

in 1454, and is buried in Canterbury Cathedral on the Epistole side of the choir.

Thomas Bourcier, Bishop of Worcester in 1430 of Ely in 1443, and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1455, was created in 1464 Cardinal Priest of S. Cyriacus in Thermis. He died in 1486.

John Morton, born in 1410, Bishop of Ely in 1478, and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1489, was created Cardinal Priest of S. Anastasia in 1493 by Pope Alexander VI. He died in 1500.

Christopher Bainbridge, Bishop of Durham in 1507, Archbishop of York in 1508, and Ambassador of Henry VIII. to Rome, was created Cardinal Priest of S. Paredes, by Julius II. in 1511. He died poisoned by an assassin in 1584. His tomb is in the English College.

Thomas Wolsey, Bishop of Tournai in 1531, of Lincoln in 1514, Archbishop of York in 1514, and Lord High Chancellor, was created Cardinal Priest of S. Cecilia by Leo X. in 1516 and Legate *a latere*. He died in 1530.

John Fisher, born in 1459; professor of theology at Cambridge 1502; Bishop of Rochester 1504; attainted and imprisoned 1534; suffered for the Faith 22nd June, 1535, and is buried in the chapel of the Tower.

Reginald Pole, Dean of Exeter, 1527; created Cardinal Deacon of SS. Nereus and Achilleus by Paul III. in 1536 (afterwards of Sta. Maria in Cosmedin, and subsequently Cardinal Priest of S. Frisca); Legate to England in 1564; ordained Priest and consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in 1556. He died in 1558, and is buried in "Becket's Crown" in Canterbury Cathedral.

William (or Peter) Peto, Peyto, or Peyton, Franciscan, Bishop of Salisbury, created Cardinal Priest and Legate *a latere* by Paul IV. 1557, but never received the insignia or reached Rome, dying in 1558.

William Allen, Alan, or Alleyn, educated at Oriel College; Canon of York in 1556; created Cardinal Priest of St. Martin in Montibus by Sixtus V. in 1587; founder of the College at Douai, and counsellor of Gregory XIII. in the foundation of the English College at Rome; appointed in 1589 Archbishop of Mechlin; died in 1594. Buried in the English College. A jewelled crozier presented to him by Sixtus V. is preserved in the Archiepiscopal residence at Westminster.

Philip Howard, third son of Henry Lord Mowbray, by Elizabeth, daughter of Esme Stuart, Duke of Lennox; born in 1629 in Arundel House, London; professed as a Dominican at Cremona; appointed one of the Chaplains to Queen Catherine of Braganza; left England at the outbreak of the persecution; founded a community of his Order at Bornheim in Flanders; created Cardinal Priest of Sta. Maria supra Minervam in 1675, by Clement X. He was generally styled Cardinal of Norfolk, or Cardinal of England. "Protector" of England. Died in 1690. His tomb is in his titular church.

Henry Benedict Mary Clement Stuart, Cardinal of New York, born 1725, created Cardinal Deacon of Sta. Maria in Porticu by Benedict XIV. in 1747; subsequently Cardinal Priest (1) of the SS. XII. Apostoli, and (2) of Sta. Maria in Trastevere, consecrated Archbishop of Corinth by Clement XII.; Cardinal Bishop of Frascati (1760) and Dean of the Sacred College. Died 1807.

Thomas Weld, born 1773, took holy orders in 1821, and consecrated Bishop of Amycla *in partibus* the same year; created Cardinal Priest of S. Marcellus by Pius VIII. in 1830. Died in 1837.

Charles Januarius Acton, born 1803; proclaimed Cardinal Priest of Sta. Maria della Pace by Gregory XVI. in 1842 (created and reserved *in petto* in 1839). Died in 1847.

Nicholas Wiseman, born in 1802, Bishop of Melipotamus *in partibus*, 1840; Archbishop of Westminster 1850; created Cardinal Priest of S. Pudentiana 1850. Died 1865.

Henry Edward Manning, born 1808; Archbishop of Westminster 1865; created Cardinal Priest of SS. Andrew and Gregory on the Caelian, 1875.— Dublin Review.

MR. DISRAELI AND COUNT MUNSTER.

COUNT MUNSTER'S indiscretion was one of the most unfortunate exhibitions of over-zeal which have happened for a long time. It was really a little too much to find a German Ambassador expressing himself in such a style of lively criticism upon the institutions of a country other than his own at the very crisis when the German Government was displaying such sensitiveness in respect to the utterances of foreign opinion on German affairs. On the whole we are not surprised to find that even the "Reptile Press" is inclined to admit that Count Munster went a little too far, and though the rumour of his recall is at least premature, there can be no doubt that the eloquence poured forth at the "National Club" has not tended to enhance the diplomatic merits of the enthusiastic representative of Bismarckism in our country. It does credit to the courage of Mr Sullivan that he did not allow the opportunity, so fortunately presented to him, to pass unutilized, and the uncomplimentary manner in which the official and semi-official scribes at Berlin expand their wrath upon "the Irish Ultramontane Sullivan" is a significant indication of the discomfort which his proceedings have occasioned among the coteries of the "Culture Champions." Even without Mr Sullivan's intervention the public opinion of the country could not fail, and did not fail, to stigmatize the extraordinary step which Count Munster had permitted himself to take. Thanks, however, to this prompt action of the member for Louth, that Bismarckism efforts to stir up bad blood among the fellow subjects of her Majesty have been placed in the pillory, so to speak, for the edification of all beholders, the Count Munster's punishment has been the more severe because it was the more notorious. Besides, the head of the Cabinet has been obliged to speak, apparently not unwillingly, and it may be quite truly said that he has spoken very much to the purpose.

There was a vein of polished irony running all through the reply of the Prime Minister, which must have made it immeasurably more unpleasant to endure than any serious rebuke. Mr. Disraeli had three things to do, and he did two at least of them thoroughly well. In the first he had to administer a slight rap to

the knuckles of the polemical diplomatist for his breach of all diplomatic usages. Secondly, while rebuking the impropriety of Count Munster's harangue, he had to let it be clearly understood that in England we can afford to leave excesses of speech in almost all cases to the correction of the public taste. Thirdly, he had to check the presumptuous references to the condition of Ireland, in which it has been so long the habit of the journals in the employment of Prince Bismarck to indulge, and with which the maladroit Count Munster had gratified the ultra-Protestant cravings of the members of the so-called "National Club." The only point which perhaps was not hit satisfactorily by Mr. Disraeli was the last. He showed indeed that there is nothing in the condition of Ireland arising from religion causes which in any way calls for the re-establishment of the Garrison Church, for instance. He failed, or he did not wish, however, to demonstrate with sufficient lucidity that the whole plan of persecution is an extremely bad one for securing the peace and solidity of empires. The simple statement that there was no analogy between the condition of the Catholics in Ireland and of Prussia is at least liable to the objection that it is either trite or equivocal. Assuming that Mr. Disraeli designedly abstained from pronouncing any opinion upon the comparative merits of a policy of persecution and one of even-handed justice, we may ask why he shirked saying plainly, as the occasion seemed to demand, that Her Majesty's Government has no intention of oppressing the consciences of Her Majesty's Catholic subjects, and that such oppression would be the surest way not to promote loyalty, but to provoke discontent? Mr. Disraeli need not have said a word more than that, but that would have been enough. We trust it was not, as the "Spectator" suggests, a certain mealy-mouthedness towards Germany which imposed upon Mr. Disraeli the halting and ambiguous form of words which he adopted. Probably a little over consideration for the Newdegates of his party was at the bottom of his over caution.

Taken as another indication of the improved tone visible in the foreign policy of England of late, the reply of Mr. Disraeli must on the whole be considered very satisfactory. Whatever may have been the exact tenor of the remonstrances addressed by the British Government to Germany a couple of weeks ago, it seems to be certain that their practical effect was to convince the heads of the war party at Berlin that the wealth and power of England were factors to be taken into the most serious consideration in any little schemes with reference to upsetting the peace of Europe. This is as it should be. Our interests are too vast, and the perils to which they would be exposed in certain contingencies are too vast also, for us to pose any longer as the snug, self-complacent, ostentatiously indifferent and unconcerned nation which played a part so little worthy of its traditions during the successive annexations of Sleswig and Alsace. The Cabinet of Mr. Disraeli has remembered this, and if the return to a sense of prudence and dignity is somewhat late still we are told that better late than never. It may, indeed, be said that even the Government of which Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright were members could hardly have failed to be moved by recent incidents to a perception of the fact that the line of non-intervention must be drawn somewhere. It happens, at any rate, that the Conservatives are in office, and it must be ungrudgingly admitted that in the recent negotiations, or whatever they may be called, the British Government has acted with equal wisdom, firmness, and success. It is so long since Englishmen have been able to say as much that there is a sensible pleasure in saying it now. We trust that the Government will continue in the course upon which it has entered. It will find plenty of occasions for the employment of firmness and resolution so long as the policy of Germany is guided and her power wielded by the Minister who is now her virtual master.

AN INSIDE VIEW OF RUSSIA.

Of all European countries Russia would be thought to be about the most secure from the invasion of socialistic and communistic ideas; for of all European countries its central power is the most complete and absolute, and its administration the most searching, swift, and effective. Yet it appears that the spread of radicalism has been so rapid there within a few years as to cause the Government "grave apprehensions." Were it only the laborers out of work in the large cities, or the serfs chafing at the restrictions under which they still suffer on the great estates, the matter might, perhaps, be disposed of by a single quiet order from the Minister of Police. The contagion, however, has crept into the upper strata of society; nay, has invaded the households of "very high officials" at St. Petersburg. The wife of one of the most eminent nobles at the Russian court is said to have been discovered in league with socialistic conspiracies; and it is no longer a secret that many of the aristocracy have, for good reasons, been placed "under the eye of the police." Secret consignments of men and women of rank to Siberia are by no means a gloomy romance of bygone days. Every now and then a person of distinction is missed; and then the whisper goes round, with much significant head-shaking, that he or she has been compromised in a democratic plot, and will never be seen more. There is an evident reaction in the domestic policy of the Czar. Most of his concessions to the press and free speech have latterly been with. Opposition to the measures of the Government is dumb perforce. The dreary reign of undiluted despotism has been resumed. When an atmosphere of terror invades the Winter Palace, there seems some reason to believe that our gushing orators, who talk about the "crumbling thrones of Europe," may not, after all, be indulging in a very extravagant hyperbole. Certainly, if the throne of Peter the Great is not secure from the iconoclasm of the commune, where is to be found a throne in Europe that is? The dallying of the Russian high-born with radical ideas recalls the fatal error of the French courtiers of Louis XV., in petting Voltaire and applauding Rousseau. Alexander of Russia has in many ways alienated his nobles; but their revenge, if it takes the form of democratic conspiracy, will ruin them, if their plots should succeed, as surely as the dynasty of the Romanoffs.