

always found, that this violent way of making profelytes has had but indifferent success. It may make men temporize, dissemble, or perhaps perjure themselves. Fire and sword, famine and torture will never cure Jewish blindness; when miracles wrought by a divine power have had no effect, what is to be hoped for from any human means? TITUS reasoned with them in this way much more forcibly than any one, either before or since his time; the SENNACHERIBS, and NEBUCHADNEZZARS fell far short of him in this method of argument. But what was the consequence? They fought still more desperately for their civil and religious liberties, and obstinately expired, as they still do in the inquisitor's flames, in the defence of their faith.

UPON the whole we may safely say, that the Roman-catholic systems of *mortality*, as treated by jesuitical casuists, are truly *l'art de chicaner avec Dieu*; that their religion, as dressed out with the trappings of popery, discovers in its folds the pagan wardrobe from whence it was taken. From a view of it one cannot help coming at this obvious truth: That as the admission of all error is dangerous, it is most fatally so in matters of religion; the avenues of which should therefore be guarded with the greater vigilance. In other cases the error is removable, or the remedy at worst but difficult: But here error is generally uneradicable, permanent, and the remedy impracticable. All attempts to alter what has once been sacred, are imagined to border so near to sacrilege or impiety, that few in any age or country have had firmness and discretion enough to undertake the task. This is the great stronghold of popery, and all other corrupt religions. For as the Roman consul judiciously said upon a like occasion,

Nihil enim in speciem fallacius est, quam prava religio. Ubi Deorum numen prætenditur sceleribus, subit animum timor, ne fraudibus humanis vindicandis divini juris aliquid immistum violemus. LIVIUS, lib. xxxix. cap. 16.

ERRORS in learning commonly serve for our amusement, as abler men will set them right; errors in politics occasion at worst but temporary evils; but errors in religion are everlasting, too
obstinate

LIST of the ARCHBISHOPRICS and BISHOPRICS of *SPAIN*, with their valuation.

I. *TOLEDO*. Archbishop and Metropolitan.

His Eminence, Don LUIS DE CORDOVA, * L. 50,000

SUFFRAGANS.

1. CARTHAGENA	Don Diego de Roxas,	-	8000
2. CORDOVA	Don Martin de Barcia,	-	5250
3. CUENÇA	Vacant,	-	6250
4. SIGUENZA	Don Francisco Dias,	-	7500
5. JAEN	Don Fran. Benito Marin	-	5000
6. SEGOVIA	Don Manuel Murillo	-	4250
7. OSMA	Vacant	-	3250
8. VALLADOLID	Don Ifidro de Coffio,	-	2500

II. *SEVILLE*. Archbishop, &c.

Don FRANCISCO SOLIS DE CARDONA, 15,000

SUFFRAGANS.

1. MALAGA	Don Joseph de Franquis Lafo,	-	7500
2. CADIZ	Don Francisco Thomas del Valle,	-	2000
3. CANARIA	Don Francisco Valentin Moran,	-	
4. CEUTA	Don Joseph de la Cuesta.	-	

III. *SANTIAGO*. Archbishop, &c.

Don BATHOLOME RAJOY Y' LOSADA, 15,000

SUFFRAGANS.

1. SALAMANCA	Don Joseph Zorila	-	3000
2. TUY	Don Juan Manuel Castannon,	-	2000
3. AVILA	Don Romualdo Velarde,	-	2500
4. CORIA	Don Juan Joseph Garcia Alvaro,	-	3250
5. PLASENCIA	Vacant,	-	6875
6. ASTORGA	Don Francisco Xavier Cabezon,	-	1875

* The valuation of these preferments is taken from a Spanish book lately published at MADRID: It makes the revenues of *TOLEDO* greater than the common estimation of them: But I doubt if the account is exaggerated.

I N S P A I N.

21

7. ZAMORA	Don Isidro Cavanillas,	2500
8. OXENSE	Don Francisco Augustin de Euro,	1500
9. BADAJOZ	Don Manuel Perez Minago,	3250
10. MONDONNEDO	Don Carlos de Riomol,	1250
11. LUGO	Don Fr. Francisco Izquierdo,	1500
12. CIUDAD RODRIGO	Don Joseph Viguezal,	1250

IV. GRANADA. Archbishop, &c.

DON PEDRO ANTONIO BARROETA, 6250

SUFFRAGANS.

1. GUADIX	Don Franc. Alexandro Bocanegra,	1000
2. ALMERIA	Don Francisco Gaspar de Molina,	1125

V. BURGOS. Archbishop, &c.

DON ONESIMO SALAMANCA, 3750

SUFFRAGANS.

1. PAMPLONA	Don Gaspar de Miranda,	3500
2. CALAHORRA	Don Andres de Porras,	3000
3. PALENCIA	Don Andres de Bustamante,	2500
4. SANTANDER	Don Franc. Xavier de Arriaza	1500

VI. TARRAGONA. Archbishop, &c.

DON JAYME DE CORTADA Y' BRU', 3250

SUFFRAGANS.

1. BARCELONA	Don Affensio Sales,	1500
2. GERONA	Don Manuel Antonio Palmero,	1250
3. LERIDA	Don Manuel Macias Pedrejon,	2000
4. TORTOSA	Don Luis Garcia Mannero,	2500
5. VIQUE	Don Fr. Bartholomè Sarmentero	750
6. URGEL	Don Fr. Chathalan de Ocón,	1000
7. SOLSONA	Don Fr. Joseph de Mezquia,	625

VII. ZA-

STATE OF RELIGION.

VII. ZARAGOZA. Archbishop, &c.

Don FRANCISCO DE ANOA Y BASTA. 7500

SUFFRAGANS.

1. HUESCA	Don Antonio Sanchez,	1500
2. BARBASTRO	Don Fr. Diego de Rivera,	1000
3. XACA	Don Pasqual Lopez,	750
4. TARAZONA	Don Estevan de Villanova,	1875
5. ALBARRACIN	Don Juan Navarro,	1000
6. TERUEL	Don Fr. Rodriguez Chico,	2250

VIII. VALENCIA. Archbishop, &c.

Don ANDRES MAYORAL. 13,750

SUFFRAGANS.

1. SERGOVE	Don Fr. Blas de Arganda,	2000
2. ORIHUELA	Vacant,	3750
3. MALLORCA	Don Lorenzo Despuig,	2750

IN AMERICA.

I. SANTO DOMINGO. Archbishop.

Don PHELIPE RUIZ DE AUSMENDI.

SUFFRAGANS.

1. PUERTO RICO	Don Pedro Martinez de Oneca,
2. CUBA	Don Pedro Agustin Morel.
3. CARACAS	Don Diego Diez Madronnero.

II. *MEXICO*. Archbishop, &c.

Don MAN. RUBIO DE SALINAS.

SUFFRAGANS.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. PUEBLA DE LOS AN-
GELES | — | Don Domingo Alvarez de Abrea. |
| 2. OAXACA | — | Don Ventura Blanco. |
| 3. MECOACAN | — | Don Pedro Sanchez de Tagle. |
| 4. GUADALAXARA | — | Don Francisco de Texada. |
| 5. YUCATAN | — | Don Fr. Ignacio de Padilla. |
| 6. DURANGO | — | Don Pedro Tamaron. |

III. *MANILA*. Archbishop, &c.

Don MANUEL ANTONIO ROXO.

SUFFRAGANS.

- | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 1. CEBU' | — | Vacant. |
| 2. NUEVA SEGOVIA | — | Don Juan de la Fuente. |
| 3. NUEVA CACERES | — | Don Fr. Manuel de Matos. |

IV. *GUATEMALA*. Archbishop, &c.

Don FRANCISCO DE FIGUEREDO.

SUFFRAGANS.

- | | | |
|--------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1. CHIAPA | — | Don F. Joseph Videl de Montezuma. |
| 2. NICARAGUA | — | Don Fr. Mato. Navia Bolano. |
| 3. COMAYAGUA | — | Don Diego Rodriguez Rivas. |

V. *LIMA*. Archbishop.

Don DIEGO DEL CORRO.

SUFFRAGANS.

- | | | |
|-------------|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. AREQUIPA | — | Don Jacinto Aquado y' Chacón. |
| 2. TRUXILLO | — | Don Francisco de Luna Victoria. |
| | | 3. QUITO |

STATE OF RELIGION

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| 3. QUITO | — | Don Juan Nieto Polo del Aquila. |
| 4. CUZCO | — | Don Juan de Castoneda. |
| 5. GUAMANGA | — | Don Phelipe Manrique de Lara. |
| 6. PANAMA | — | Don Man. Romani y Carrillo. |
| 7. CHILE | — | Don Man. de Alday. |
| 8. CONCEPCION DE CHILE | — | Don Joseph de Toro. |

VI. CHARCAS. Archbishop.

Don CAYETANO MARCELLANO Y AGRAMONT.

SUFFRAGANS.

- | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1. N ^{RA} . S ^{RA} . DE LA PAZ | — | Don Diego de Parada. |
| 2. TUCUMAN | — | Don Pedro de Argadona. |
| 3. S ^{TA} . CRUZ DE LA SIERRA | — | Don Fern. Perez de Oblitas. |
| 4. PARAGUAY | — | Don Manuel de la Torre. |
| 5. BUENOS AYRES | — | Don Jof. Anto. Bafurco y Herrera. |

VII. SANTA FE. Archbishop.

Don JOSEPH XAVIER DE ARAUZ.

SUFFRAGANS.

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. POPAYAN | — | Don Geronymo de Obregon. |
| 2. CARTAGENA | — | Don Manuel de Sofa y Betancur. |
| 3. SANTA MARTA | - | Don Nicolas Gil Martinez. |

THESE were formerly in the nomination of the King, and afterwards the Concordate. This is not the case now. The Pope, the King, and the Archbishop of TOLEDO divide the patronage. The *concordate* was an old council or junto for that purpose; but is lately abolished.

THE bishoprics in SPAIN have very fine revenues. The bishops always go in the following dress: A long robe and a purple

purple rochet. They generally carry a crucifix, wear a cross upon their breasts, and a ring.

THE clergy of Spain who are not of any particular monastic order wear the regular dress, consisting of a cassock, and a hood of flannel or silk. The cassock has a cape; and their hats are tucked up on both sides. The ecclesiastical estates are very considerable.



LETTER III.

Of the GOVERNMENT of SPAIN, the *Cortes*,
 or PARLIAMENT, its LAWS, TRIBUNALS, COURTS
 of JUDICATURE, &c.

THE government of SPAIN was, by its ancient constitution, a limited monarchy, of hereditary succession, both in males and females. The male line ended in FERDINAND, who united CASTILE and ARRAGON, by marriage with ISABELLA of CASTILE. That Princess dying at MEDINA DEL CAMPO, in 1505, left issue, I. JOHN, who married MARGERITE, daughter

of the Emperor MAXIMILIAN. 2. ISABELLA, married first to Prince ALPHONZO, son of JOHN II. and afterwards to EMANUEL of PORTUGAL. 3. JOAN, who was afterwards Queen of CASTILE. 4. MARY, who married EMMANUEL of PORTUGAL. 5. CATHERINE, who married ARTHUR Prince of WALES, and afterwards HENRY VIII. of ENGLAND.

ISABELLA appointed her heirs by will, the Princess DONNA JUANA her third daughter, conjointly with her husband the Archduke PHILIP, of BURGUNDY, son of the Emperor MAXIMILIAN, who was surnamed PHILIPPE LE FLAMAND. In consequence of this testamentary disposition, PHILIP claimed the crown of CASTILE against his father-in-law FERDINAND. This dispute was however amicably adjusted by an agreement in 1506, that both parties should have equal power and authority. But PHILIP dying that same year, the power and crown of SPAIN reverted entire into the hands of FERDINAND, who dying in 1516, was succeeded in the throne of SPAIN by his grandson CHARLES V. who was the son of PHILIP by Donna JUANA, siled the *Fool*, who was the mother of two Emperors. And thus the crown of SPAIN came into the house of AUSTRIA. This monarchy was limited by its *Cortes*, or Parliament, composed of representatives sent from the cities and towns, each of which, according to the old *Gothic* plan, sent procurators, or deputies, chosen by and out of the aldermen of their respective cities. The eldest member for BURGOS always acted as speaker of the house; though TOLEDO was a rival to BURGOS, for that privilege. In order to adjust amicably their two claims, the King used to say on opening the session of the *Cortes*, "I will speak for TOLEDO, which will do what I order: But let BURGOS speak first," because BURGOS was anciently the capital of CASTILE. No act could pass in this parliament by majority of voices; it required the unanimous assent of all the members. All its acts were afterwards carried to the King to be confirmed. The members of this parliament were always assembled in a *Cortes*, by letters convocatory from the King and privy council;