



Adsum

Adsum is published by the seminarians of **Mater Dei Seminary** for the enjoyment of our families, friends and benefactors.

LETTER FROM THE RECTOR

Dear Friends and Benefactors,

With the recent news of the “lifting” of the excommunications of the bishops of the Society of St. Pius X (SSPX), I would not be surprized to see in the future their reconciliation with the Conciliar Church of Vatican II.

The reason for this is that the SSPX has continued the ever-vacillating theology of its founder, the late Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. For those who have carefully observed the late Archbishop over the years, at one time he held a hard line, in which he declared the Conciliar Church a heretical and schismatic Church, only later to adopt a soft line where he claimed to have mere reservations about some of the errors of Vatican II.

This vacillation of position is not difficult to demonstrate. In June of 1976, after Paul VI had issued a “suspensio a divinis” prohibiting Archbishop Lefebvre from the administration of the Sacraments, the Archbishop responded:

“We are suspended a divinis by the Conciliar Church and for the Conciliar Church, to which we have no wish to belong. That Conciliar Church is a schismatic Church, because it breaks with the Catholic Church that has always been. It has its new dogmas, its new priesthood, its new institutions, its new worship, all already condemned by the Church in many a document, official and definitive **The Church that affirms such errors is at once schismatic and heretical. This Conciliar Church is, therefore, not Catholic.** To whatever extent Pope, Bishops, priests, or faithful adhere to this new Church, they separate themselves from the Catholic Church. (Reflections on Suspension ‘A Divinis’ by Msgr. Marcel Lefebvre)”

Then, in March of 1980, in a letter addressed to John Paul II, the Archbishop wrote:

“Holy Father, To put an end to some doubts that are now circulating in Rome and certain traditionalist areas in Europe and America . . . permit me to state again that which I have always expressed . . . **I fully agree with Your Holiness’ judgment of the Second Vatican Council . . . ‘That the Council must be understood in the light of all Holy Tradition and on the basis of the constant Magisterium of the Holy Church.’ Regarding the Mass of the Novus Ordo, despite all the reservations one must have about**

it, I have never said that it is in itself invalid or heretical.”

And again in April of 1981, in a letter to “Cardinal” Seper, the Archbishop reiterated:

“If some of my words and some of my acts are disapproved by the Holy See, I am very sorry. I state again regarding the Council that I subscribe to the phrase of the Holy Father which asks that one accept it ‘in light of tradition and the constant Magisterium of the Church.’ **Regarding the liturgical Reform, I myself signed the Conciliar decree and I have never stated that its applications were in themselves invalid and heretical.”**

Later on, in 1987, the Archbishop reversed his soft line:

“I have summed it up to Cardinal Ratzinger in certain words, of course, because it is difficult to sum up this whole situation; but I said to him: ‘Eminence, see, even if you grant us a bishop, even if you grant us a certain self-government in relation to the bishops, even if you grant us all the liturgy of 1962, if you grant us to continue the seminaries and Society, as we do it now, **we cannot collaborate; it is impossible, impossible, because we work in two diametrically opposed directions: you, you work for the de-Christianization of society, of human person, and of the Church, and we, we work for its Christianization.** They cannot be in agreement.’ **Rome has lost the Faith, my dear friends. Rome is in apostasy.** It is not just words, it is not just words in the air that I say to you. It is the truth. Rome is in apostasy.”

And again, in an August, 1987 letter addressed to the future bishops, the Archbishop declared:

“**My dear friends, The See of Peter and the posts of authority in Rome being occupied by anti-Christ**s, the destruction of the Kingdom of Our Lord is being rapidly carried out even within His Mystical Body here below . . . Since this Rome, Modernist and Liberal, is carrying on its work of destruction of the Kingdom of Our Lord . . .”

For the Archbishop, one day the Conciliar Church is heretical and schismatic and another day it is the Catholic Church. One day it is “Holy Father,” and another day it is “anti-Christ.”

continued on page 2

continued from page 1

At the root of this confused theology is the erroneous concept of the Papacy. For all the protestations that the SSPX recognizes the Vatican II “popes” as legitimate, they have had no canonical approbation from their “popes” and have continued to establish churches and to administer the Sacraments throughout the world without regard to their lack of juridical status.

This erroneous concept of the SSPX “to recognize and to resist” the one they hold as “pope” is in complete contradiction to the infallible decrees of Vatican Council I in 1870:

“And because, by the divine right of apostolic primacy, the Roman Pontiff is at the head of the whole Church, We also teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful; and that one can have recourse to his judgment in all cases pertaining to ecclesiastical jurisdiction. We declare that the judgment of the Apostolic See, whose authority is unsurpassed, is not subject to review by anyone; nor is anyone allowed to pass judgment on its decision....”

If the false popes of Vatican II were true Popes, the SSPX would have no right to establish churches, to administer the Sacraments, to consecrate bishops without papal mandate, and to assume the role of a quasi-hierarchy that sifts through the “papal” teachings to decipher what is orthodox and what is erroneous. What an utter contradiction!

For us, it is because of our belief in the papacy, papal infallibility, and the primacy of jurisdiction of the pope, that we reject these false claimants to the See of St. Peter.

When we examine closely the Church’s teachings on the papacy, we find it irreconcilable that a true Pope could

promulgate heretical teachings of false ecumenism and religious liberty, as well as legislate the sacrilege of “Eucharist sharing” to heretics and schismatics. Vatican Council I clearly stated:

“For the fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following closely in the footsteps of their predecessors, made this solemn profession: ‘The first condition of salvation is to keep the norm of the true faith. For it is impossible that the words of our Lord Jesus Christ who said, “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church” (*Matt. 16:18*), should not be verified. **And their truth has been proved by the course of history, for in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been kept unsullied, and its teaching kept holy.**’ ...Indeed, it was this apostolic doctrine that all the Fathers held, and the holy orthodox Doctors revered and followed. **For they fully realized that this See of St. Peter always remains untainted by any error, according to the divine promise of our Lord and Savior** made to the prince of His disciples, ‘I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, strengthen thy brethren.’ (*Luke 22:32*).”

So if the SSPX does actually reconcile with the Conciliar Church, the question remains, what price will they pay to be a pea in the ecumenical pod of the Conciliar Church? Will they eventually accept false ecumenism, religious liberty, and the New Mass?

With my prayers and blessing,
Most Rev. Mark A. Pivarunas, CMRI

Message from Moscow

Dear Brothers and Sisters in Christ!

On the day of my Ordination and other days of my Holy Mass services in Spokane, I was presented by a great number of greeting cards with warm congratulations and wishes. And on the Merry Christmas Day, I would like to answer personally and to write every one of my congratulators. It is a great pity, but I could send my answers from Moscow only to an addressee who had left me their contacts in the cards.

A fortiori, I send my congratulations, best of good wishes in a beautiful Christmas Holyday and express one more time my gratitude for your prayers and concern by help of “Adsum”!

You can send your letters to our Chapels’ address in Moscow: **Father Alexander Krysov, Moscow, Proezd Rusanove, 27-1-86, Russia.**

More than two months I have been a Pastor of our Catholic community here in Moscow. At last, Holy Mass is celebrated in our Chapel regularly! This is a great happiness! Also, I hope that I could visit Russian cities where

many Catholics have strong wishes to organize Traditional Catholic Chapels for Traditional Holy Service.

Really, when I returned to Moscow, we met serious difficulties with local modernists and Lefebvreist circles that, unfortunately, work against us. Also there is a problem with material (financial) support for our Chapel in Moscow. But we realize that Russia is on a perfect way of conversion into Catholicism, into the True Catholic Faith; and we do realize that this way couldn’t be easy. We see that we are just in the beginning of the crucial but excellent way!

Cum benedictione,
Pater Alexander Krysov
Moscow, December 25, 2008

**Message from Tim Drahman at Mt. St. Michael:
Russian banks will not accept checks directly from the U.S. Donations to Fr. Krysov or St. Pius V Chapel need to be made payable to Mt. St. Michael, in order for us to deposit the money in our bank and wire it directly to Father’s bank account in Russia.**

The Life of St. Gabriel, Passionist

by Rev. Fr. James McGilloway, CMRI

When we consider the lives of the saints, we may fall into the mistake of thinking that the saints were born saints. However, this is not the case for some of them, and in particular, St. Gabriel, the Passionist. His friends called him “the dude” because of his immaculate grooming. They also nicknamed him “the dancer” because at parties he didn’t hesitate to dance with as many girls as were available. He was popular with his companions because he was witty and could readily make them laugh. With his vivacious nature, he fit right in with the “Lords of Spoleto,” a gang of classmates whose idea of fun was marching through the streets laughing, joking and instigating boisterous stunts, often while enjoying a smoke on the side to prove their maturity.

Does this sound like one of those students who is more of a “party-goer” than a scholar, more of a potential candidate for juvenile hall than for a diploma? Well, oddly enough, the student described was at the time in the process of becoming a candidate for sainthood. Yes, seventeen-year-old Francis Possenti, the son of a well-to-do civil official in Spoleto, Italy, found his enjoyment in many of the pleasures and frivolities of youth. But the fun-loving side of his character was offset by his integrity, piety, and natural talents. He was an able scholar with a quick mind and tenacious memory enabling him to earn the most envied prizes the school had to offer, the gold medals of philosophy and honor. The religious principles that had been instilled into him, both in his home and Catholic schooling, exerted an influence on him, such that he did not neglect his religious duties of prayer, attendance at Mass and frequent confession and Communion. Furthermore, he fostered a tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary. Doubtless, these Catholic practices preserved in him a high moral standard. He remained pure in mind, heart and speech, and his chastity of soul and body was reflected in his very facial appearance.

While the world was trying to entice Francis into its service, God was beckoning to him in the opposite direction, that of His service. The instrument God used to make this call heard was the reality of death—the experience of his own narrow escape from death, not once, but twice. Twice on the threshold of death from illness he promised God that he would leave the world and consecrate his life in a religious order as a priest. Twice the world seduced him and he broke his promise.

A third call reached him during a procession in which a famous icon of the Blessed Virgin Mary was being carried through the streets of Spoleto. As the sacred picture passed the spot where he was kneeling, his eyes met those of the image. As he gazed spellbound, in the depth of his soul he

heard a voice say, “Francis, why do you remain in the world? It is not for you. Follow your vocation!”

That brief moment changed the course of his life. All procrastination ended and he answered the call without delay. In September, 1856, he entered the Passionist Order. One year later he made his religious profession, taking the name Gabriel, vowing to live according to Our Lord’s evangelical counsels of poverty, chastity and obedience. He then proceeded to take up clerical studies in preparation for the priesthood. He distinguished himself by the practice of heroic virtue, not manifested by doing extraordinary feats of heroism, not by working astounding miracles, but by constant virtuous fidelity to the ordinary obligations and duties expected of any religious and cleric, fulfilled with extraordinary faith, diligence and purity of intention. By the power of God’s grace, he gradually died to self-love to live for love of God alone.

His constant progress in virtue in a short time can be attributed to the firm resolutions he made, inspired largely by his fervent devotion to Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament, to His Passion, and to the Sorrows of Mary, whereby he received abundant graces to remain faithful to those resolutions. After six years in the religious life, at the age of 24, after suffering greatly with patient resignation, he died peacefully of consumption on February 27, 1862.

On May 13, 1920, Pope Benedict XV officially proclaimed him a canonized saint, citing Gabriel Francis Possenti as “the new patron of youth for the Universal Church in this 20th century,” stressing that what he achieved is “a lesson and inspiration to us all.” What specifically is that lesson? I think it is well summarized by Cardinal William Connell: “To live an ordinary life dedicated to God’s glory, that is the lesson we need most in these days of spectacular posing and movie heroes. And that an ordinary life, lived only for God, quite simply, quite undramatically, but very seriously, each little task done with a happy supernaturalism—that such a life means sainthood.”

But the life of St. Gabriel has an added lesson for those young men who are also being called by God to follow in the footsteps of his vocation, and who, perhaps like him, are attracted by the seductions of the world. To such, the example of young Gabriel can serve as a magnet to draw them away from the world’s allurements and inspire them with courage and resoluteness in responding to God’s invitation: “Young men . . . love not the world . . . because all that is in the world is the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life . . . And the world with its lust is passing away, but HE WHO DOES THE WILL OF GOD LIVES FOREVER.” (I John 2:14-17).

Father Connell Answers Moral Questions

by Very Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., S.T.D., LL.D., L.H.D.

Difficulties About Extreme Unction

Question A: If a priest is anointing a sick person with the intention of giving all the anointings, but finds, after anointing the hands, that for some good reason he cannot anoint the feet, is there any reason for doubting the validity of the sacrament?

Answer A: These questions center about the difficult problem as to just when, in the administration of Extreme Unction, the essence of the sacrament is given. Of course, Extreme Unction *can* be given with a single anointing on any sense, at least if a general form is used, such as is the prescribed *forma brevior* (Canon 947, 1). But from this it does not follow necessarily that in the ordinary conferring of this sacrament it is essentially completed with the first anointing—the anointing of the eyes with a prayer for the remission of sins committed by the sense of sight. In fact, it seems quite probable that it is only after the fifth anointing that the essential sacramental grace is given. For it is only then that the anointing prayers prescribed by the ritual have covered all the types of sins that the person could have committed, so that it can be said that the anointing of

his body has been essentially completed. The anointing of the feet adds only to the *integrity* of the sacrament, as is evident from the facility with which the Church dispenses from this anointing (Canon 947, 3), and also from the fact that any sins committed *per gressum* have already been included in some manner in one of the preceding anointings. Accordingly, the priest who would start with the intention of giving all six anointings, but would decide to omit the sixth only after giving the fifth need have no doubt about the validity of the sacrament, as long as his general intention is to anoint according to the mind of the Church (Kilker, *Extreme Unction*, St. Louis: Herder, 1927, pp. 45 f.). Nevertheless, as a general rule the priest should find out before beginning to anoint whether or not he can give all the prescribed six anointings.

Question B: Supposing in the same circumstances the priest discovered, after giving the first four anointings, that he could anoint neither the hands nor the feet: is there any reason for doubting the validity of the sacrament?

Answer B: According to the probable view just expounded, Extreme Unction is not essentially administered until the hands have been anointed. From this it would follow that the priest who would discover in the course of the anointings that he could not anoint the hands would run the risk of not giving the sacrament if he would do nothing to supply the defect. Accordingly, he would be bound to take measures to make certain the administration of the sacrament. The most practical course would be to add an anointing on the forehead, with the general form, and with the

intention of giving the sacrament on condition that it has not already been conferred. In the event that the priest discovers beforehand that he cannot give one or more of the first five anointings on the proper members (at least one of each pair) or on a part of the body sufficiently proximate (*Rit. Rom., De Extrema Unctione*, Cap. 1, n, 19), it would be best to give the forehead anointing absolutely with a general form, and then to add whatever particular anointings are possible.

ADSUM, a publication by the seminarians of **MATER DEI SEMINARY** for the reading enjoyment of friends and benefactors, is sent free of charge to all who request it. If you are interested, please provide your name and mailing address to:

MATER DEI SEMINARY

7745 Military Avenue

Omaha NE 68134-3356