Introduction

*Arbiters of Faith, Administrators of Empire*

_Hard marble would soften at the cry, / And with it the fierce breast hardens, /
O hard Office, who calls you Holy?*_

Few historical figures are as iconic as the inquisitor, and few institutions are as infamous or reviled as the Spanish Inquisition. At its foundation in 1478, the Spanish Inquisition fit in the mold of established customs: a delegation of authority from the papacy to King Ferdinand and Queen Isabel to appoint inquisitors who would seek out heresy and conduct trials of faith in the lands under the authority of their recently conjoined crowns, powers that followed precedents set by earlier medieval inquisitions and drew on judicial practices with origins in Roman law. The initial focus of these inquisitors was the pursuit of _conversos_ – Jewish converts to Christianity and their descendants – suspected of Judaizing heresy, that is, the conduct of practices or credence in beliefs identified as Jewish by baptized Christians. As the Spanish Inquisition soon included an Inquisitor General, a royal Council of the Inquisition (or _Suprema_), and a growing number of regional tribunals, each with inquisitors, lesser officials, and even buildings, it became clear that it was also something strikingly new. From the fifteenth century until its final abolition in 1834, the Spanish Inquisition developed a body of law and practice and an institutional framework that, by the seventeenth century, included twenty-one tribunals on two sides of the Atlantic; its targets and the frequency, intensity, and severity of its activities changed over time and varied across its wide

---

geography. Much ink has been devoted to scholarship on the Spanish Inquisition; over the past four decades, there has been a flourishing of excellent revisionist studies that have charted the institution’s history, excavated the identities of its victims, and read its archives in original ways. Still, the inquisitors themselves have rarely been the focal point of this analytical work. In response, this book focuses on the multifaceted careers of Spain’s inquisitors and the worlds they inhabited, and so it seeks to reexamine the Spanish Inquisition through the prism of some of the individual judges who sat on its tribunals and on the Suprema and who wrote its history and compiled its laws.

A series of questions lies at the heart of this book. How can we account for inquisitorial action? Or, how is it possible to explain the activities of inquisitors? What motivated Spanish inquisitors: that is, what made an inquisitor and what subsequently drove his decisions? On one level, these are questions that might be posed about an array of historical actors; questions that seek to probe the balance between autonomy, choice, or agency and social, institutional, or intellectual constraints in examining the past; questions that seek to consider how and why individuals behaved in certain ways vis-à-vis the systems of an earlier era. On another level, these are questions that have a particular potency when they are posed about those who have become the great villains of history.

In this book, I have sought neither to excuse nor to rehabilitate Spanish inquisitors, but rather to explore how their actions might be comprehended, to analyze what made their choices viable, their careers successful, and their writings persuasive — if never uncontroversial — within the logics of their social


world. In sum, I would submit that inquisitors were motivated by a potent combination of careerism and ideological commitment, a blend that varied from judge to judge in balance and content and that, for each individual, was also liable to change over time and to develop in a dynamic relationship to his acquired experience and to the particular situations in which he found himself.

The judges’ official ideals were delicately poised between belief in the fallen nature of humankind and in human perfectibility. They shared in the tensions of clerical life that proposed that a removal from the mundane concerns of family would better enable them to care for the world, a pastoral ideal that simultaneously advocated engagement with the flock and an exceptional position within it. They also experienced the tensions surrounding judicial action. Ideally, rendering justice was understood as the prudent exercise of judgment, the seeking out of the truth in a given matter, an operation in which the judge should be free of enmity, passion, and personal interests. As an arbiter of trials of faith, an inquisitor was thus expected, by his own ideals, to be doubly insulated from worldly concerns in order to best correct the religious practice and belief of his fellow humans. At the same time, an inquisitor understood his search for the truth of a case to require a capacity for discernment, an ability based both on more theoretical learning and on knowledge derived from experience of the world. It was for such reasons that the Inquisition’s guidelines often recommended forty as the minimum age for appointment to the office. As arbiters and administrators, inquisitors were expected to be both set apart from their world and adept at navigating within it. The chapters that follow examine how individuals who became inquisitors sought to negotiate this tension and how they simultaneously elaborated the ideals of their office and exercised their authority on the ground.

No one was born an inquisitor in early modern Spain. Thus, this book considers what propelled a man into this peculiar judicial career through an examination of the lives of five men who were inquisitors. Each of the first five chapters charts the professional trajectory of a single individual, suggesting a method of approach that might be taken – to varying degrees of depth – to any Spanish inquisitor. Each of these chapters considers the inquisitor’s origins, the kinds of offices he held and the cases in which he was involved, the places where he worked, and the political pressures to which he was especially subject. Each then traces some of the ways in which the inquisitor conducted his work, how he responded to the situations he encountered and the multiple constraints on his actions, and what might be gleaned from this about what kinds of ideals he drew from to give
meaning to his office. This approach offers a way to explore the persistent negotiations that suffused inquisitorial careers and to which inquisitors’ actions were subject. Simultaneously, it seeks to locate inquisitors – so often rendered as a case apart – more coherently as part of their society. This study builds on prosopographies of judges in the Inquisition’s district tribunals, councillors of the Suprema, and Inquisitors General. Historians have established a standard social profile of inquisitors at the apogee of the Spanish Inquisition. By and large, they were so-called Old Christians, often from gentry families and with ties of kinship to other royal and ecclesiastical officeholders. It was common for them to have relatives who were Inquisition officials. Usually secular clerics, they were increasingly jurists by discipline, many educated at the university in Salamanca, where they had attained the degree of licentiate or doctor of laws – canon, civil, or both. Frequently shaped by initial appointments in universities, civil courts, and cathedrals or as lesser officials in tribunals of the Holy Office, while inquisitors they were often delegated to short-term inspections of other institutions. Increasingly, holding office in the Spanish Inquisition offered a route of social mobility within the Catholic Monarchy. There was crossover with the Chanceries (the royal appellate courts) and occasionally with the Rota in Rome (the papal appellate court). Being an inquisitor could be a stepping-stone to Court in multiple ways, more and less formal, in particular to nomination as a royal councillor – especially to the Suprema – and sometimes to council presidencies. It was often a path into the episcopate, and there were extensive connections – as well as persistent conflict and competition – between bishops and

inquisitors. There were also regional variations in career patterns, as inquisitorial office in the Americas rarely led to appointments in the peninsula; over time, a relatively self-contained circuit of colonial promotions was established. Nevertheless, approaching inquisitorial careers in the aggregate or, occasionally, as brief sketches has its limitations. Julio Caro Baroja observed in a seminal 1968 essay a habit of depicting an “Inquisition without inquisitors,” an imbalance that has yet to be thoroughly corrected.\(^5\)

The collective treatment of inquisitors has tended to mute the differences between them. It has also played into a long-standing image of inquisitors as frightening by their very facelessness, by the disappearance of the individual human into the authority and power of his office. In undertaking a more detailed interrogation of a few inquisitorial careers, this book proposes that the particular experiences, ambitions, and beliefs of individual inquisitors were significant to how they constructed their writings, how they conducted trials of faith, and how the Spanish Inquisition took shape as an institution. To some extent, this approach is a response to a mechanistic vision of the Inquisition. From early modern polemic to more recent analyses of the Inquisition as proto-bureaucracy, the tendency has been to depict inquisitors as interchangeable. In one of the most sophisticated such formulations, Jean-Pierre Dedieu cast them as “the machine’s essential cog.”\(^6\) There is much truth to this metaphor. The relationship between the individual and the corporate in early modern expressions of identity is notoriously fraught. The metaphor also captures something very important about inquisitors’ self-perception; in a way, it mirrors their rhetoric of judicial dispassion. It indicates—as many institutional histories of the Spanish Inquisition have found—that their actions were constrained by procedure, by directives from their superiors, and by a host of political exigencies. Inquisitors’ industriousness or lack thereof, vacancies in the office, and the deaths of its incumbents altered the conduct of business in a tribunal. At the same time, the inquisitor was more than a mere executor of predetermined procedures, and inquisitorial correspondence offers glimpses of the human dynamics of the tribunal, of how


\(^6\) I draw this phrase—“le rouage essentiel de la machine”—from Dedieu’s masterful study of Toledo’s Inquisition tribunal, \textit{L’Administration de la foi}, 161. For one such more recent approach to the Inquisition as bureaucracy, see Irene Silverblatt, \textit{Modern Inquisitions: Peru and the Colonial Origins of the Civilized World} (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004).
procedural reform was often rooted in individual experience, and of how cases stalled or advanced as a result of the quality of interactions between inquisitors and their colleagues, other authorities, and defendants. Scholarship on medieval inquisitions and the Roman Inquisition has increasingly considered the working habits, pastoral impulses, and intellectual lives of inquisitors. Histories of the Spanish Inquisition have ventured less into such questions, although there has been particularly suggestive work about how the personal dynamics between judges and accused affected the course and conduct of trials.

Apart from those Inquisitors General whose names have taken on a mythic cast, Alonso de Salazar Frias has become arguably the most famous Spanish inquisitor. Gustav Henningsen’s extensive study of the witch
trials of the Navarrese village of Zugarramurdi, between 1609 and 1614, gave Salazar Frías an enduring place in the historiography as a heroic skeptic whose thorough investigation, petitions, and remonstrances both halted a wave of persecution and forestalled further witch hunts in Spain. When Henningsen described an inquisitor whose doubt about the evidence before him caused him to urge caution and to oppose further prosecutions, he created a figure who has been perceived as exceptional. Although the inquisitors treated in this book are far more likely to be classified as arch persecutors than as forward-thinking skeptics, their careers suggest that many elements of Salazar Frías’s story were decidedly unexceptional. In the right circumstances, other junior inquisitors in district tribunals could, like Salazar Frías, trump their senior colleagues and persuade higher authorities of the validity of their opinions. Like his opposition to the Zugarramurdi trials, other particular local conflicts were also transmuted into legal precedent; he took his extensive consideration of a set of cases, his experience of visiting a tribunal’s district, and his judicial practice and translated them into a broader theory. Through letters and first-person memoranda, he made that theory persuasive to an audience on the Suprema, ultimately altering the Spanish Inquisition’s practices. Like some of the inquisitors examined in this book, he entered the Inquisition after holding ecclesiastical office in a cathedral, and he left a trail of writings in his wake. Early in his career, Salazar Frías wrote a local history; later, he wrote extensive memoranda in his inquisitorial capacities, including a brief autobiographical sketch, written in response to the Suprema’s request for reports of its officials’ qualifications. While promoting reforms, he also promoted both the institution’s judicial authority and his own; elevated to the Suprema a decade later, he remained a councillor until his death in 1635. The compelling tale of Salazar Frías hints at how much

Inquisitor General (Madrid: Dykinson, 2010).

might be learned about the Inquisition by attending more closely to the individuals who staffed it.

This book spans the middle of the sixteenth to the middle of the seventeenth centuries— from the close of Charles V’s reign through the first phases of Philip IV’s—years identified as the height of the Spanish Inquisition’s institutional influence and activity. The five inquisitors on whom it is centered—Cristóbal Fernández de Valtodano, Diego de Simancas, Luis de Páramo, Juan Adam de la Parra, and Juan de Mañozca y Zamora—were all born during the sixteenth century. For the oldest of them, the institution that they would serve had been established in their grandparents’ time. Their lives offer glimpses of four overlapping generations of judicial practice, of how jurists made their careers in an institution that was already fairly well established within their society and its political order. As those who exercised the office at its apogee, their careers offer five approaches to examining a certain inquisitorial status quo, suggesting both the shared terrain and the variability in how they sought to voice, fit themselves to, and apply a fairly constant set of shared ideals and practices. None were Inquisitors General, although three of the five sat on the Suprema. No selection of five such men can be representative of all Spanish inquisitors.

At any particular moment in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century, between forty and seventy men were likely serving as inquisitors in the Spanish Inquisition’s district tribunals and as councillors of the Suprema. In sum, I would estimate that a bit fewer than a thousand men—several hundred at the very least—were appointed to these offices between the 1540s and the 1650s. Thus, the five subjects I have selected for study are meant to be suggestive of the range of inquisitorial experience. All had notable successes in their careers and brushes with life at
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11 For the characterization of the period 1569–1621 as “el apogeo del Santo Oficio,” see HIEA 1:701.

12 As the chapters that follow imply, in addition to the length of their service, the total number of individuals would be further reduced by the practices of transfer between tribunals and promotion to the Suprema. Although there were eventually twenty-one tribunals, several of them (including all three in the Americas) were founded during the century under consideration. For example, there were 158 appointments to the Suprema between 1539 and 1664, see n. 51. Thirty-seven inquisitors were appointed to Sicily’s tribunal between 1543 and 1659, only sixteen were appointed to Mexico’s tribunal between 1571 and 1642, while forty-two inquisitors were active in Valencia’s between 1530 and 1609. Manuel Rivero Rodríguez, “La Inquisición Española en Sicilia,” HIEA 3:1212–20; Martin Austin Nesvig, Ideology and Inquisition: The World of the Censors in Early Mexico (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2009), 274–75; García Cárcel, Herejía y sociedad, 127.
Court, although some also found their ambitions frustrated. Taken together, they illustrate possibilities for success and failure for that vast majority of inquisitors who never reached the helm of the institution. They held office in a variety of locales, each spending significant time in Castile, but their careers also encompass Rome, Sicily, and all three Inquisition districts in the Americas; three were promoted to the episcopate. In this way, they show the mobility and the polyvalence of inquisitorial careers, which served as vehicles to carry theoretical stances and practical experience between interconnected institutions and disparate places.

Following inquisitorial careers thus offers one way to bridge the gaps between studies centered on individual tribunals. Inquisitors operated in an argumentative culture that valued tradition and reviled innovation. When they confronted a new situation, they were charged to interpret the environment and to accommodate its peculiarities in a way that could fit within existing precedents, even as they might then use the experience of novelty to reshape practice and precedent. When inquisitors engaged in this negotiation between universal standards and local environments, between their experiences and the languages in which it was acceptable to communicate that experience, they drew together far-flung pieces of the Catholic Monarchy. They transported directives and their acquired knowledge between what is often referred to as center and periphery, but also from periphery to periphery, as, to take a particularly mobile example, in the early seventeenth-century career of Juan Gutiérrez Flores, who moved from the tribunal in Sicily to that on Mallorca, to Mexico City’s, and finally to Lima’s.

Each of the five inquisitors examined at length here has been offered as a face of the institution in some manner. Valtodano’s contemporaries praised him as a model judge. Simancas was one of the foremost commentators on inquisitorial law; over the past century, he has attracted particular attention for his autobiographical Vida. Páramo gained fame for writing the first printed history of the Inquisition. Adam de la Parra has become known as a poet and propagandist, for his purported friendship with Francisco de Quevedo and his imprisonment in the waning months of the count-duke of Olivares’s administration. Mañozca, on the other hand, has been depicted as an archetypal ambitious inquisitor, amassing power in colonial tribunals and driven by enmity, zeal, and greed. The chapters that follow seek, then, to assess what differentiated and what bound together these individual careers.

These inquisitors are also particularly apt subjects for study because each left a significant body of writings, albeit of varied kinds. Whereas
three have become known to scholars, in large part, for what they wrote, the two with the most successful career trajectories – Valtodano and Mañozca, who sat on the Suprema, were nominated to be Chancery presidents, and ended their lives as archbishops – did not publish treatises. They established another relationship to the available modes of writing, producing extensive correspondence and substantive reports within their institutional contexts, some written in their own hand. When they appeared in print, it was as the objects of dedications, patrons praised as reformers by younger clerics. Thus, Mañozca took center stage in vernacular accounts of elaborate autos de fe and other religious celebrations. Attending to what inquisitors wrote, or did not write, provides an avenue to explore the complicated relationship of inquisitorial work to publicity and to secrecy; it illuminates both how they wrote their way into higher offices and also how too much writing – or writing of the wrong kind – could stall an inquisitor’s professional ascent.

Inquisitors’ work hinged, in part, on their writing abilities. Promotions were pursued, jurisdictional conflicts were argued, and a host of disputes were fought out in missives and memoranda, in print and manuscript compositions of greater or lesser formality, sometimes in Latin, usually in the vernacular Castilian Spanish. Judges in the district tribunals used letters to defend their judgments to the Suprema, the Inquisitor General, the king and his other councils, and even occasionally to the pope; the Suprema, in turn, communicated its decisions in the same manner. Inquisitors’ writings form the backbone of this book. Although only Simancas has been perceived as writing an autobiography, all five constructed narratives of their lives as judges. They turned to their pens to make their decisions comprehensible to their contemporaries and to supply their judgments with legitimacy. Hence, this study is based on their published writings and manuscript treatises, as well as the print and manuscript in which they or the cases in which they were involved appeared. It relies heavily on the Spanish Inquisition’s internal correspondence sent between the Suprema and the district tribunals, as well as instructions, consultations, visitation and trial records, and accounts of autos de fe. It draws on other administrative documents as well, such as the reports of royal and ecclesiastical councils, the minutes of cathedral chapters, and the correspondence of bishops. Much has been written about the self-affirming