

THE SPANISH INQUISITION AS A MEANS OF INFLUENCING THE COMMON SENSE OF CITIZENS

Slobodan Nešković, B.A. Danijela Marčeta

Faculty of Economics and Engineering Management in Novi Sad,
University Business Academy Novi Sad, Serbia
e-mails: slobneskovic@gmail.com, danijelamarceta@gmail.com

Abstract:

Manipulation of the human mind is a topic that suggests a number of different discussions, but so far most of these have focused on the subject of crowd manipulation as if it were only a contemporary phenomenon that is carried out through the mass media. However, manipulation is a means of engaging, controlling, or influencing the desires of a crowd in order to direct their actions toward the manipulators' best interests. It is clear that manipulation is an essential part of human nature and dates back to the founding of societies. Religion is one of the mechanisms aimed at unification of societies, and therefore unification of their supreme values, principles, and objectives. Unfortunately, there are extreme examples of the manipulation of societies by means of religion, and the Spanish Inquisition is a case in point. The objective of this paper is to draw conclusions regarding the mechanisms of domination and control over human common sense. It also aims to discover how the Inquisition restricted not only people's actions, but also their minds, and how it employed human minds to achieve not only its own goals, but also the goals of the government with which it was mutually dependent.

Key words: Spanish Inquisition, common sense, the social control, religious extremism.

Introductory considerations

Religion is a window to the human soul; it teaches the human to recognize his own nature, to discover the world. When confronted with problems in life, a human seeks after the purpose and meaning of life by developing an understanding of the universe and its existence. Religion is an answer to why humans are the way they are. Unfortunately, history books abound with examples of the forceful abuse of religion. Religion can be a powerful weapon for controlling the thoughts and common sense of people. This creates further possibilities for

taking control of their actions. The Inquisition was established within Christianity and the Roman Catholic Church. When studying the functioning of the Inquisition, it is important to take into consideration the period of its development, the conditions under which it evolved, and the identity of its victims in order to reach the proper conclusions.

First of all, the Inquisition as a tool of social control was created after the religious schism, but it was not an exclusively Spanish, medieval, or Roman Catholic phenomenon, since the tribunal of the Holy Office was created in Sicily and would later spread to other countries in Western Europe (France, Great Britain, Switzerland, etc.). What characterizes the Inquisition in Spain is that it was a tool of social control in the religious absolutist monarchy, and was strongest from the end of the 15th till the end of the 17th century.

The Spanish Inquisition was officially established in 1478 by a decree of King Fernando II and Queen Isabella and remained under their direct control, but it was also under the control of the Pope in Rome. It originally had jurisdiction over Christians only, but after the expulsion of Muslims and Jews from Spain, its jurisdiction was extended to all the king's subjects. It is important to emphasize that the Inquisition was created with the aim of controlling the population of Christianized Jews and Muslims suspected of secretly observing non-Catholic religious practices. Isabella aspired to make everyone Catholic, and she was strongly influenced by her confessor, a Dominican friar named Tomás de Torquemada, who became a notorious inquisitor.

1. The levers of power and the Familiari as the intelligence apparatus of the Inquisition

Considering the question of the real power of the Spanish Inquisition to manipulate human common sense and actions, Peter Leposavić (2006)

overcomes many old prejudices, emphasizing that "the presence of the Spanish Inquisition in the entire area and the establishment of permanent courts—distributed regionally according to a certain elaborate but logical system of 'visits'—confirms that it was not about decentralization or regionalization, since there were courts in the centers of each district, but simply a good and deliberate centralization," and also "that the Inquisition was set up as a pyramidal structure of ecclesiastical authority and control from its very outset" (p.85). The Spanish Inquisition was associated with the Vatican, but it was also an instrument of the Spanish state seeking to establish control. Leposavić (2006) came to this conclusion by drawing on a series of historical facts, the most important being that the Inquisition in Spain came out as *Consejo de la Suprema y General Inquisición*. The *Suprema* was primarily a supreme state body, and was only nominally under the control of Rome. In reality, it was the Spanish kings who initiated the establishment of the Inquisition in Spain. However, both the church and the state had a shared interest in the Spanish Inquisition. The connection between the *Suprema* and the top of the Roman Catholic Church is evident from the fact that all the great inquisitors elected by the *Suprema* at the time of the elections were bishops or archbishops, and twelve grand inquisitors held the title of Cardinal.

The *Suprema* had a lot of tasks to perform, the most important being the direction and control of the provincial courts. Leposavić (2006) emphasizes that "the *Suprema* was constantly modifying, completing, and reducing its regulations, conclusions, tasks, and goals, aligning them with the political, economic, and psychological state of the society" (p. 86). Of particular significance were inspections of the courts, in which an inspector's duty was to determine whether the general policy prescribed by the *Suprema* was being implemented in court procedure. It also controlled the work of the *Familiari*, who represented a kind of Inquisition intelligence apparatus, and were of particular importance to the mechanism of instilling fear in the entire society and controlling citizens through intimidation. It is interesting that the *Suprema* had entire files on every court, containing data about court cases, inquisitors, and all other members of the courts.

The first court was established in 1481 in Seville. According to the instructions of Torquemada, each court was composed of two inquisitors, one lawyer, one alguazil, and one clerk.

In addition, every court had notaries and subordinate officers, as well as royal officials whose job was to confiscate and manage the property of every person sentenced by the Inquisition. Of course, we should not forget the other assistants whose number varied from court to court. At that time, Spain was divided into 12 provinces provided with an equal number of courts. Most courts had two or three inquisitors, and in rare cases one. The Spanish Inquisition was studied by Bartolome Bennassar (1981), who examined biographies of inquisitors and arrived at the conclusion that over 90% of inquisitors were elected from among highly educated people belonging to the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church in Spain.

Provincial courts received a permanent status after 1530, and afterwards—given the frequent inspections by the *Suprema*—they faced the need for an increased number of undercover agents and informants to disclose heretics among the population. Their job was to investigate suspicions and to summon, interrogate, torture, and punish those convicted of heresy. The Spanish Inquisition was very interconnected, and every territorial unit in Spain had its own network of *Commissioners* and *Familiari*.

Commissioners of the Inquisition were a sort of secret police, and a large number of them represented so-called *letrados* subject to a very strict selection. *Letrados* were literate and educated officers in the public service. *Commissioners* often worked in places located far away from the provincial courts, and were charged with the tasks of execution, interrogation, examination, questioning, and recounting oral statements of immobile persons. The Inquisition vested *commissioners* with these powers in order to save money.

Familiari and their role in the activities of the Inquisition have been studied by the famous Spanish historians Henry Kamen, Bartolome Bennassar, and Ricardo García Carsel. These authors agree on the fact that *familiari* were lay people loyal to the Inquisition and were granted certain privileges by the Inquisition for their activities. Stephen Haliczzer (1990) examined the issue of the origins of the *familiari* and came to the conclusion that *familiari* were the Inquisitors' armed escorts, accompanying them in their travels from town to town. At first they were simply young monks of the Dominican Third Order who were called *familiari* due to their close attachment to the inquisitors. Emil Lucka (1933) states that *familiari* enjoyed immunity from secular

courts: "Fear and trembling of the citizens was instilled by the *familiari*, the hull of suspicious people who, as officers of the Inquisition, could not be brought before any secular court," but he also reveals another fact about them: "they often used the name of Inquisition for their own deeds" (p. 131). *Familiari* used to be elected publicly by a court from among old Christians who had never been indicted by the Inquisition (nor had their ancestors). The number of *familiari* was largest in the period of the most active operation of the courts—from 1490 to 1550. Some records indicate that citizens often complained about the work of the *familiari*, whose number was constantly increasing and whose work was financed by the courts. According to Lucka (1933) "complaints to the secular authorities were constantly occurring; in 1514, the Toledo city authorities complained to the king because of the impudence of these people who disturbed peace in the city. Ferdinand and Cardinal Ximenes issued several decrees to curb their iniquity, including that only the people of good reputation were eligible for the *familiari*; in addition, they had to carry with them an authorization signed by three inquisitors" (p.132). As part of his research on *familiari*, Bennassar (1981) also studied their past. He found that out of a total of 78 *familiari* hired at the end of the first large recruitment in 1544 in Cordoba, there existed data on the former occupations of 68 of them. Most belonged to the lower strata of the society, either artisans or small traders. Emil Lucka (1933) points out that there were prominent people who accessed the famous *familiari* brotherhood Confradia de San Pedro Martyr, and that some of them even used to pay large sums of money to the Inquisition in order to join the *familiari*. Another author to write about inquisitors taking money in exchange for admitting people into the office of *familiari* is Bennassar (1981). He cites, as an example, the case of inquisitor Alonso de Hoces from Seville, who was twice accused of bribery. However, the Inquisition solved this problem by announcing in 1651 that one needed to pay 1,500 ducats in order to become a member of the *familiari*. This paid off the most for people who had just converted to Christianity and were afraid of being suspected of heresy and denounced.

Familiari had other privileges as well, including the right to carry weapons, ride horses, eligibility for military ranks, and exemption from rent and from military service in the case of war. The title of *familiari* became a legacy that everyone sought to

preserve within his family and pass on to heirs. *Familiari* possessed prestige and people feared their power, although they lost their privileges and influence in the late 17th century. It is clear that *familiari* represented an important element of social control, a kind of an intelligence machine, and most importantly, all citizens feared them. The *familiari* could be anywhere, and anyone could be in touch with them. The function of the *familiari* was to enable the Inquisition to keep control over the people and to rule using the pedagogy of fear.

2. The course of the Inquisition against heretics

We can distinguish different steps taken by the Inquisition from the start of the process until the final outcome. The worst possible outcome of a trial was burning at the stake. The process consisted of the following elements: a complaint, a period of grace, interrogation procedures, torture, *sambenitos* (penitential clothing), *autos-de-fe*, imprisonment, etc. All procedures were carefully planned, and judges followed instructions from books written specifically for them. One of the first books of this type was the "Directorium Inquisitorum" written by the monk Nicolas Eymerich in 1376 in Avignon. It was the synthesis of a number of documents, and it was used to justify the ecclesiastical structure of the repressive apparatus. Moreover, four Dominican monks had already drafted a similar book between 1244 and 1254. This was a famous manual by Bernard Guy, the "Practica inquisitionis." Later on, inquisitors also used a book called "Malleus Maleficarum."

During the medieval Inquisition period that lasted from the 13th to the 15th century, bishops who acted as judges used to apply the method of *acusatio*, waiting for individual complaints. The inquisition method that involved testing and active verification of whether there had been manifestations of heretical behaviour or a moral transgression was introduced by the modern Saint Office. The Torquemada period brought about the need for more serious evidence in order to level accusations, causing the Inquisition tribunal to act more carefully when leveling a charge of heresy considered a crime against the "divine majesty."

Beatriz Comella (2003) came to the conclusion that the usual stages of judicial procedure were "preparatory period, checks, taking precautions, initiation of the trial, presentation of evidence, use of

torture, sentencing, enforcement of the sentence (*auto-de-fe*), mitigating of the judgment” (p. 106).

2.1 The preparatory period

Edicto de gracia was the so-called period of forgiveness, an edict which guaranteed forgiveness to all those who signed up as heretics without public exposure. There used to be many self-incriminations during periods of forgiveness. The punishment implied either merely social consequences, or the penitent was whipped, obliged to give charity on a regular basis, or obliged to attend all religious services. Still, such penitents were not deprived of their property.

Edicto de fe was a proclamation issued in the 16th century, and commanded people to denounce all those who they knew to be heretics—even if said heretics were their own family members—or face excommunication. Bartolomé Bennassar (1981) called this proclamation a “pedagogy of fear.”

Edicto de delaciones used to be read on one Sunday during Lent every year, and it obliged believers to denounce those who committed heresy within six days (until the next Sunday mass).

Edicto de los anatemas used to be proclaimed eight days after the *edicto de delaciones* as a threat to all believers who did not denounce another person's heresy.

Edicto emplazador applied to those who fled or were absent, i.e., whoever would not show up in person before inquisitors (investigators) at a defined time in a defined place as their trials began. Such persons were convicted of heresy for being stubborn and failing to fully repent.

2.2 Verification

In its quest for signs of heresy, the Inquisition used to avail itself of various sources: accusatory rumours confirmed by honourable persons, the prosecutor's charges substantiated by evidence, individual denunciation before a notary and two witnesses who swore on the Gospels. Initially, three individual denunciations were necessary to issue an indictment; later on (in the 15th and 16th centuries) this was not necessary, even though the supreme inquisitor Valdes proclaimed that a case would only be taken into consideration if there were several individual denunciations. Starting in the second half of the 16th century, anonymous individual denunciations were allowed in order to protect the informer from revenge. Moreover, when it came to informers, they had to be absolutely confident in what they were doing, as there was a special

consideration that they had to take into account in reporting their suspicions to the Inquisition. If an informer accused another person of heresy, they had to be aware of the punishment foreseen for the accused, because should the allegations turn out to be false, under the law of Talion it would be the informer who received that punishment instead. Alternatively, if informers merely expressed their doubts in the form of information, the informer would run no risk of being punished.

Two witnesses were needed to give statements under oath for the tribunal to issue an arrest warrant for the accused. At the end of the 15th century, an obligation was introduced to take a statement from the accused; within 8 days he had to answer whether he knew what he was accused of before the Inquisitor, two priests, and a notary.

2.3 Precautionary measures

Precautionary measures included the imprisonment of the accused and the confiscation of all his property. It is important to mention that an accused person used to be incarcerated and unable to communicate with the outside world; the whole trial used to be conducted in utmost secrecy both from the public and from the indicted person. Preventive imprisonments of up to two years also occurred while the cases were being supposedly investigated, while the indicted person very often did not even know why they were in custody. Regarding the confiscation of the suspected offender's property, it was inventoried according to specific court rules, and confiscated in order to pay off the debt for the costs of the trial. As a result, families of the accused would frequently lose all of their assets.

2.4 Initiating the trial

First the accused would be interrogated by the inquisitors in the presence of two priests and a notary in accordance with the instructions from the manual. The accused had three chances to confess heresy and, should that happen, he would be punished with imprisonment and property confiscation. Should one fail to admit heresy, the content of the denunciation would be read out to the accused, and he would be entitled to a lawyer who would get a share of the seized property. Also, the defendant could request the withdrawal of one inquisitor.

2.5 Presentation of evidence

The presentation of evidence implied either the confession of the defendant or witness statements.

When interrogating witnesses, the inquisitor was obliged to investigate whether any of them were hostile to the accused. All statements were given under oath and signed by witnesses. Emil Lucka (1933) points out in this respect: "Since the inquisitor was anything but a fair judge, as a prosecutor he wanted to prove the guilt of the accused at all costs; he would appreciate any witness incriminating the accused, while opposing all witnesses who would speak in favor of the defendant" (p. 140). Also, the defendant was entitled to make up a list of all his enemies, but also of all witnesses who would guarantee his innocence. If evidence could not be determined at this stage, the Inquisition would proceed to the phase of torturing the accused.

2.6 Use of torture

Inspired by secular trials, the Church introduced the method of torture in the 13th century. It is important to note that torture was always applied in the presence of a doctor. It is rarely mentioned in the literature that victims were tortured naked or with certain body parts just barely covered, which was supposed to have a particular psychological impact on them. The most common methods of torture included winch, water, and crank. The *garrucha* (winch) was a method of torture by tying the wrists of the accused behind his back and then suspending him from the ceiling with weights tied to his ankles. Tormentors would first lift the accused high into the air and subsequently lower him to make him feel as if he was about to hit the floor. This was the mildest method of torture. The *agua* was a water-based method in which a cloth was placed into the mouth of the accused and water was spilled inside his mouth, provoking a fear of drowning. The defendant would be posed in such a position that his head would hang down slightly below the rest of his body, and the tormentors would spill slightly less than one liter of water. The tormentors used to repeat the torture process 6 to 8 times. During pauses, they would ask the accused whether he would like to confess heresy. Later on, these two primitive methods of torture were replaced by the rack. The *cordeles* (rack) was a wooden frame to which the victim of the torture would be tied with ropes. By a gradual straining of the ropes the accused person was stretched, causing unbearable pain. There were also other inventions, like the red-hot iron, red-hot stones, etc. However, even though the Inquisition's activity reached its peak in the 16th century, it rarely used torture.

2.7 Pronouncement of sentence

An advisory committee composed of priests was responsible for the pronouncement of sentence. It used to deliver a decision after reviewing detailed reports submitted by inquisitors. Regarding the most severe sentence (the death penalty), starting from the period of Torquemada the unanimous consent of all members of the advisory committee was required, and thus a single vote would be sufficient to save the defendant from a death sentence. The defendant was also entitled to "canonical compurgation" (a canonical principle taken from Germanic law), which meant that the accused had a final chance to prove his innocence with the help of witnesses who would swear together with him (seven to thirty witnesses). If the judges were not convinced of the guilt of the accused, this method would be used. If the judges accepted the oaths of witnesses, the accused would get a milder sentence, which would be announced to him privately. Should the accused person be convicted, the decision would be announced before the accused, a notary, a representative of the bishop, and the inquisitors.

2.8 Execution of sentence

If proven guilty, the convicted person would have his sentence determined by the inquisitors according to the degree of severity of the misdeed. We can distinguish five types of penalties for offenses that fall under heresy:

1. Disclaimer: this sentence was reserved either for convicts who had committed a minor offense, or for those who had been accused of more serious offenses but whose guilt could not be proven. The sentence required repentance of the convicted at Sunday Masses.
2. Death sentence: this sentence was reserved for those heretics who would not admit their mistakes. This sentence was always followed by excommunication from the Church and the confiscation of all property.
3. Prison sentence: According to Eymeric's manual (1376) for inquisitors, persons accused of grave heresy were detained and sentenced to prison. Those sentenced to life imprisonment could be subject to a milder regime in prisons, and their punishment never really lasted a lifetime, because later on—as penitents—they would be sent to monasteries or to their homes to atone for their sins. The sentence of house arrest was

applied since 1488. Moreover, convicted persons would have all their property confiscated, with a certain amount left for a dowry if the convict had a daughter, while sons could not claim any right to the convict's property.

4. Financial fines: Besides property confiscation, prisoners could be assigned cash fines. The *ammenda* was the best-known fine, assigned to the descendants of sentenced persons in order to wash away their shame through financial contributions.
5. Other forms of punishment included whippings, exile, and penitence—punishments designed to induce feelings of shame in convicts. Public repentance implied the penitents' duty to attend every ceremony of *auto de fe*, publicly renouncing their sins. During the ceremony of *auto de fe*, graver offenders whose sins were heinous used to be subject to public whipping, which was supposed to serve as a warning to the people observing this torture. Those condemned to exile used to get sentences ranging from three-and-a-half to fifteen years (lifetime sentences were rare). This punishment was typical for wealthy businessmen, who would thus lose their prestige and reputation and were at the same time squeezed economically, which suited the *Suprema's* interests. Emil Lucka mentions a sentence that required work on the galleys. Lucka (1933) states that this sentence was introduced by Ferdinand the Catholic because he needed ship rowers.

As regards practices that induced shame in convicts, it is important to mention the *sambenito*. The *sambenito* was a penitential garment that "marked" the penitents in the society and made them subject to derision. In the first decades of the Spanish Inquisition's operation, penitents had to wear *sambenitos* any time they left their home. These were yellow tunics with a red cross of St. Andrew on the chest and back. The *sambenito* was a way to perpetuate punishment. Those who had not repented and were handed over to the secular authorities wore black *sambenitos* with painted flames, which symbolized hell. The *sambenito* was a way of punishing not only heretics, but also their descendants, and was thus called the "inherited guilt."

Those prisoners who were condemned to carry *sambenitos* only for a defined period of time had to return these tunics to the church. Priests would hang these *sambenitos* marked with the penitents' names on a special place in the cathedral. There were cases of *sambenitos* disappearing from the cathedral, but *Suprema's* inspectors controlled all the cathedrals and placed new *sambenitos* in place of the stolen ones so that the descendants of convicted people could not escape public humiliation. The aim of the *Suprema* was to stigmatize the accused forever, together with their descendants, in order for the church to be protected from them in advance, and to make persons carrying *sambenitos* embody a warning to sinners of their fate, instilling fear in the populace. Petar Leposavić (2006) states that the people of Spain sought the abolishment of every practice of public humiliation through complaints and public protests, outraged at the presence of publicly labelled people walking around in towns wearing *sambenitos*; in their opinion, penitents in these tunics were disgracing entire cities.

A heretical or apostate offense could be punished differently depending on whether the convicted person admitted the offense or denied it. Should he deny the offense, the Inquisition would hand him over to secular authorities, who would condemn the offender to public burning at the stake during the ceremony of *auto de fe*. The *auto de fe* was actually a ceremony aimed at spreading the faith and directing people towards orthodoxy. The nation even looked forward to this feast of faith, and used to complain if there was a decrease in number of burned heretics, while official persons had a duty to attend these ceremonies. Emil Lucka (1933) emphasized that the *auto de fe* "was the highest service to God, the victory of the church over all of its enemies, a genuine picture of the last judgment" (p. 161). If the convicted person repented at the last moment, he would not be burned alive, but hung instead, and thus spared of major torment. There were cases of prisoners somehow managing to escape, and pictures bearing their names burned at the stake instead. In the case of someone being convicted of heresy after his death, the inquisition would burn that person's remains.

Besides these public *autos de fe*, there were also *auto particular* or *autilio* that were held in churches or halls of the Inquisition, when the latter wanted to spare some offenders of major public shame, or simply did not have the money to organize a public *auto de fe* in a city square. In the case of

auto de fe penalties, families of the convicted were most gravely hit by the forfeit of civil rights. This verdict was called *inabilita*. The penalty was designed mostly for rich Jews with the aim of their exclusion from both public and economic life. However, *inabilita* often included the possibility of *ammenda*, which allowed the cessation of punishment through financial contribution, thereby removing the stamp of shame from descendants. It is important to emphasize that the researchers of Spanish Inquisition came to the conclusion that the *Suprema*'s aim was to weaken all heretics economically.

2.9 Mitigation of sentence and appeal procedure

Appeal and mitigation of sentence was possible only for those sentenced to prison. Good conduct of the defendant was a precondition for the mitigation of punishment and its conversion to spiritual atonement, which implied attending Masses, making pilgrimages, and the like. Appeals were frequent from the time of Torquemada. Complaints filed by respectable persons on behalf of the accused could suspend trials on grounds of insufficient evidence.

3. The Inquisition as a tool of social control and mind control

After analyzing the judicial process, we can conclude that the victims of the Inquisition were numerous. Certain numbers presented by some authors during the 19th and early 20th century are not accurate, since some data is lacking, and certain ideological prejudices that existed at that time led to an exaggeration of the number of victims. Henningsen and Contreras thoroughly researched the number of victims of the Inquisition, and came to the most objective conclusions made so far. They found that at the time of the highest activity of the Inquisition—between 1540 and 1700—there were approximately 50,000 trials. Beatriz Comella (2003) emphasizes their conclusions: "Tribunals in Castilla sentenced 44,674 people, 876 were burned at the stake; Tribunals in Aragon sentenced 25,890 people, 520 were burned at the stake. Accordingly, during the period of two and a half centuries of the highest inquisitorial activity, 1,346 people were executed, accounting for 1.9% of the total number of convicts" (p. 116). The most serious of the crimes for which people were convicted were: Crypto-Judaism (baptised Jews who secretly adhered to the faith of Moses), Mohammedanism (baptised Muslims

persisting in their customs), Lutheranism, being Illuminati, blasphemy, making up stories against religion, bigamy, etc.

Contreras and Henningsen also came to the conclusion that the most brutal period of the Inquisition (the period between 1540 and 1595) coincided with the secular reign of King Philip II, which proves that the Inquisition was a tool of the Counter-Reformation.

The relationship of synergy has always been ideal for the church and state. Of course, this relationship implies a clear distinction between spiritual and secular authorities, whereby there is a mutual cooperation for the sake of the progress of the community. For this reason, the Church has always followed politics and social changes and tried to contribute to those changes. Before secularization, religious heresy represented a doubly destructive phenomenon for the society, because a heretic violates both God's law and the societal law. And the people themselves have accepted these laws. Beatriz Comella (2003) argues that Inquisition is nothing else than an institutionally embodied timeless and universal social function—the social control that is performed by absolutely all known human societies in order to defend their special values, an essential condition for the preservation of collective identity. Heresy reached socio-political dimensions because religion and politics intertwined, and therefore heresy actually threatened the teachings upon which the society rested. Theorists of the 16th century equated sin with offense. Heresy was not only an insult against God, but also an insult against the king as a Christian ruler, and also a source of civil discord and other problems.

The objective of the *Suprema* was to control all layers of the society, including respectable ones, through the Inquisition. Moreover, the Inquisition often accused even prominent government officials of heresy, and even those within its own ranks. The Inquisition in Spain condemned prominent humanist Juan de Vergara, doctors Constantine and Kazali, inquisitor Jose Fernandez de Toro, archbishop and primate of Spain De Karnas, archbishop of Toledo and the primate of Spain Bartolome de Carnaza y Miranda, and also other prominent people, including Pablo de Olviede, Luis de Leon, Teresa of Avila, etc. Comella (2003) also states that the Inquisition became increasingly dedicated to purging the church's ranks, not allowing the "disease" imported from Europe (Humanism, Reformation,

Enlightenment, rationalism, liberalism, and modernism) to create a stronghold on the soil of the most Catholic country—Spain.

Moreover, public execution of penalties and loss of reputation are clear evidence that heresy was condemned in general. The best examples are *sambenitos* and *autos de fe*. Through the ceremony of *auto de fe*, the Inquisition was attributing huge importance to the public pronouncement of judgment in order to teach people a lesson and create a state of fear in the society. Also, the ceremony had a lot of religious symbols and elements of a real drama, which further affected the general state of human consciousness at that time. However, the social control implemented by the Inquisition was based on law, and people accepted it because they were awed by the Inquisition. The *sambenito* was a kind of reminder of shame to both the victim and others. The custom of wearing *sambenito* persisted until the 19th century.

Another mechanism of social control was the mechanism of secrecy. The Inquisition penetrated deep into the private sphere, and the accused persons often did not know why they were arrested, nor had they had any contact with the outside world. This mechanism of secrecy instilled fear among all individuals in the society, because anyone could be accused of something. Emil Lucka (1933) points out that “the most unique invention and a tremendous power of the Inquisition was the secrecy that surrounded all its operations” (p. 141). Subjects of the Spanish king and Christian believers were deeply surprised to learn that someone could be imprisoned without any evidence and kept far away from the outside world; and on top of that, the accused had no right to know who had accused him, nor what the charges were. This is why in the 16th century there were frequent protests appealing to the authorities to ensure a public and fair trial. In 1518, citizens sent an appeal to King Charles V. The appeal was drafted in the form of an amendment containing 25 clear demands. This was not the only attempt of citizens to influence the work of the Inquisition. However, the authorities did not exert any influence in this area because, in a certain way, the Inquisition worked in their favor. The church itself also tried to influence the Inquisition. Pope Leo X tried to influence the work of the *Suprema*, but his edicts did not produce the expected results. The Pope died, and his successor did not attempt to deal with these issues. So secrecy was the most important mechanism employed by the Inquisition for the

establishment of social control, since mystery evoked fear, and fear proved to be the best weapon for controlling human minds and common sense. No one even dared to entertain an opinion different from the church's, let alone publicly express such opinions.

Bartolome Bennassar (1981) states that for three centuries the Inquisition ruled by fear, because orders were carried out through instilling fear. He emphasizes that “the most conscientious inquisitors were trying to achieve a result: fear was meant to remove the biggest obstacles in the way of heresy” (p. 94). The opinion of Francisco Peña on the manual for inquisitors—written by Nicolau Eymerich—has been mentioned above in this paper. It is important to emphasize that, when speaking of “terror against the people,” Eymerich refers to the psychological unbearability of terrifying scenes created deliberately to induce fear in believers so as to make them cast aside any shadow of doubt in their faith.

Bennassar (1981) still wonders whether the terror of the Inquisition was more terrible than the terror of secular courts. He analyzed the opinion of Louis Sala Molins, who claimed that the Inquisition had invented a technology of torture that was different from others, and that both state courts and the Inquisition pursued the same goal, i.e. forced confessions. Bennassar (1981) disagrees with these views and claims there is no difference between the torture performed by the Inquisition and that performed by courts worldwide, and that civilian courts tried to find material evidence of offenses, but the Inquisition was doing its best to extract confessions from defendants. Emil Lucka (1933) wrote on this subject that “whoever did not confess and whose heresy could not be proven demonstrated the incapacity of the Inquisition, and could be ruled innocent at the end of the day. By way of consolation, the following principle was already in force back in the time of the medieval Inquisition: it is better to punish a hundred innocent people than to let one criminal escape” (p. 145).

However, we must assess things objectively and ask ourselves how the Inquisition managed to control the common sense of each person. The human mind is practically impossible to control, and the same is true for the ideas that emerge in it. The thoughts and common sense of every individual belong only to him, and if he does not express them aloud or act in accordance with them, the Inquisition could have no suspicions of heresy. Therefore, the

Inquisition found another effective mechanism for establishing control—censorship. It took all necessary measures to prevent the spread of new ideas that were not in line with the church's teachings. Intellectuals in particular found themselves in the spotlight of the Inquisition's attention. Books sold in Spain were under control, and the Inquisition was very strict in terms of censorship. By the 19th century there were no works of scientific or philosophical significance left in Spain, as it was basically cut off from the rest of Europe and its culture. The Renaissance, humanism, and the German Reformation left no trace on the cultural heritage of Spain. The most interesting fact is that the church tried to "hide the Bible" from the nation, even resorting to burning translations of the Bible done by priests. It was only in 1790 that the first Spanish translation of the Bible was published. A list of banned books was issued by the Spanish Inquisition in 1559. The famous historian of the Spanish Inquisition Juan Antonio Llorente (1826) analysed in detail the censorship in Spain during the Inquisition, adding that the activities of the Inquisition regarding censorship weakened over time. Emil Lucka (1933) wrote on the cooperation between the church and state regarding the mission of censorship and the whole process at large: "Before a book could be published, its manuscript had to be handed over to the Inquisition, which thoroughly examined it before issuing a license. The license had to be submitted to the *Consejo Real* in Madrid, which conducted governmental censorship" (p. 206). By performing the function of censorship and controlling shipments of every book that was entering the country, the Inquisition worked in favor of the state, particularly after the outbreak of the French bourgeois revolution.

All of this leads us to the conclusion that the Inquisition introduced a form of terror into the society. Dragan Simeunović (2009) defines terror "as a form of intense and terrifying violence carried out by someone who is dominant, which implies not only possession of power, but also the use of any currently superior position in human relations; but, as a political category, terror violence of a certain political authority is vested in someone" (p. 23). Furthermore, terror as political violence is characterized by an organized, planned, and targeted enforcement, provoking large-scale fear in order to achieve certain goals. Also, the symbolic function of terror is that anyone can become an object of

violence, and even someone who is completely innocent has no possibility of remaining protected.

Concluding Remarks

In the end, it is unquestionable that the Inquisition included a kind of extreme religious violence. However, it is ironic that Jesus himself was a victim of intolerance. Also, the first Christians suffered great casualties and experienced violence themselves. Nowadays, it can be claimed that the Inquisition violated fundamental human rights, but at a time when the state was not secular, it was state terror and the Inquisition that were nothing but tools of the state, used to combat heresy that had acquired social-political dimensions and threatened the doctrines on which the society was based. Of course, the Inquisition was an apparatus that was created as a common interest of both the state and the Roman Catholic Church in the Vatican.

Governments sometimes resort to terror when they become less powerful, and this is especially characteristic for closed and totalitarian societies in which ideology or religion have important roles. The aim of the Inquisition was not to save the souls of convicts, but to frighten the rest of the population. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Inquisition operated on the principle of "it is better to win than to convince!" The aim was not to convince the masses of the existence of God, but to dominate them by provoking fear, which is typical of a policy of terror. The Inquisition in Spain manipulated people's common sense by employing the mechanisms of secrets, censures, announcing verdicts, etc. The most important element of the Inquisition for causing fear was the existence of secret police, who acted secretly and enjoyed great privileges in society. *Familiari* worked to obtain information about the perpetrators of heresy, and induced fear in people's minds because anyone could be an informer and provide *familiari* with true or false information. Torture performed by the Inquisition was nothing worse than torture performed by secular authorities. The most terrible fact about inquisitorial process was the mechanism of secrecy, as well as public exposure of convicts with the help of *auto de fe* penalties, *sambenito*, and similar sentences. Also, the Inquisition prevented any intellectual development of people by means of censure, and it exhausted the economic assets of the wealthy, since economic power is the basis of any other kind of power.

The conclusion that can be directly drawn from all this is that the Inquisition in Spain was a state instrument for implementation of certain objectives by employing terror as a kind of political and—in this case—religious violence. It can be concluded that the citizens in Spain at the time did not have freedom of speech, and also it can also be assumed that their freedom of opinion was limited.

References

- Bennassar B (1981) *Inquisición española: poder político y control social*. [e-book]. Grupo editorial Barcelona: Grijalbo. Available via SCRIBID. <http://www.scribd.com/doc/115160832/Benassar-Bartolome-Inquisicion-Espanola>, accessed 20 Oct 2014
- Comella B (2003) *Španska Inkvizicija*. Translated from the Spanish language by Biljana Bukvić. Beograd: Clio.
- Haliczer S (1990) *Inquisition and Society in the Kingdom of Valencia, 1478–1834*. [e-book]. Berkeley: University of California Press. Available via Google Books, http://books.google.rs/books?id=crCQmS_85EEC&printsec=frontcover&hl=sr&source=gbg_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false, accessed 12 Oct 2014
- Leposavić P (2006) *Inkvizicije: srednjovekovna, španska, rimska*. Beograd: IGAM.
- Llorente J A (1827) *The History of the Inquisition of Spain, from the Time of Its Establishment to the Reign of Ferdinand VII.: Composed from the Original Documents of the Archives of the Supreme Council, and from Those of Subordinate Tribunals of the Holy Office*. [e-book]. London: G. B. Whittaker,. Available via GoogleBooks, http://books.google.rs/books?id=ZTUvAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=sr&source=gbg_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false, accessed 10 Oct 2014
- Lucka E (1933) *Torquemada i inkvizicija u Španiji*. Translated from the German language by Stevan Milović. Beograd: Nolit.
- Simeunović D (2009) *Terorizam*. Beograd: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.