

Beaufort, and five cardinals, near relatives, were in the train. Pope Innocent VI., his successor, volunteered to assume all the expenses attendant upon these magnificent obsequies. And to whom was given the honor of delivering the panegyric? To no other than the dear saint, Peter Thomas, who found the office an easy one from the blameless and noble life led by the deceased Chief of the Church, and Vicar of Christ. The dignified presence, the mild and beautiful countenance of Pope Clement VI. will ever leave an ineffable memory, as it stands forth with imposing serenity in the annals of the historian.

In regard to his mode of administration, one cannot fail to admire his wise and energetic course, his just appreciation of men and things, his spirit of leniency, and love of peace,—no less than the air of grandeur, the suspicion of majesty which pervaded his reign. Then, too, from the papal chair there emanated during this entire pontificate, through the astute diplomacy which Pope Clement practised towards the various sovereigns, the happiest influence of spiritual authority. If we consider his personal character, we are lost in admiration of that affability which attracted towards him the hearts of his subjects, by that ineffable goodness, which taught him the art of satisfying those even whom he had to refuse, by his virtuous amenity, in fine by his proverbial *clemency*, of which history relates such admirable traits. That he possessed the qualities befitting his rank is a willingly granted fact, and we give due praise to the universal verdict which has given him a high place among those pontiffs who have, with the most dignity, splendor and prosperity, wielded the sceptre of the Church.

We are not unaware that certain disciples of Voltaire, always eager for scandal, whose suspicions are universal, whose doubts are systematic, have maliciously enquired if there be no faint shadows obscuring the private life of the Holy Father, which would take away some gleams of the vaunted glory of his reign. For our reply, we ask what proofs ever existed for such base insinuations? None worthy of a moment's notice have ever been produced. The utterances which have given use to them were but the erroneous opinions of some few secular historians, rashly admitted by but *one* annalist of the fourteenth century, the Florentine Matteo Villani. Far otherwise, the contemporaries of Pope Clement VI., even *Petrarch*, who was so given to the vice of calumny, have found but little fault with his mode of life, and speak in the highest terms of his many virtues. The impartial critic should recognize that, if the Pontiff, accustomed as he was to the courtly manners and splendid festas of the French Court during his sojourn there when Chancellor, manifested a certain tolerance for the trend—frivolous as it may have been—of his environment—it arose from the sweetness of his disposition, and *not* from his concurrence therein. To condemn him because he was fond of elegant surroundings and refined society, is to act in a manner most disrespectful to religion and unworthy of those principles which should ever influence the truthful historian.

St. Peter Thomas was *anything* but a flatterer, nay, as has already been said, he even assumed the privilege, when he thought it beneficial, to express his disapproval of this—or that—action of the pontiff, and yet he venerated him as a most worthy Chief of our holy