

7-1-1966

## The Mexican Inquisition and the Enlightenment 1763–1805

Richard E. Greenleaf

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr>

---

### Recommended Citation

Greenleaf, Richard E.. "The Mexican Inquisition and the Enlightenment 1763–1805." *New Mexico Historical Review* 41, 3 (1966). <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol41/iss3/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in New Mexico Historical Review by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [amywinter@unm.edu](mailto:amywinter@unm.edu), [lsloane@salud.unm.edu](mailto:lsloane@salud.unm.edu), [sarahrk@unm.edu](mailto:sarahrk@unm.edu).

*THE MEXICAN INQUISITION AND THE  
ENLIGHTENMENT 1763-1805*

RICHARD E. GREENLEAF

**M**ANY 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. These tenets were not later developments in the history of the Spanish Inquisition; they were inherent in the rationale of the institution from the fifteenth century onward, and were apparent in the Holy Office's dealing with the Jews, Protestants, and other heretics during the sixteenth century. The use of the Inquisition by the later eighteenth-century Bourbon kings in Spain as an instrument of regalism was not a departure from tradition. Particularly in the Viceroyalty of New Spain during the late eighteenth century do the Inquisition trials show how the Crown sought to promote political and religious orthodoxy.<sup>1</sup>

**THE AGE OF SCIENCE** and the Age of Reason in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Europe had powerful reverberations in the new world colonies of Spain. The attack on Scholasticism and the campaign against divine right kingship represented a joint political-religious venture all the more significant because the papacy was also a divine right institution. Regalist prelates came to dominate

the Church in Spain and Spanish America, and they were just as combative in their efforts to quell the new exponents of natural laws of politics and economics as were the Spanish monarchs. The environmentalism of Montesquieu and Rousseau was as much a challenge to Spanish rule in America as were the doctrines of empiricism and methodical doubt to the supremacy of the Roman Catholic faith and dogmas. During the period 1760 to 1805, the vicissitudes of Spanish-French politics and the shifting diplomatic and military alliances of the Spanish rulers in Europe complicated the problem of stemming the tide of rationalism in Mexico. The opening decade of the century had heralded the arrival of the French Bourbons on the Spanish throne, and the Spanish royal house and the French monarchy coordinated their diplomacies by the Family Compact of 1761. This made it difficult to prevent the circulation of Francophile ideas in the empire.

The Frenchmen in New Spain openly espoused Enlightenment ideas. Before 1763 they had infiltrated the periphery of the Viceroyalty of New Spain—merchants, sailors, and even clergy who came from Louisiana or the French-held islands of the Caribbean. In addition to French Protestantism, they began to disseminate the pre-revolutionary ideas of the *philosophes* and French literary figures. Technicians at the military-naval department of San Blas on the Pacific, physicians all over the empire, royal cooks and hairdressers in the viceregal capital, regiments of soldiers—all of these added to the Francophile *ambiente* in eighteenth-century Mexico.<sup>2</sup> In the two decades, 1763 to 1783, and even afterwards, the residuum of French influence in Louisiana caused New Orleans to be a center of sedition.<sup>3</sup>

Before philosophe thought culminated in the bloody French uprisings of 1789-1793, the Holy Office of the Inquisition found itself hamstrung in enforcing orthodoxy because of the *afrancesado* leanings of Charles III (1759-1788) in his administrative techniques and his economic theories.<sup>4</sup> For all of these reasons French literature was read in Mexico, not only for its freshness and its vitality, but as a guide for the "promotion of useful knowledge." An inherently dangerous ingredient of this milieu was the Holy

Office's necessary relaxation of censorship, with the subsequent proliferation of French ideas on many levels of Mexican society.<sup>5</sup> As the French Revolution gained momentum, the fear of its export to Mexico gave impetus to a resurgence of inquisitorial activity, demands for expulsion of Frenchmen and other suspicious foreigners from Mexico, and confiscation of their properties.<sup>6</sup> This cycle of Francophobia gradually ended as the political alliances of Spain vis-à-vis France and England again shifted, and as the reactionary Directorate consolidated its power in revolutionary France. After 1800, it soon became apparent that Napoleon Bonaparte was unwittingly spreading libertine doctrines over Europe, and the Holy Office once again had the task of defining and enforcing Mexican orthodoxy in a confused ideological and diplomatic environment. The investigatory activities of the Mexican Inquisition and the trials of the era must be examined against this background.<sup>7</sup>

ENLIGHTENMENT men in France—and in New Spain—were talking of popular sovereignty and the inalienable rights of man. The men who questioned the divine right of kings and severed the royal head of Louis XVI from his divine body were also prone to question papal authority, the practice of indulgences, the Triune God, the Immaculate Conception of Mary, and the doctrine of original sin. Both Voltaire and Rousseau had unorthodox religious ideas as well as iconoclastic social and political ones. Those who analyzed orthodox Christianity and established Mexican societal patterns from the philosophe point of view, often found them wanting.<sup>8</sup> Fear lest the French Revolution spread to the Mexican vicerealty was so great that after 1789 the Holy Office forbade citizens to read about the deplorable event. Late in 1794 plans were made to expel all Frenchmen and French sympathizers in the manner of the Jesuit expulsion three decades earlier.<sup>9</sup>

The Inquisition's control over printed matter, including books, pamphlets, manuscripts—and even printed designs, some of which, for example, showed the Tree of Reason—extended well beyond mere censorship of questionable material.<sup>10</sup> In theory, all books

which entered New Spain were inspected by the Inquisition; much of the data in the Inquisition archive of Mexico consists of lengthy lists from the *aduana*, together with inventories of books being detained in the port of Veracruz. With the aid of these lists one can trace the evolving definition of orthodoxy by noting what works, once banned, were later passed.<sup>11</sup> The books ordered by individual Mexicans throw light on colonial mentality through a knowledge of what men were reading.

Monelisa Lina Pérez-Marchand made an extensive study of the books prohibited in Mexico by the Inquisition, and her research determined that in the latter part of the eighteenth century, works of political philosophy predominated.<sup>12</sup> It is important to note that the majority of books proscribed by Holy Office edicts during 1763-1805 did not simply question specific policies but rather challenged the theoretical existence or *raison d'être* of the State. This indirect attack made it possible for the colonist to read and apply general theories to particular circumstances—Spanish mercantilism, monopolization of office by peninsular Spaniards, monolithic religion, etc. Because the colonists saw the French Revolution as an attempt to put these ideas into practice, accounts of it had to be zealously prohibited. Such works always carried heretical religious propositions. The banned *Lettres d'une Péruvienne* (1797) are a case in point. The Holy Office charged that they were filled with sedition and heresy and “injurious to monarchs and Catholic rulers of Spain . . . and to religion itself.” The same decree also prohibited *Les Ruines ou Meditation sur les revolutions des Empires* by M. Volney and others.<sup>13</sup> A separate ban of the Volney tract alleged that:

its author affirmed that there neither is nor could be revealed religion, that all (people) are daughters of curiosity, ignorance, interest, and imposture, and that the mystery of the birth of Jesus Christ, and the rest of the Christian religion are mystical allegories.<sup>14</sup>

The Holy Office of the Inquisition did not limit its censorship to French books; English Enlightenment works were also a matter of concern. The works of Alexander Pope were most frequently mentioned in edicts of the Inquisition, particularly his *Cartas de*

*Abelardo y Heloisa*, a translation of *Eloise to Abelard*, telling the tale of a nun's love for Peter Abelard. Proscriptions of Pope occurred in 1792 and 1799, and by 1815 all of his works were banned.<sup>15</sup> Other English books on the lists were *Gulliver's Travels* (1803), *Tom Jones* (1803), and *Pamela* (1803).<sup>16</sup> The most important edict of the period was the one issued on August 25, 1805, for it presents a comprehensive and alphabetical listing of all books prohibited since 1789. Several hundred works appear on the list. The edict not only reflects concern with the French Revolution, but also with the ascendancy of Napoleon.<sup>17</sup>

In many cases the Inquisition not only found it necessary to prohibit political philosophy, but to deny its content and validity. An example of this was the edict of November 13, 1794 with regard to a volume published in Philadelphia by Santiago Felipe Puglia entitled *Desengaño del Hombre*:<sup>18</sup>

The author of this book, writing in their own language, blows his raucous trumpet to excite the faithful people of the Spanish nation to rebellion of the most infamous sort. . . . The pedantic writer has made of himself a bankrupt merchant in such sublime goods as politics and the universal right, and [is] equally detestable for his impiety and insolence that, for his ignorance of sacred and profane literature and for the vile and ignominious style with which he speaks of Kings divined by God, imputes the odious name of despotism and tyranny to the monarchical regime and royal authority that arises from God himself and from His divine will . . . and the universal consent of all the people who from most remote antiquity have been governed by Kings . . . [He attempts] to introduce the rebellious oligarchy of France with the presumption to propose [it] as a model of liberty and happiness of republics, while [it is] in reality the best example of desolation brought on by pestilences and anti-evangelical principles.

Of course many of the polemics of the rationalists were against the Inquisition itself, and to maintain its station in colonial life the Holy Office could not tolerate them. In the ban of *Borroquía o la Víctima de la Inquisición* the judge condemned the book as full of "ridiculous falsehoods that the enemies of religion have vomited

against the Holy Office." He claimed that the purpose of the tract was to weaken and eventually destroy the inquisition and to introduce heresy.<sup>19</sup>

Such "book reviews" as these must have greatly whetted the colonists' appetite for prohibited foreign books. For those unable to read there were the French prints, and there were watches, snuff-boxes, and coins bearing the figure of the goddess Liberty.<sup>20</sup> But many could read, and large quantities of revolutionary literature were being assimilated into colonial thinking. Among the most avid readers were the clergy, who naturally made up a large part of the literate classes. In his letter of October 4, 1794, the Mexican Archbishop lauded the Inquisition for its zeal, and took pride in the fact that until that time he had had no knowledge of any priests being involved in foreign intrigues.<sup>21</sup> His Reverence was being naive if he thought that the exciting new publications from abroad were not being read by members of the clergy. In the same month the Holy Office commenced the trial of Juan Pastor Morales, a professor at the Royal and Pontifical Seminary of Mexico who had read the prohibited French books extensively and who openly espoused seditious ideas.<sup>22</sup> It was alleged that he approved of the republican system, defended the execution of Louis XVI, and claimed that the King of Spain was an oppressive "puritan rogue" who ought to be dealt with in the same way as his French counterpart.<sup>23</sup> He was also accused of speaking against the Pope and the Inquisition.

Juan Ramírez, a member of the Franciscan Order, was also tried in late 1794 for appearing to be an "assemblyist" who applauded the execution of the French monarch, possessed prints of scenes from the revolution, and called Voltaire the "holy father of the century."<sup>24</sup> Anastasio Pérez de Alamillo, the priest and ecclesiastical judge of Otumba, was tried in the same year on counts of religious and political heresy. He maintained a little shop where he sold works by Voltaire and small images of the French philosopher Ferney. Copies of many revolutionary manuscripts and books were found in his possession. Perhaps French philosophy inspired Pérez de Alamillo to express disbelief in the apparition of the Virgin of Guadalupe and the miracles purported to have accompanied the

event.<sup>25</sup> The padre was defended in this famous trial by the later-renowned Carlos María Bustamante. Inquisition processes against the Franciscan Ramírez and the hierarchy clergyman Pérez de Alamillo are forerunners of the great trials of Hidalgo and Morelos after 1810. In each of the four cases it appeared as though the clergy had tried to remain theologically orthodox while embracing philosophical eclecticism. For the most part, however, the Mexican clergy rejected the new thought of the Age of Science and the Age of Reason and cooperated in ferreting out heretics. Priests were under orders promptly to report any evidence of French influence they might encounter in casual conversation, or in the confessional. "The people were to be taught the 'ancient and true' principles of obedience and fidelity 'to the king and to all their superiors.'"<sup>26</sup> In the main, however, the Church, like the State, looked to the Holy Office of the Inquisition to deal with the men, books, and ideas which threatened both.

THE BEST EVIDENCE of the union of heresy and treason appears in the trials of men haled before the tribunal of the Holy Office during the 1790's. Unorthodox clergymen received special treatment and their trials and punishments were private matters. On the other hand, great pains were taken to make a public example of foreigners who were active disseminators of the dreaded libertine ideas. On Sunday, August 9, 1795, the residents of Mexico City witnessed their first major auto de fe in six years. The procession included five heretics convicted of Enlightenment ideas—three of them in person, and two in effigy. The latter were Don Juan María Murgier and Don Esteban Morel, both of whom had committed suicide in the Inquisition jail. The effigy of Murgier was burned with his bones, but since Morel had given signs of repentance in the last moments of his life, he was reconciled posthumously. The cases of Murgier and Morel had caused a scandal and great embarrassment to the Inquisitors.<sup>27</sup>

The most interesting case of this auto de fe, obscured by the attention given to the sensational suicides of Murgier and Morel,

was the trial of Don Juan Longouran of Bordeaux, who had lived in Cuba and Honduras as well as New Orleans before he emigrated to Mexico.<sup>28</sup> In addition to having a lucrative career as a merchant, Longouran was an army doctor. His rationalistic medical view of the universe and the nature of man led him to question religious phenomena. Rash statement of his views in public led him into the halls of the Tribunal of the Holy Office. Shortly after his arrival in the viceregal capital in 1790, Longouran was invited to a dinner where he blatantly expounded heretical ideas. His host made him leave the house, and the next morning denounced Longouran to the Inquisition. He reported that Don Juan had said that fornication was not a sin, and that in taking the women they desired, men simply followed natural law, which was, after all, the guiding motivation of the world. He had claimed that Hell was nothing more than the labors and sufferings men undergo in their mortal lives. He opined that a God of Mercy would not save Christians alone, for there were only three and one half million of them in a world of thirty-three million souls. Such a situation would make for a "small Heaven and very great Hell."<sup>29</sup> He also questioned the doctrine of the Incarnation, the adoration of images, and various other mysteries of the faith, saying he would not kiss the hands of bishops and popes or call for a priest at the hour of his death. He had spoken at length in favor of the French Revolution, and claimed it was legal and just to deny obedience to the Papacy.<sup>30</sup>

The Holy Office of the Inquisition made a secret investigation of the Longouran affair, quietly gathering testimony and keeping the accused under surveillance as a "Protestant" and "secret spy." Perhaps he escaped immediate arrest while the Holy Office gathered more data on his background from Cuba, Honduras, and Louisiana. As the Reign of Terror in France intensified, and as the Spanish prepared to expel Frenchmen from the viceroyalty, the Holy Office arrested Longouran on July 17, 1793, and confiscated his property.<sup>31</sup> After long judicial proceedings, Juan Longouran was convicted of heresy and sedition. He was reconciled in the auto de fe of August 9, 1795, did lengthy penance in the

monastery of the Holy Cross at Querétaro, and was finally deported from Veracruz in October 1797, to serve eight years of exile in a Spanish prison.<sup>32</sup> Juan Longouran was the typical example of the learned man who had separated religion and science in his thinking, and whose eclecticism undermined his orthodoxy.

The Inquisition's concern with French Enlightenment thought continued after the crowning of Napoleon Bonaparte, and as the Napoleonic soldiers spread philosophe doctrines in the areas they occupied. Don Antonio Castro y Salagado, another native of Bordeaux, was tried for francophile sentiments in 1802.<sup>33</sup> Castro, who had been in France at the time of the Revolution, was a devotee of Rousseau and, as one witness put it, "infected" with revolutionary ideas.<sup>34</sup> Lic. Manuel Faboada testified that Castro could recite entire passages of *Emile* from memory, and that he spoke of Rousseau as "the greatest man of the universe," while he denounced St. Augustine as "a horse" and St. Thomas as a "beast" and spoke of theology as a "useless science."<sup>35</sup> Other testimony proved that he was an agnostic, if not an atheist, and detailed his formal lack of respect for established religious principles. Castro heard his sentence in a private auto conducted in the chambers of the tribunal with only the Inquisitors and his family present. Apparently this procedure was necessary because he was a man of great influence in the viceregal capital. After an abjuration ceremony *de levi*, Antonio Castro y Salagado spent a year in the monastery of Santo Domingo doing penance for his sins. He was then banished from the realms of New Spain for ten years. He was to spend six years in the service of Spain in the Philippine Islands, where his conduct would be supervised by the Inquisition Commissary in Manila.

At the same time that the Holy Office of the Inquisition was preoccupied with the impact of philosophe thought, Freemasonry made its first inroads in the Viceroyalty of New Spain. Fore-shadowing the nineteenth-century Mexican Masonic movement, the thinking of the late eighteenth-century group tended to be more political than religious. First formal notice of Masonry in the Indies was taken by the Supreme Council of the Spanish

Inquisition in 1751, when that body sent a letter of warning to the New World bishops requesting them to send lists of soldiers and foreigners who might have Masonic affiliations.<sup>36</sup> Unfortunately, the Holy Office never made a clearly defined distinction among Masonry, Enlightenment philosophy, and Protestantism, and the term *Francomason* took on a very broad meaning.<sup>37</sup>

TO CONCLUDE, as some writers have, that the Holy Office of the Inquisition in Mexico declined in power and became decadent in the late eighteenth century because it developed into a political instrument is clearly fallacious. It is obvious that it had always been a political instrument from the time of its founding in New Spain.<sup>38</sup> Only when the Enlightenment publicists, and the French Revolutionary activists, tried to split religion and politics did the distinction between political heresy and religious heresy become manifest in New Spain. For the most part, the Spanish monarchy and the Mexican Inquisition rejected the idea that politics and religion could be separated. The Holy Office tried heretics as traitors, and traitors as heretics. For the Mexican inquisitors, Enlightenment social and political philosophy *was* heresy.<sup>39</sup>

The seeming decadence of the Mexican Tribunal of the Inquisition after 1763 resulted from a whole complex of political and diplomatic circumstances which, in the end, led to a weakening of the institution. The shift of diplomatic and military alliances between Spain and France, and Spain and England, made it difficult for the Holy Office to punish foreign heretics within the Viceroyalty of New Spain. It was equally difficult, if not impossible, to contain foreign political ideas.<sup>40</sup> From the standpoint of domestic politics and Empire policy, the activities of the Holy Office were severely hampered and began to atrophy because of the tendency of royal and ecclesiastical officialdom to embrace philosophical eclecticism. Certainly in the case of the clergy this became a dangerous trend, since, in the final analysis, the new philosophical and political ideas tended to undermine orthodoxy. Social

and economic tensions in the Mexican colony, pragmatically evident, were reinforced by consideration of the new natural laws of politics and economics being expounded from abroad. On the threshold of this societal discontent, the Holy Office was often forced to make an ideological retreat, adopting an attitude of tolerance or inaction instead of its former firmness—in reality a new kind of “flexible orthodoxy.”

The total documentation in the Mexican Inquisition archive for 1763 to 1805 reveals that the Holy Office cannot be indicted as loath to prosecute unorthodoxy of any kind.<sup>41</sup> It only confirms the fact that the overriding political considerations of the State made the Inquisitors responsible for enforcing a rapidly changing “party-line” kind of orthodoxy, an almost hopeless task. It was impossible to police the far frontiers from California to Florida, from Colorado to Guatemala, from Havana to Manila, a problem as serious to the Inquisitors as the problem of “flexible orthodoxy.” Perhaps it was a sense of frustration in coping with the larger problems that led the Holy Office to concentrate on smaller ones. The tendency to engage in hairsplitting and tedious controversies over jurisdiction and judicial competencies was one result of this frustration.<sup>42</sup> Another was the preoccupation with protecting the position and dignity of the Tribunal of the Inquisition.

The interpretation that the clergy (and the Inquisition) mirrored the times and the society to which they ministered is no doubt true of the Mexican experience during the second half of the eighteenth century. Would the Inquisition and the Crown have reacted any differently had the revolutionary political themes then in vogue been circulating fifty or one hundred years earlier? Probably not. At all events, the policies of Charles III (1759-1788) and Charles IV (1788-1808) did little to strengthen the Mexican Inquisition's mission to preserve political and religious orthodoxy. Indeed the Spanish kings weakened the institution by failing to define the place of the Holy Office of the Inquisition in defining the Imperial self-interest.

## NOTES

1. The most recent study touching upon the political side of the Holy Office's activities in eighteenth-century Mexico is Lewis A. Thombs, "The Inquisition in Eighteenth Century Mexico," *The Americas: A Quarterly Review of Inter-American Cultural History*, vol. 22 (October 1965), pp. 167-81.

2. A few random investigations of French ideas and French influence in the period 1763 to 1805 by the Holy Office of the Inquisition are the following: a French maitre de ballet in Mexico City for reading and praising Voltaire, Archivo General de la Nación, Mexico, Inquisición, Tomo 1070, exp. 5 (1765); a 1784 investigation of French writings of the encyclopedists in *El Diario Enciclopédico*, AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1214, exp. 14; a probe into the alleged heresy of an entire circle of French artisans and painters in 1786, AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1216, exp. 5. For a list of the French, English, and Portuguese sailors and technicians in jail at San Blas for heretical ideas see: AGN, Inquisición 1324, exp. 9 (1790). To this author's knowledge these manuscripts have not been examined previously.

3. When France ceded Louisiana to Spain in the Treaty of Paris of 1763, Spain's policy was one of tolerance of French Protestant ideas and social philosophy. See Lillian E. Fisher, *The Background of the Revolution for Mexican Independence* (Boston, 1934), p. 104; AGN, Inquisición 1389, exp. 22, for a letter from Louisiana in 1794, about the influx of prohibited books and the Holy Office's concern about New Orleans as a center of political intrigue.

4. For background on the French influence in late eighteenth-century Mexico, see in addition to Fisher, the masterful study of Robert J. Shafer, *The Economic Societies in the Spanish World 1763-1821* (Syracuse, 1958). Arthur P. Whitaker, ed., *Latin America and the Enlightenment* (New York, 1942); Clement G. Motten, *Mexican Silver and the Enlightenment* (Philadelphia, 1950); and Jefferson R. Spell, *Rousseau in the Spanish world Before 1833* (Austin, 1938) are very valuable.

5. As early as 1769 the Fiscal of the Holy Office recognized the dangers of the new policy and protested that works opposing pontifical authority were being read freely, and respect for bishops and the ecclesiastical system was being weakened. He urged prompt action against works that mocked religion and its principles. See Julio Jiménez Rueda, *Herejías y Supersticiones en la Nueva España* (Mexico, 1946), pp. 257-58, for the emendation of the Fiscal's letter to the Consejo de la Suprema of May 26, 1769.

6. See AGN, Historia, Tomo 414, exp. 3, for the interesting set of documents from 1789-1792, Sobre noticias de los acontecimientos de la revolución francesa, Ordenes comunicadas de la corte para que se evite Nueva España la propagación de las ideas revolucionarias; para que se vaya expulsando poco a poco a los negros y castas introducidos de lugares en donde pudieran haberse contaminado con todas tales ideas, y para que no se permita el arribo e internación de emisarios extranjeros. This set of instructions is one of many in AGN, Historia, Tomos 502-519, concerning the "French Menace."

7. Outside of the Catálogo de la Inquisición of the AGN, the most encyclopedic list of trials is José Toribio Medina, *Historia del Tribunal del Santo Oficio de la Inquisición en México* (México, 1954), pp. 311-42. For the most part the Medina treatment is factual and cryptic, without analysis, and does not discuss the trials in relation to the prevailing political, ideological, and diplomatic background. Jiménez Rueda, follows the Medina approach but gives more attention to interpretation. Unless otherwise indicated, archival materials cited below have not been used by Medina or Jiménez Rueda.

8. A devotee of Rousseau brought before the Mexican Inquisition in 1802, Don Andrés María Rodríguez, was quoted as saying that Rousseau had fallen into disrepute in the Spanish realms because only his political philosophy was known. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1414, fols. 312-14v. Other cases indicate that Mexicans were intimately acquainted with *Emile* and other tracts which propounded the general theory that man could be regenerated by a reshaping of his environment, a theory that led to a sophisticated decision on the part of some that Spain's Mexican colony needed a new and separate social and political structure independent of the mother country. See AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1393, exps. 15, 16, 23, for cases during the years 1792-1811.

9. John Rydjord, *Foreign Interest in the Independence of New Spain* (Durham, 1935), gives an authoritative treatment of the francophile-francophobe cycles in Mexican viceregal governmental policies. His research in Spanish archival materials illuminates the inconsistent political policy which Viceroys and Inquisitors in Mexico were supposed to follow vis-à-vis the French. The Treaty of Basle (July 1795) prevented the Viceroy and the Holy Office from making decisive moves against the Frenchmen and their activities in Mexico.

10. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1352, exp. 7.

11. See the multiple studies of Irving A. Leonard for this methodology, especially his *Books of the Brave* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949), *Baroque Times in Old Mexico* (Ann Arbor, 1959), and his articles on the book trade in the

*Hispanic American Historical Review*, *passim*. Particularly valuable to this study are his "Frontier Library, 1799," HAHR, vol. 23 (1943), pp. 21-51, and "A Proposed Library for the Merchant Guild of Veracruz, 1801," HAHR, vol. 24 (1944), pp. 84-102, the latter work in collaboration with Robert S. Smith.

12. Monelisa Lina Pérez-Marchand, *Dos Etapas Ideológicas del Siglo XVIII en México a través de los Papeles de la Inquisición* (Mexico, 1945), pp. 83-145.

13. Jiménez Rueda, p. 256.

14. Nos los Inquisidores Apostolicos . . . a todas y qualesquier personas, Mexico, 28 de Julio de 1797. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1310, fols. 262-263 v.

15. *Ibid.*, Tomo 1382, fol. 140; Tomo 1367, fols. 414-15; Tomo 1458, fol. 214.

16. *Ibid.*, Tomo 1415, fols. 126-27, 130-31; Tomo 1411, fol. 249. See also John E. Longhurst, "Fielding and Swift in Mexico," *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 36 (1952), pp. 186-87.

17. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1427, fols. 2-57.

18. Medina, p. 332, citing *Gaceta de México*, 13 de noviembre de 1794.

19. Nos los Inquisidores Apostolicos . . . a todas y qualesquier personas, 13 de noviembre de 1794, AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1414, fol. 1.

20. Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of Mexico*, 6 vols. (San Francisco, 1883-1889), vol. 3, pp. 482-83.

21. Carta del Arzobispo, México, 4 de octubre de 1794, AGI, Estado (México), leg. 22, cited in Rydjord, p. 143.

22. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1361, exp. 1. Jiménez Rueda, pp. 258-60, has a cryptic summary of this 184 page proceso.

23. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1361, exp. 1, Denuncia.

24. Jiménez Rueda, p. 260.

25. AGN, Inquisición, Tomo 1360, exp. 1, fols. 1-363. See also Tomo 1367, exp. 10, fols. 322-50, for the defense of Bustamante.

26. Carta del Arzobispo, México septiembre de 1794, AGI, Estado (México), leg. 22, cited in Rydjord, p. 142.

27. These cases receive detailed treatment in AGN, Inquisición 1347, exp. 2. Of particular interest is the posthumous trial of Juan María Murgier for suicide in Tomo 1367, exp. 2, fols. 1-133. Murgier's relations with other Frenchmen in Nuevo Santander and in Mexico City are treated in Tomo 1355, exp. 2. Especially interesting was his friendship with a Dr. Juan Durrey who openly avowed that regicide was justifiable in France and elsewhere when kings violated natural law and the natural rights of men:

Tomo 1357, exp. 4; Tomo 1346, exp. 1. The total trial records show Murgier to have been guilty of heresy and treason, and to have questioned the rationale of the power of the Spanish state and the Spanish church in New Spain.

28. Relación de la causa seguida contra D. Juan Longouran de nación francesa, natural de la ciudad de Burdeos, casado en la Nueva Orleans, comerciante y Médico de ejercicio en las provincias de Tegucigalpa y Comayagua del Reino de Guatemala, por proposiciones heréticas, *ibid.*, Tomo 1365, exp. 21. For the continuing Longouran investigation, see Tomo 1320, exp. 1.

29. Copia de la denuncia de Don Rafael López, México, 23 de noviembre de 1790, *ibid.*, fols. 19-20.

30. *Ibid.*, fols. 14-15.

31. Mandamiento de prisión que hemos mandado despachar contra Don Juan Longouran, México, 20 de julio de 1793, *ibid.*, fol. 119 r-v.

32. Juan de Mier y Villar al Señor Marques Branciforte, México, 15 de octubre de 1797, *ibid.*, fol. 13; Copias de cartas al Señor Gobernador de Veracruz, 21 de octubre de 1797, *ibid.*, fols. 145-46.

33. Relación de la causa que en este Santo Oficio ha seguido el Señor Fiscal contra Don Antonio Castro y Salagado . . . por proposiciones heréticas, *ibid.*, Tomo 1414, fols. 280-89, 309-27v.

34. Testimonio de Don José Villeda, México, 27 de octubre y 3 de noviembre de 1802, *ibid.*, fols. 282-85v.

35. Testimonio de Don Andrés María Rodríguez, México, 27 de noviembre de 1802, *ibid.*, 312-14v.

36. *Ibid.*, Tomo 1231, fol. 148.

37. The most complete account of colonial Mexican Masonry is the volume of documents published by the Archivo General de la Nación: *Los Precursores Ideológicos de la Guerra de la Independencia. La Masonería en México en el Siglo XVIII* (México, 1932). The earlier treatment, Medina, *Historia del Tribunal*, pp. 297-311, closely parallels these documents as does the later account by Julio Jiménez Rueda, pp. 268-83.

38. Consult Richard E. Greenleaf, *Zumárraga and the Mexican Inquisition 1536-1543* (Washington, D.C., 1962), pp. 90-93, for the political side of the early Mexican Inquisition.

39. Joseph Ferraro, *The Influence of the Philosophy of the French Enlightenment on the Separation of Church and State in Mexico* (México, 1960), reinforces this interpretation.

40. As the late eighteenth-century Inquisitor Juan Vicente Amestoy put it in 1791, "to prevent the arrival of papers and letters is not only

most difficult, but impossible." Juan Vicente Amestoy a Floridablanca, México, 30 de septiembre de 1791, AGI, Estado (México), leg. 1, cited in Rydjord, pp. 131-32.

41. AGN, Inquisición, Tomos 976-1551, or five hundred and seventy-five volumes of documents.

42. See Richard E. Greenleaf, "The Inquisition and the Indians of New Spain: A Study in Jurisdictional Confusion," *The Americas: A Quarterly Review of Inter-American Cultural History*, vol. 22 (1965), pp. 138-66.

