburg kings of Spain regarded religious unity as essential to the survival of the Catholic state of Spain in confrontation with hostile Protestant states like England. On the other hand, the Bourbons crassly exploited the Spanish Inquisition for strictly (secular) political ends, i.e., primarily to contain the influx into Spanish domains of revolutionary ideas engendered by the French Enlightenment and French Revolution.²⁸

25. John A. O'Brien, *The Inquisition* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1973), p. 93.

26. Greenleaf, "The Mexican Inquisition," p. 181.

27. Leopold von Ranke, *Die Osmanen und die Spanische Monarchie* (Leipzig, 1877), pp. 195-98, cited in Henry Charles Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of Spain* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907), Vol. 4, pp. 248-49.

28. Greenleaf, "The Mexican Inquisition," pp. 181-96. Other sources on the "politicalization" of the Holy Office by the Bourbons are Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition* (London, 1965), pp. 303-6, and Lewis A. Thams, "The Inquisition in Eighteenth Century Mexico," *The Americas: A Quarterly Review of Inter-American Cultural History* 22 (October 1965): 167-81.

To understand how the Spanish monarchs were able to control the Holy Office, a review of its origins is in order. Papal (or medieval) Inquisition, "directly subordinate to Rome," was known only in Aragon. Established in 1238, the Aragon tribunal, however, had become inactive in the fifteenth century. In 1438, under the pressure of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Pope (Sixtus IV) issued the bull which established the Spanish Inquisition. "The new tribunal," noted Henry Kamen, "came directly under the control of the crown and was the only institution whose authority ran in all the territories of Spain, a fact of great importance for future occasions when the ruler of Castile wished to interfere in other provinces where his sovereign authority was not recognized."²⁹

The extent of the king's control over the Holy Office comes from Henry Charles Lea: "Ferdinand's control over the Inquisition rested not only on the royal authority, the power of appointment, his own force of character and his intense interest in its workings, but also on the fact that he held the purse-strings."³⁰ The Pope continued to exercise the powers to issue bulls (on appointment of highest inquisitors, injunctions, etc.) affecting the Spanish Inquisition and to entertain appeals of cases. Lea, still the foremost authority on Spanish Inquisition history, noted, however, that it was virtually impossible for Rome to enforce its bulls and decisions on appellate matters. At times, the Spanish crown ignored papal acts outright; on other occasions pretended that the bulls were "forgeries," and so menaced penitents pardoned by the Pope that they were compelled to take asylum in Rome.³¹

Thus, for three centuries a continuous struggle over jurisdiction between the Spanish crown and the Holy See marked Spanish Inquisition history. Where a Spanish ruler was weak, he yielded to the Pope. Where he was strong, he defied Rome openly. In general, the Hapsburgs resorted to "obedience without compliance" (*obedezco, pero no cumplo*). The Bourbons were less reverential than the Hapsburgs.

The foregoing historical facts were the reason why a Catholic author was moved to write:

29. Kamen, op. cit., p. 40; Lea, *Inquisition of Spain*, Vol 1, p. 236.

30. Lea, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 293.

31. Lea, *ibid.*, Vol. 2, pp. 104-59. The material comes from this section of Vol 2, Book 3, Chapter 5, "Appeals to Rome".

The Spanish Inquisition deserves special treatment, for it is quite different from papal Inquisition of the Middle Ages. . . It served quite different ends. . . Its sins were Spanish sins, not English sins, or French sins, or German or Dutch sins. . ."³²

But the exact role of the Spanish Inquisition is best stated by Kamen:

The Inquisition as it existed in 1483 and thereafter, was in every way an instrument of royal policy and remained politically subject to the crown. This, however, did not make it a secular tribunal. It was at one time a favorite claim of Catholic apologists that the Spanish Inquisition was no more than a secular tribunal and that its excesses could be excused as the responsibility of Spaniards and not of the Church. The claim is quite inadmissible. Any authority and jurisdiction exercised by the inquisitors of Spain came directly or indirectly from Rome, without whom the tribunal would have ceased to exist. Bulls of appointment, canonical regulations, spheres of jurisdiction — all had to have the prior approval of Rome. The Inquisition was consequently an essentially ecclesiastical tribunal for which the Church of Rome assumed full responsibility.³³

CASES PROCESSED BY THE PHILIPPINE INQUISITION

The Philippine Inquisition investigated and readied for prosecution or reconciliation the following cases: (1) Protestantism; (2) secret Jewry and judaizing; (3) Masonry; (4) secret practice of Islam (*moriscos*); (5) other non-Catholic groups (Armenians, etc.); (6) Illuminism, Jansenism, and like heresies; (7) heretical propositions by Catholic laity; (8) blasphemy; (9) denial of God (*reniegos*); (10) apostasy by renegades; (11) dissemination and use of prohibited literature; (12) witchcraft, sorcery, superstition, astrology, palmistry, and fortune-telling; (13) clerical offences (usurpation of orders, sexual immorality, etc.); (14) bigamy and concubi-

32. Franciscus Willett, *Understanding the Inquisition* (No. Easton, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Press, 1968), pp. 80-89. A contemporary Catholic publication continues to regard the Spanish Inquisition as "royal tribunal, created to meet a political danger in a country and at a period when religious unity was the fundamental basis of the social order." See Fernand Hayward, *The Inquisition*, trans. Malachy Carroll (New York: Society of St. Paul, 1966), p. 144. A similar view may be found in A. L. Maycock, *The Inquisition; from the Establishment to the Great Schism* (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969), p. 226, which averred that the Holy Office was "reconstituted on a primarily monarchical basis" to play a "part in cementing the national unity of Spain" of which "religious uniformity was regarded as being the necessary foundation."

33. Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition* (London, 1965), p. 138 (Am. ed., p. 141).

nage; and (15) contempt of court (disobedience to and disrespect for the Holy Office, impersonation of inquisitorial officer, etc.)³⁴

PROTESTANTS, JEWS, AND OTHER HERETICS

When the Holy Office was extended to the Philippines, more than five and a half decades had passed since the Diet of Worms. Four major groups within the Protestant movement had emerged: Lutheran, Calvinist, Anglican, and Anabaptist. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, however, the ministers of the Philippine Inquisition (like the Mexican inquisitors) were grossly ignorant of these distinctions. To them all Protestants were *luteranos*, Lutherans.

The first Protestants investigated by the Holy Office were Dutchmen captured in naval contests and displaced Europeans who constantly shifted their loyalty and service from the Dutch and English to the Spaniards (and back, at times). When the Philippines was opened to world trade, a wider range of Europeans (Scandinavians, Germans, Irish, etc.) and North Americans appeared before the commissioners, mostly to exchange their Protestant faith for the Catholic, although some were summoned later for interrogation over reports that their "conversion" was dubious.

More than Protestant aliens, secret Jews and *judaizantes*, or "New Christians" whose conversion was fake, were disdained by Philippine Inquisition ministers. These agents revealed during their labor the same attitude as their fellow ministers in Spain and Mexico: that foreign Protestants merited some consideration because they were ignorant or misinformed dissenters of exogenous origin. But they were harsh on judaizers who acted as specious Catholics in public, then observed Jewish rites in the privacy of their homes — these Spaniards and Portuguese were traitors to crown and faith. Thus, judaizers indicted in the Philippines, including rich merchants, an *alcalde* of Pampanga, a *regidor*, and a prosecutor of Manila, were insultingly labeled in the documents as *marranos* (pigs).

Inquisition records show the abundance of Protestant aliens in the Philippines. Although the same records carry allegations by the Holy Office on the existence of "many" secret Jews, the few cases

34. Angeles, "Bibliographical Data on the Philippine Inquisition," 259.

recorded did not support the alarm raised. The ministers also issued a warning over "many" Masons in the colony, but the data show that there were only a few cases processed. Two Irishmen and an Englishman, investigated for Masonic ties during the latter part of the Inquisition, were quickly reconciled to the Church. In 1753, the head of the Holy Office in Manila, Fray Bernardo Ustáriz, reported to Mexico the presence of three other Masons, in addition to the Englishman already mentioned, one French, one Dutch, and a Prussian. The last three appear not to have sought reconciliation.

Because of the Spanish experience of Arab and Moorish occupation, secret Moslems (*moriscos*) in the Spanish community were also feared. They were a rarity, however, in the Philippines where the most serious threat to Spanish Catholicism came from native Moros of Mindanao.

One group of heretics processed by the Philippine Inquisition does not appear at all in the histories of Latin American Inquisition. These were the *Armenian Christians*. Dislodged by the partition of their homeland between Persia and Turkey and persecuted in the Middle East, Armenians scattered as far as Australia in search of refuge. Inquisition records reveal that those Armenians who settled in the Spanish colony of the Philippines usually came from Isfahan in Persia, transferred to India before moving once more to Manila. (Better a Spanish Catholic than a Hindu or Moslem environment.) Their admission into the Philippines and their facile, voluntary reconciliation to the Catholic Church speaks favorably of Spanish colonial policy and suggests that the Inquisition did not consider Armenian "schismatics" (so the archival sources label them) as a grave threat to the unity and security of Spanish domains.³⁵

Jansenism and Illuminism, the cult of *alumbrados* characterized by "ecstasies," "trances," and "sexual aberrations," were heresies of European origin which were also examined by the Holy Office in the Philippines. Illuminism, particularly, found adherents among the Spanish clergy. The best example of an Illuminati case in the Philippines was that of an incident around 1665 which centered around an alleged *beata* or pious woman, a Tagala named

35. A schismatic is one who separates himself from the Catholic Church to form another sect, thus breaking the social bond by the refusal of obedience to the Church's legitimate pastors.

Luisa de los Reyes. Jesuits were involved. The Holy Office, however, cancelled the proceedings later.³⁶

At times, Catholic laity, but also a smaller number of priests, were hailed before the commissioners in the colony for heterodox propositions. These offenders were not heretics *per se*; they were generally loyal Catholics who invented or borrowed deviant ideas from their culture contacts and expressed them, *discursus gratia*. Samples of the propositions were, as follows: "Neither the Father nor the Holy Ghost knows the exact date of the Judgment Day — only the Son knows"; "Jesus had original sin"; and "The King is absolute and subject to no one."

BLASPHEMY

Blasphemy, rather close to heresy, offered problems in identification. The earliest cases were those of soldiers who lost in gambling and vented their frustration upon God. But tattoos, bed-clothes, chinaware, and handkerchiefs with religious designs were also regarded as blasphemous. Objects of this sort were confiscated from vessels in port, shops, and private homes. The Mexican archives did not yield a single case of persons in the Philippines caught using these objects, e.g., an individual blowing his nose into a handkerchief with the face of the Virgin. But two rascals were denounced to the Holy Office for having climbed to a window on a wooden cross.

Related to blasphemy was the denial of God by *reniegos* (deniers or cursers). Men and women alike were interrogated by Philippine commissioners for this offence. In despair over domestic problems, offenders were generally sorry for their lapses, and happily for everyone, the commissioners proved understanding of human weakness. No one knows, however, how one case of an embittered soldier in Fort Santiago ended. In 1626, Sergeant Andres de Torres Adalid, who was suffering from a stubborn disease, was denounced to the commissioner in Binondo, Extramuros, for outbursts like, "God, with Thy power, Thou canst not give health!" and for invoking the devils afterwards.³⁷

The Holy Office was also concerned with renegades because de-

36. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 604, Exp. 5; Tomo 608, Exp. 7.

37. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 355, Fs. 450-53.

fection often involved heresy. As defectors transferred to the Spanish fold from the Dutch East Indies and British India, European soldiers in Spanish forces also went over to the Protestant enemy or to the Moslems in Mindanao. The most famous case in this regard involved a high-ranking Swiss officer, Captain Cesar Pierre Fallet, a naval functionary and penitent of the Holy Office, who sailed away with the British in 1764 after the occupation of Manila.³⁸

Among the methods used by the Philippine Inquisition to control heresy were censorship and inspection of sea vessels. The Mexican tribunal sent Index lists to the commissioners in Manila, but they could examine, if necessary, suspicious literature outside these lists. At the beginning, romances appeared among materials inspected or expurgated in the Islands. Toward the middle period of the Philippine Inquisition, Index lists included the names of Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin, as well as bibles in a variety of Western languages. By the end of the eighteenth century, political literature, for example, Voltaire, Montesquieu, essays on the French Revolution, and the French *Encyclopédie*, joined religious matter in the lists. Also, material about to be published, as of a Jesuit enclave of 1664 in Manila, as well as books, pamphlets, sermons, and prayers written by priests and already printed in the colony, were brought to the attention of commissioners by priests and laymen alike.

WITCHCRAFT

Witchcraft, sorcery, and superstition were, likewise, a form of heresy. Following, however, inquisitorial practices in Spain, the Holy Office in the Philippines stopped dealing harshly with offenders in these categories. No "witches" were ever burned in the Philippines; in fact, cases of sorcery and witchcraft disappeared from the books of the Holy Office in Manila after the first half of the seventeenth century. Spain provided the example; she executed her last "witches" in 1610, some years ahead of Protestant

38. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1069, Exp. 2, Fs. 28-71.

lands in western Europe and North America.³⁹

Most clerical offences in the Philippines were attempted or consummated solicitation of sexual favors in confession rather than heresy. (The official Holy Office description was *solicitación*.) A common explanation for this was the early lack of a confessional stall; but Spanish *machismo* and a weakness of *patronato real*, the careless admission of ill-fitted candidates into the priesthood, should not be neglected as significant factors in this particular inquisitorial crime. Between 1584 and 1809, a total of seventy-seven cases for solicitation were recorded from AGN archival sources, or an average of one erring priest for every three years of the 225-year existence of tribunal inquisition in colonial Philippines. Those processed came from both secular and regular ranks, Augustinians, Dominicans, Jesuits, and Franciscans (I have discovered no mention of Recollects), in high or low positions, Spanish peninsulars, Philippine Creoles, Latin Americans, mestizos, and indigenous Filipino priests.

In summary, a review of inquisitorial cases in the Philippines reads very much like a survey of Latin American and Spanish *procesos*. The Armenian cases proved to be the exception, but this matter should be investigated further. On the Latin American and Spanish side, only secondary sources were consulted.

JURISDICTION

What can be said on the subject of jurisdiction? The individuals subject to tribunal inquisition, according to Lucas Alamán, were *gente de razón* or mature individuals.⁴⁰ Under this classification, the documentation shows that persons who were indicted or investigated by the Holy Office in the Philippines for crimes against the faith came from the same racial groupings earlier mentioned in cases of solicitation by clergy. In addition to peninsulars and Creoles

39. Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition* (New York, 1965), p. 208; George Lincoln Burr, ed., *Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases, 1648-1706* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914), p. xvi; Alan C. Kors and Edward Peters, *Witchcraft in Europe, 1100-1700: A Documentary History* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972), pp. 250, 240-41; Lea, *Inquisition of Spain*, Vol. 4, pp. 240-41.

40. Lucas Alamán, *Historia de Méjico desde los primeros movimientos que prepararon su independencia en el año de 1808 hasta la época presente* (Méjico: Imprenta de J. M. Lara, 1849), Vol. 1, p. 23.

lands in western Europe and North America.³⁹

Most clerical offences in the Philippines were attempted or consummated solicitation of sexual favors in confession rather than heresy. (The official Holy Office description was *solicitación*.) A common explanation for this was the early lack of a confessional stall; but Spanish *machismo* and a weakness of *patronato real*, the careless admission of ill-fitted candidates into the priesthood, should not be neglected as significant factors in this particular inquisitorial crime. Between 1584 and 1809, a total of seventy-seven cases for solicitation were recorded from AGN archival sources, or an average of one erring priest for every three years of the 225-year existence of tribunal inquisition in colonial Philippines. Those processed came from both secular and regular ranks, Augustinians, Dominicans, Jesuits, and Franciscans (I have discovered no mention of Recollects), in high or low positions, Spanish peninsulars, Philippine Creoles, Latin Americans, mestizos, and indigenous Filipino priests.

In summary, a review of inquisitorial cases in the Philippines reads very much like a survey of Latin American and Spanish *procesos*. The Armenian cases proved to be the exception, but this matter should be investigated further. On the Latin American and Spanish side, only secondary sources were consulted.

JURISDICTION

What can be said on the subject of jurisdiction? The individuals subject to tribunal inquisition, according to Lucas Alamán, were *gente de razón* or mature individuals.⁴⁰ Under this classification, the documentation shows that persons who were indicted or investigated by the Holy Office in the Philippines for crimes against the faith came from the same racial groupings earlier mentioned in cases of solicitation by clergy. In addition to peninsulars and Creoles

39. Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition* (New York, 1965), p. 208; George Lincoln Burr, ed., *Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases, 1648-1706* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914), p. xvi; Alan C. Kors and Edward Peters, *Witchcraft in Europe, 1100-1700: A Documentary History* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972), pp. 250, 240-41; Lea, *Inquisition of Spain*, Vol. 4, pp. 240-41.

40. Lucas Alamán, *Historia de Méjico desde los primeros movimientos que prepararon su independencia en el año de 1808 hasta la época presente* (Méjico: Imprenta de J. M. Lara, 1849), Vol. 1, p. 23.

les, other Europeans, as well as North Americans and Middle East natives, were the other whites processed by the commissioners.⁴¹ Lastly, the Instructions also placed "mulattos" under the competence of the Philippine Inquisition.

With reference to indigenous Filipinos, Article 23 of the Philippine Instructions affirms:

Everything that has been stated up to this article on the admission of complaints, as well as the transfer of lawsuits, prisoners, and trials to the Holy Office in Mexico, does not cover Indians, against whom at this time the commissioner shall not take any legal action. They lie within the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical ordinary, and therefore, there is no obligation to remit cases covering them to the tribunal.⁴²

Father José S. Arcilla gives the reason for the exemption of non-white natives from the jurisdiction of the Holy Office. He states that the "Indians" (i.e., indigenous Filipinos) were considered "minors" by the Inquisition, "children" in the faith, "not subject to the judgments applied to grown men."⁴³

A Spanish government document published by the Ministerio de Fomento confirms that Spaniards classified non-white Filipinos as "Indians."⁴⁴ Consequently, it is apparent, Spanish policies toward Indians in Latin America were also applied to "Indians" in the Philippines. The precedent for the status of indigenous Filipinos under the Philippine Inquisition is found in Mexico. Harsh treatment of Mexican Indians under the inquisition of Archbishop Zumárraga, Fray Diego de Landa, etc. resulted in royal censures of justice.⁴⁵

If the Holy Office was not allowed to process indigenous Filipinos for inquisitorial offences, it could admit them, however, as aggrieved parties in lawsuits against Europeans and Americans. Under this rule, the commissioner of Manila investigated Alferez Luís Villareál in 1637 for the killing of his slave and an *encomen-*

41. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 736, Exp. 13, Fs. 489-93; Tomo 808, Exp. 17, Fs. 563-77; Tomo 808, Exp. 19, Fs. 581-98; Tomo 857, Fs. 158-90; Tomo 1333, Exp. 28, Fs. 141-42. See also Medina, *Inquisición en las Islas Filipinas*, p. 183.

42. Medina, *ibid.*

43. José S. Arcilla, S.J., "Slavery, Flogging and other Moral Cases in 17th Century Philippines," *Philippine Studies* 20 (1972): 414.

44. Spain, Ministerio de Fomento, *Cartas de Indias* (Madrid: Imprenta de Manuel G. Hernández, 1877), pp. 39-47.

45. Greenleaf, *The Mexican Inquisition of the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 74-75, 101-102, 173-74.

dero, Cristóbal de Velásquez, in 1592, for the maltreatment of three natives.

A consequence of the exemption of indigenous Filipinos was the rise of a defence in tribunal cases for mestizos, that is, individuals of mixed native and European blood. The mestizo before the Holy Office claimed exemption from jurisdiction by passing himself off as an "Indian." In 1723, for example, one Jacinta de Jesus, a "mestiza," claimed to be an "Indian"; consequently, the Philippine commissioner, Fray Juan de Arechederra, suspended the case against her.⁴⁶

Historical researchers should investigate Philippine diocesan archives for sources of colonial episcopal inquisition of indigenous Filipinos. This was reputed to be "milder" than tribunal inquisition, a view with which Henry Charles Lea did not agree.⁴⁷ There is proof, however, in the Mexican national archives that ordinaries treated Philippine natives with leniency. An AGN manuscript cites the episcopal case of a native woman in Cebu in connection with a complaint against an ordinary before the Holy Office. In the case, the ordinary of Cebu gave a certain Maria Sagbuet a simple reprimand for concubinage with the son of her Chinese husband.⁴⁸ Another case of episcopal inquisition, which indicates that it was "mild," was mentioned in a 1976 news report on a document stolen by an American soldier from a Philippine church during the Philippine-American War. The document covered the petition of a Filipino soldier that an ecclesiastical court punish his wife for refusal to cohabit. However, the ordinary, Archdeacon Don Gregorio Ruiz de Escalona (*ca.* 1647) of the Cathedral of Manila, found the soldier to be a cruel husband and forthwith granted legal separation to the abused Filipina.⁴⁹

PROCEDURE OF THE OFFICE

The *denuncia* or denunciation of an inquisitorial offence by an informer could lead to the filing of a lawsuit by the commissioner.

46. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 384, Exp. 8; Tomo 213, Exp. 15; Tomo 808, Exp. 17, Fs. 563-77.

47. Lea, *The Spanish Inquisition in the Spanish Dependencies*, p. 308.

48. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 334, Exp. 2, F. 144.

49. "Rare Document made Available," *Bulletin Today* (24 January 1976): 1, 8.

On 12 July 1611, for example, a Portuguese sailor, Francisco González, was denounced in Oton, Iloilo for having uttered a heretical proposition: "Simple fornication is not a sin." By that time, González had already left for India and was not expected to return. But, by law, the Holy Office prosecuted litigants *in absentia* or posthumously.⁵⁰

Denuncias could be made by agents of the Inquisition or anyone else in the colony. Edicts of faith, providing clues to identify heretics, were read in principal churches to all the faithful, who thus became a vast intelligence network for the ministers. The Holy Office had a long arm. Testimony by secret Jews in Peru caught up with Manoel da Guarda (Manuel de la Guardia), a prosecutor in Manila of Portuguese descent.

Voluntary self-denunciation, relative to one's offence, could be made also. Known as *espontaneo*, this merited a light penalty. In one such case in Manila, three Europeans on 13 April 1601 approached the commissioner of the Holy Office, Fray Bernardo de Santa Catalina, to confess their Protestant heresy. Of the three, Jan Albert (Juan Alberto) was Dutch, Jan van Antwerpen (Juan de Amberes) was Flemish, and John Calleyway alias Juan Calbart was English. The three were accepted to *reconciliación*, pronounced an *abjuración de levi* (light retraction), and pledged to keep the secrecy of the Holy Office.⁵¹

The commissioner required the complainant or informer to repeat his deposition, a procedural level known as *ratificación*. Depending upon availability, he collected additional testimony from people who knew the suspected deviant. The next step was to transfer the mass of evidence to the *calificadores* or examiners to determine if there was enough ground for charges of heresy. The *consultores* advised the commissioner on relevant legal questions.

The investigation, carried on in great secrecy, could involve long periods of time in cases where the commissioner did not have enough testimony or evidence. The case of Diogo Hernández de Vitoria (Diego Hernández Victoria), a Portuguese *regidor* (councilman) of Manila, suspected and acquitted posthumously of judaiz-

50. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 293, Exp. 11, F. 26. See also Seymour B. Liebman, *The Inquisitors and the Jews in the New World; Summaries of Procesos, 1500-1810 and Bibliographical Guide* (Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press, 1974), p. 66, and Medina, *Inquisición en México*, p. 205.

51. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 263, Exps. 1-C, 1-D, and 1-E.

ing or secret Jewry, comprises one whole volume in the AGN, a third of another volume, plus papers scattered in other volumes. Normally, one volume would contain ten to thirty cases.⁵²

The warrant of arrest was dispatched to the Philippines from Mexico. No commissioner could order an arrest by himself except under extraordinary circumstances. Even so, he had to exercise utmost discretion. The most infamous exception to this rule in Philippine inquisition history happened in the tragic case of Captain General Diego de Salcedo. In this instance, the commissioner of Manila, Fray José de Paternina Samaniego, rashly ignored orders by the Mexican tribunal to defer an arrest until after allegations against the governor general had been confirmed.⁵³

Personal grudges motivated Paternina and his fellow conspirators. They barged into the governor's palace at midnight, seized Salcedo in his bed, and marched him off to prison in fetters. Under trumped-up charges, Salcedo was shipped off to Acapulco, but died at sea. For this abuse of power, Paternina himself was dismissed from his post, arrested by orders of the tribunal, and dispatched to Mexico; but like his victim, he also perished during the voyage.

Using the records of the Council of the Indies in Seville, Dr. Cunningham interprets the Salcedo case as a conflict between Church and State. The Inquisitor General's defense of Paternina before the supreme governing body for the Spanish colonies would support this stand. But if the inquisition records in both Spain and Mexico are consulted, a different conclusion is warranted. The Inquisitor General's defense of Paternina, Cunningham himself admitted, leaned on the natural desire of the head of the Holy Office to protect his organization. When the evidence came in of the commissioner's villainy, both the Mexican tribunal and the *suprema* changed their attitude.⁵⁴ Therefore, considering the mixed

52. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 162; Tomo 163, Exp. 1; Tomo 251, Exp. 2; Tomo 263, Exp. 1-1; Tomo 267, Exp. 30; Exp. 293, Exp. 5, F. 10.

53. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 614, Exp. 1. See also Charles Henry Cunningham, "The Inquisition in the Philippines; the Salcedo Affair," *The Catholic Historical Review* 3 (January 1918): 422-45.

54. See Cunningham, *op.cit.*, p. 443; but the evidence for the opposing interpretation is formidable. The Augustinian provincial of the Philippines warned the Mexican tribunal that Paternina was not qualified to be a minister of the Holy Office (AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 515, Exp. 2, Fs. 252-72). Father Santa Cruz, O. P., also reported that the Dominicans regarded Salcedo "hospitably." (Blair and Robertson, Vol. 37, p. 121).

composition of the two opposing factions in Manila concerning the Salcedo case, it is really impossible to class the conflict as one between Church and State. In the ultimate analysis, the conflict was rather between the crown and a political faction in Manila who overthrew the king's representative and usurped political powers over the colony. But it demonstrated at the same time that, when the king commanded, the Spanish Inquisition obeyed.

PROBLEM OF DISTANCE

It is easy to imagine the many inconveniences present in a system which dispatched inquisitorial suspects and documentation from Manila across thousands of miles of ocean to Mexico for trial. Vessels were shipwrecked or lost. Prisoners escaped or got sick during the voyage and died. Lastly, the system entailed greater expenses than an arrangement which allowed the trial of prisoners in the Philippines itself.

In complaining about the restriction on his inquisitorial activities, Bishop Salazar argued, not unreasonably, that the substitution of a commissioner would bring difficulties to the European-American community in the Philippines. In 1598, Archbishop Santibañez of Manila argued more forcefully for tribunal status, pointing out that it was "unjust" for the Philippines to be under "a foreign court" (the Mexican tribunal).⁵⁵ Eight years later, Bishop Diego de Soria of Nueva Segovia added his own entreaties for an independent tribunal in the insular colony:

Don Diego de Cartagena de Pantoja, who became dean of the cathedral of Manila, criticized Paternina for the proceedings against the governor general (Medina, *Inquisición de las Islas Filipinas*, p. 94, footnote). Of nine friars asked by the commissioner to assess the case against Salcedo (one Franciscan, two Augustinians, three Dominicans, and three Jesuits), only two recommended an indictment (Medina, *ibid.*). Lastly, Salcedo was on friendly terms with the Jesuits (AGN, *Inquisición*, Tomo 616, Exp. 2, Fs. 27-28).

Besides Paternina, the Franciscan friars hated the governor general (Lea, *Spanish Inquisition and Spanish Dependencies*, p. 317). In fact, the Franciscans joined Salcedo's personal enemies in arresting him (Medina, *op. cit.*, pp. 101-3). The citizenry of Manila were divided on the arrest of Salcedo, most officers of the Manila Audiencia and certain high military and civil authorities taking advantage of the governor's plight.

The cause of the Salcedo tragedy was "personal enmities" according to Fray Felipe Pardo, O.P., who succeeded Paternina as commissioner in Manila of the Holy Office (AGN, *Inquisición*, Tomo 518, Exp. 35, F. 369).

55. Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, Vol. 10, p. 151. See also Cunningham, *The Audiencia in the Spanish Colonies*, p. 431, footnote.

When a galleon [from Manila] put into harbor in Japan once or in another place, two heretics, who were being ferried to México as prisoners, escaped. In a kingdom and dominions as large as ours, it is necessary that there should be tribunal inquisition, or that the bishops should be allowed to set up their own, which is our right.

Perhaps, the last proposal on the subject was in 1749, in the memorial of Don Francisco de Rauzo to the inquisitor general in Madrid:

Here [in the Philippines], at present, a regular priest is presiding over a jurisdiction so vast and noted for its great distance of three thousand leagues from Mexico, a distance much longer and more exposed to hazards of navigation than the route between Mexico and Spain. It is imperative, therefore, in many situations to do away completely with the inconvenience to the most serious lawsuits of this holy tribunal that come to mind.⁵⁶

All these proposals, however, were unsuccessful.

At least, the Mexican tribunal was willing to go halfway to bring about a solution to the problem of distance. In offences lighter than heresy, exercise of tribunal powers in certain cases by commissioners was arranged. In a directive on 12 March 1768, for example, the Mexican tribunal gave minute instructions to the Commissioner of Manila in dealing with bigamy cases. The commissioner was asked to make three *audiencias* (hearings) of offenders coupled with the customary admonitions. He was advised to give consideration to the right of defence of the accused. The original Instructions also directed the commissioner to tolerate ecclesiastical and civil authorities who proceeded to judge bigamy cases. Likewise, the commissioners were allowed to settle lawsuits on blasphemy in the colony rather than to send the violators to Mexico.⁵⁷

Although no specific directive on the procedure for dealing with *denuncias* of superstitions is to be found, the impression derived from archival data is that, aside from cross-examination of witnesses and offenders, no further action was taken. Commissioner's admonitions must have been given because manuscripts show pleas of the accused for pardon. There are abundant cases touching on superstition and a few on astrology, palmistry, and fortune-telling.

56. Medina, *Inquisición en las Islas Filipinas*, pp. 37, 144.

57. Ibid., pp. 53-54.

A report by the commissioner of the Philippines in 1623 contained names of persons investigated or denounced for superstition.⁵⁸

The Instructions also gave the commissioner, because of the distance between Mexico and Manila, the power to judge cases of contempt of, and disobedience to, the Holy Office. Thus, in 1762, when the master of the *Santisima Trinidad* refused to load a box of the Holy Office in Manila for dispatch to Acapulco, he was cited for disobedience. As a result, the captain apologized to Commissioner Sierra and loaded the box after all. In another case in 1670, Maderazo, a former servant of Governor-General Salcedo, was beaten by sympathetic officers to silence him when he criticized the commissioner for jailing his master. Someone reported Maderazo, nevertheless, to the Holy Office. His remarks were noted down, but the archival document does not tell how the case ended.⁵⁹

Sequestration of the property shipped for trial, of convicted defendants, or of accused persons judged to have unfavorable cases (like Diogo Hernández de Vitoria), was also inquisition practice, although the Holy Office made qualified dispensations because of poverty in the Philippines. A *juez de bienes* took charge of confiscated property, the transaction taking place before witnesses, which was duly recorded by the notary of the Holy Office. In the Diogo Hernández case, however, there is evidence that the notary of the commissioner of Manila, Don Benito de Mendiola, took a personal interest in the property of the accused.⁶⁰

CONFISCATION OF PROHIBITED LITERATURE

Among the documents are reports of confiscation of prohibited literature in Manila, Cebu, and other towns and their burning in Holy Office compounds. One such burning took place in the Colegio de San Juan de Letran. However, "trustworthy" persons were given licenses to read approved portions of larger works, e.g., the permit to Don Ventura de los Reyes to read the scientific parts

58. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1095, Exp. 25, Fs. 377-84.

59. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1086, Exp. 2, Fs. 121-29; Tomo 616, Exp. 19, Fs. 561-65.

60. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 163, Exp. 1.

of the French *Encyclopédie*. Ironically, Reyes turned up later in the liberal Spanish Cortes in 1812 which was anti-Inquisition.⁶¹

Inspection of sea vessels docking in Manila and the nearby port of Cavite was part of the task of controlling heresy. The ministers of the Holy Office inquired if a vessel had prohibited reading matter and heretics among the crew and passengers. Records indicate that ships came to Manila from Java, India, Siam, China, and Mexico; also, that the inspection was not regularly carried out. The result of this negligence, as a study in El Colegio de Mexico by Monelisa Pérez-Marchand reveals, was that much condemned literature in the eighteenth century entered Mexico via Manila.⁶² From the Philippines, the finger of suspicion pointed to Batavia in the Dutch East Indies, and from there to Holland. Obviously, the inquisitors expected contraband to travel across the Atlantic to Veracruz, but some resourceful smugglers discovered that controls in Acapulco were more lax.

The system tried to be thorough. Those who conducted the business of the Holy Office were required to go through a security check themselves. Commissioners to notaries to constables, therefore, had to pass their *limpiezas* before appointment. The *limpiezas* of candidates for inquisitorial posts in the Philippines show that investigators checked not only the past activities of nominees, but also their ancestral background. As may be seen, the ultimate result of this policy was racist, which both St. Ignatius Loyola and Pope Paul IV condemned.⁶³

INTERROGATION PROCEDURES

Interrogation and recording of testimony by the Philippine Inquisition may be found to conform to patterns set in the manuals of the Spanish Inquisition prepared by Torquemada, Deza, and others, to guide the conduct of Holy Office agents. We may note Salazar's procedure in interrogation which made use of vague questions: "Do you know why you are a prisoner, or presume the

61. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1435, Fs. 250-52; "Filipinas (Islas)," *Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada Europea-Americana* vol. 23 (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, S.A., 1924), pp. 1344-1382.

62. Monelisa Lina Pérez-Marchand, *Dos etapas ideológicas del siglo XVIII en México* (México: El Colegio de México, 1945), p. 40.

63. Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition* (New York, 1965), pp. 124-25, 128.

reason why you are a prisoner, or why you were placed in this cell?" In this instance, if the suspect feigned ignorance, he was asked "to search his memory," remanded to his cell, and recalled a number of times until he "remembered." Eventually, the guilty would confess, but the procedure was cruel on the innocent.⁶⁴ Torture was practiced in Mexico on stubborn prisoners under interrogation, but there is no evidence that it was done by the Holy Office in the Philippines.

The formula used by Bishop Salazar conformed to that followed in an *audiencia* by an inquisitor of the Holy Office. The approved form for interrogating persons and recording testimony or confession by the commissioner was different. Observe this example:

In the city of Manila, on the fourteenth day of May, one thousand six hundred and sixteenth year [of our Lord], before Father Fray Bernardo de Santa Catalina of the order of Saint Dominic and commissioner of the Holy Office . . . appeared a man who said his name is Jean Marcos, native of . . . France . . . thirty-two years old, who swore, according to procedure, to tell the truth.

He declared: [the subject narrated how he came to the Moluccas with the Dutch, how he decided to desert to the Spaniards, and why he went over to the Spanish side].

He was questioned: [What the religion of his parents was or were and what religion the deponent professed before joining Spanish forces.]

He declared: [That when the deponent was a boy, *etc.* The rest of the deposition shows that the interrogator spared no effort to obtain all background information possible which could shed light on vital aspects of a cause, truth or falsity of allegations, degree of the crime committed, aggravating or mitigating circumstances, *etc.*]⁶⁵

The preceding material demonstrates that the procedure of the Philippine Inquisition was identical with that in Spain or Latin America and followed faithfully the formulas laid down in the Spanish inquisition manuals. However, inasmuch as the Philippines was only a commissioner district, trials of heresies and other grave crimes took place in the viceregal capital [Mexico City] and underwent the same conditions as similar cases submitted from other

64. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 126, Exp. 3; Greenleaf, *The Mexican Inquisition of the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 198-206; Medina, *Inquisición en México*, p. 205; Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition* (New York, 1965), pp. 179-80.

65. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 352, Exp. 110.

parts of New Spain. Because those trials took place overseas, the more horrifying part of inquisition, the burning alive of convicted heretics, or the harassment of prisoners in the streets by crowds during the auto-de-fe (or final ceremony for convicted people) would not have been witnessed in the Philippines.

The fact, however, is that only one burning of a heretic from the Philippines ever took place in Mexico, that of Domingo Rodriguez, and then, when he was already dead. Because evidence of *relapso* or recidivism was found after his death, the Mexican tribunal ordered his bones to be exhumed and to be *relajado* ("relaxed") or delivered to secular authorities for public burning. Professor Liebman wrote that in 1649 three Jews were burned in Manila and that there were reports of "several" Jews in the Philippine colony. The archival records in the AGN, however, fail to turn up any evidence to confirm his findings. Hugo Pieter (Hugo Pedro), a teen-age Flemish Protestant, escaped from Mexico and was burned in effigy; but was captured later in the Philippines and dispatched. He was reconciled in 1603 before the tribunal.⁶⁶

Despite the fears of inquisition officers and Spanish missionaries that the Philippines, "so recently converted to Christianity" "was very much exposed to foreign heresies," the total number of heretics denounced in the entire history of the Philippine Inquisition is relatively small. Of the secret Jews or alleged judaizers, the AGN mentions only nine cases, to which must be added two additional cases mentioned by Medina but which are not listed in the Mexican national archives. The figures in this context are approximate. Between 1601 and 1806, 164 cases of Protestants were counted. Most of these ended in reconciliation; the rest, Dutch prisoners captured in 1601, were executed, not for heresy, but treason against Spain.⁶⁷ There were thirty-four American Protestants before the Holy Office between 1735 and 1809. Two Palestinian "Catholics" were recorded in Manila in 1745 who applied for a permit to transfer to Mexico. By their own classification, they were not heretics, but all aliens entering the colony had to be

66. Liebman, *The Jews in New Spain*, pp. 231, 266, 283, 308, and 310. However, the archival source cited by Professor Liebman contained no mention of the "burning" of Jews in Manila. See also Medina, *Inquisición en México*, p. 86.

67. Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, Vol. 17, pp. 15, 121-26; Vol. 13, pp. 127-29. The rest of the paragraph is a summary of research findings in the AGN, Ramo de Inquisición.

checked. In 1643, a case for morisco was brought against Alexo de Castro. In addition, two cases of apostasy (to Islam) were recorded in 1588 and 1777, one against a Spaniard who jumped ship in Borneo and another against a Mexican mestizo in Ternate, the Moluccas. Classified as mere renegades (*renegados*) instead of apostates, were soldiers who "accepted" Islam for purposes of survival when they were captured by Moros in Mindanao around 1639. Most of them escaped later to Spanish territory, but a Dutch artilleryman in the service of Spain, Heinrich (Enrique) de Medina, preferred to stay with the Moslem enemy and his Moro wives. Lastly, seven foreign Masons of European origin were reported in 1753-1779. One of these, a certain Vincent O'Kennedy, was reported "presumably drowned" in 1779 in Candon (Ilocos Sur?).

END OF SPANISH INQUISITION

The Spanish Inquisition finally came to its end in the early nineteenth century. On 14 August 1821, the governor general of the Philippines, Mariano Fernández de Folgueras, notified the Ministry of Grace and Justice in Madrid that he had complied with instructions in 1820 to inform the archbishop of Manila and the head commissioner that the Holy Office had been abolished. From 1792 to the final days of the Philippine Inquisition, the last commissioner, Fray Nicolás Cora, O.P., recorded six reconciled Protestants, one reconciled Armenian, six cases of heretical propositions, one case of blasphemy, seven cases of solicitation of women by priests, five miscellaneous complaints, and twenty tabulations of paper work on censorship. Although at this time the Holy Office in the Philippines had many times more officers than when Manrique started out in 1583, it spent half of its time studying applications for inquisition posts, reading of edicts in various towns, and forwarding lists of its officers to Mexico. The most exciting thing that happened to Fray Cora, it appears, was the robbery of the Holy Office quarters in 1793!

CONCLUDING OBSERVATION

One may observe similarities in evolution, organization, goals, functioning, and procedures between the Philippine Inquisition and its counterparts in Latin America, certainly a proof of Ka-

men's statement that the Spanish Inquisition was "uniform" from Manila to Lima to Sicily.⁶⁸ Greenleaf wrote of the Mexican Inquisition as "less of a repressive institution" than what previous scholars had hitherto portrayed.⁶⁹ The same may be said of the Philippine Inquisition. But compared to the Mexican Inquisition, the Philippine counterpart was "weak." This was not only because the Philippines had only a "commissioner inquisition," rather than a complete tribunal inquisition, but also because the Asian colony of Spain did not attract too many heretics. More important, like the Mexican Inquisition, the Philippine Inquisition underwent shifting attitudes of Spanish officialdom, both secular and religious.

There were minor differences. For example, the cases of Quintero's socializing with Manila "Moors," and of the reconciliation of Armenians in the Philippines, seem to find no parallels in Latin America. Seemingly, the inclusion of indigenous (non-white) Filipino priests as jurisdictional subjects of the Holy Office demonstrated a major deviation from Spanish Inquisition policy — because Spain chose not to train Indian priests in Latin America.⁷⁰ This particular case, however, involved merely a difference in race and not the inclusion of subjects whose theological and ethical values suggested pre-Spanish, rather than Spanish, origins.

On the whole, there is no evidence to justify Medina's suspicions that the Philippine Inquisition was "completely removed" from the Mexican Inquisition in terms of "place, men, and circumstances."⁷¹ True, the Spanish Inquisition in the Philippines worked in an Asian environment, but this fact did not produce significant deviations, in deference to cultural differences, from procedures and policies used by the mother organization in La-

68. Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition* (New York, 1965), p. ix.

69. Greenleaf, *The Mexican Inquisition of the Sixteenth Century*, p. 213.

70. From the start of the Spanish occupation of Mexico, young Indians were used by missionaries as interpreters, then *doctrineros* (lay preachers), but not as priests. By the Council of 1539, Indians were admitted to four minor orders (porter, reader, exorcist, and acolyte) which were not regarded as sacramental. There is a record of a royal order in 1588 (it is not known if this is the earliest) permitting mestizos (not Indians) to be ordained into the priesthood. A study made by Professor Braden uncovered no evidence that Spain ever allowed Mexican Indians to be trained and ordained as priests. See Charles S. Braden, *Religious Aspects of the Conquest of Mexico* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1930), pp. 270-76 and Joaquín García Icazbalceta, *Nueva colección de documentos para la historia de México* (México, 1886-1892), Vol. 4, p. 499.

71. Medina, *Inquisición en las Islas Filipinas*, p. vii.

tin America. After all, the "men" processed by Philippine commissioners were Europeans and Americans — as in Latin America — or Armenians and indigenous Filipino priests whose exposure to Christian doctrine raised them from the level of "minors" to that of *gente de razón*. More significant, "circumstances" affecting the *procesos* in Latin America and the Philippines were identical: the struggle of Spaniards to offer models of Catholic behavior to native converts, to create politico-religious stability, and thus to preserve the colony for Spain.