



Adsum

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

LETTER FROM THE RECTOR

Dear Friends and Benefactors,

With the recent announcement of the Society of St. Pius X to proceed with the consecration of bishops without the approval of Rome, we are reminded of the evident contradictions in their theological position in which they recognize the manifest heretics in Rome as true popes yet are forced to operate without their authorization.

It would be advantageous for us to review the interview of the late Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre (founder of the Society of St. Pius X) given to Stefano Paci in the magazine *30 Days* (July-August 1988) after he had proceeded to consecrate four bishops for his Society in late June of 1988.

Excerpts from *30 Days* interview

Stefano Paci: And now, what do you foresee will be the future of the Fraternity in its relations with the Church of Rome?

Lefebvre: I hope that within a few years, four or five at the most, Rome will end up coming to an agreement with us. I am convinced that now we will have more influence on Rome, because we are keeping all our organization intact, strong and well organized, and we are more valid discussion partners than if we had accepted the accord that they proposed to us.

Stefano Paci: And if this does not happen?

Lefebvre: Rome would remain far from the Tradition. And it would be the end of the Church. Since I

recognize in the Pope the successor of Peter, I am not one who considers the See of Peter vacant; I do not say that this Pope is a heretic. But his ideas are heretical, and they have already been condemned by previous pontiffs, and they lead to heresy.

To see how the authorities of the Church have acted since the Council, it seems that the Holy Spirit has taken a vacation.

While the late Archbishop recognized the manifest heresies of the false popes of Vatican II,

unfortunately he still recognized their supposed authority.

This theological position of the Archbishop stands in stark contradiction to the Catholic Church's teachings on the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff and Papal Infallibility.

Let us consider the following teachings of Vatican Council I (1870):

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. (Denzinger 1830)

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 blessing of candles on February 2nd,
the Feast of the Purification (Candlemas Day)*

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 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). (Denzinger 1833)

The only logical conclusion is that the See of Peter has been vacant and the false popes of the Conciliar Church of Vatican II, as manifest heretics, do not represent the Catholic Church. To claim otherwise would be tantamount to the blasphemous idea that Christ has failed, for He promised to be with His Church all days, even to the consummation of the world, and that the gates of hell would not prevail against His Church.

Nevertheless, the Catholic Church is indefectible and will ever be the institution of salvation that Christ

established. The consecration of bishops during the time of interregnum (the vacancy of the Holy See) has historical precedents. During the interregnum from the death of Pope Clement IV on November 29, 1268, to the election of Blessed Gregory X on September 1, 1271, twenty-one vacancies occurred in various dioceses. During this time bishops were consecrated without papal mandate to fill these vacancies because of the spiritual necessity of the faithful and the impossibility to have recourse to the Holy See.

Furthermore, Dom Grea, in his work *L'Eglise et sa divine constitution* (The Church and its divine constitution), made reference to the terrible situation in the Church during the Arian heresy where many of the faithful were deprived of Catholic pastors and the very existence of religion was endangered.

He refers to the actions taken by St. Eusebius of Samosata, who traveled in disguise to Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine in order to provide priests and bishops for the faithful; under the circumstances, it was impossible for him to have recourse to the Holy See. Let us read from Dom Grea on this matter:

Thus, in the 4th century St. Eusebius of Samosata was seen traveling through the churches of the East devastated by the Arians and ordaining for them orthodox pastors, though without having special jurisdiction over them.

Theodoret of Cyrus, Ecclesiastical History: "Having found out that numerous churches were lacking pastors, he clothed himself as a soldier, and with his head covered with a helmet, he set out to travel to Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine, and to ordain there priests and deacons and confer other ecclesiastical orders. Whenever he would find doctrine consistent with a bishop, he would also establish pontiffs for the churches that lacked a head."

We are dealing here with actions that are truly extraordinary, like the circumstances that prompted them.

If, then, history shows us bishops carrying out the office of "medic" of failing churches, at the same time it relates to us the urgent circumstances that demanded from them such conduct. To legitimize it,

it was necessary for needs to arise in which the very existence of religion was endangered, the ministry of the particular pastor was completely annihilated or rendered powerless, and no possible recourse to the Holy See could be hoped for.

In such extreme cases the apostolic power that appeared in the beginning to establish the Gospel reappeared as if to reestablish it anew; in fact, to preserve the churches from total ruin and give them a savior is practically equivalent to giving them new birth.

But outside of these conditions, as long as the legitimate hierarchy of the particular churches still stands, it would be an act of manifest abuse and usurpation for a bishop to put sickle to his brother's harvest and tear down the boundaries of the local jurisdiction erected by their parents.

Monsignor Charles Journet referenced these extraordinary consecration of bishops in his work *The*



One of our new deacons, Lucas Costa de Oliveira (Brazil), chants the Gospel on the Feast of the Epiphany

Church of the Word Incarnate:

The power of naming or instituting bishops belongs to the Roman Pontiff (Cod. Jur. Can., 329 §2, and 332, §1). But, remarks Cajetan in his De Romani Pontificis Institutione (cap. Xiii, ad 6), we have to distinguish between the power of the Sovereign Pontiff (auctoritas) and the exercise of this power (executio), which has varied in mode down the centuries... The elections of bishops effected during a vacancy of the Holy See and regarded as valid, are thus to be explained.

The historical precedents listed above provide us with the course of action to be taken for the consecration of bishops during an extended interregnum or when there is a moral impossibility to have recourse to the Holy See, as in the case of St. Eusebius.

A very important point to be made in both precedents was that the bishops so consecrated truly functioned as pastors and teachers. In our own times, the traditional Catholic bishops function likewise. We have the assurance of Christ Himself when He gave the Divine command to His Apostles to teach all nations all things whatsoever He commanded; that He would be with them and their successors all days even to the consummation of the world (Matt. 28:20). This was taught at Vatican Council I (1870) in the First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ:

Therefore, just as He sent the Apostles, whom He had chosen for Himself out of the world, as He Himself was sent by the Father (John 20:21), so also He wished shepherds and teachers to be in His Church until the consummation of the world (Matt 28:20).

In the Nicene Creed we recite "I believe in one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church." Apostolicity is an essential mark of the Catholic Church and must be always present in the Church of Christ; otherwise the Church would have defected. Indefectibility, like infallibility and authority, is an attribute of the Church which cannot be absent in the Catholic Church.

Let it be said that as Catholics it is because of our firm belief in the papacy, papal primacy, and papal infallibility that we hold the See of St. Peter vacant!

With my prayers and blessing,

Most Rev. Mark A. Pivarunas, CMRI

Outlines of Moral Theology

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

THE NECESSITY OF HOPE

The *habit* of hope is necessary for salvation, since no one is saved unless he departs from this world in the state of sanctifying grace, and whoever possesses the state of grace has the theological virtue of hope. For adults (those who have reached the age of reason) the *act* of hope is necessary, since no one can be justified or perform meritorious works unless he has hope that God will forgive his sins or reward his supernatural deeds.

There have been false systems of asceticism which denied the necessity of hope, or have taught that it is more perfect for a person to exclude from his love of God the hope of his own beatitude. This was the error of the Quietists toward the end of the seventeenth century (led by Michael Molinos). They taught that “the soul must not think of reward or of punishment, or of heaven or of hell, or of death or of eternity,” and that one who is resigned to God’s will should not ask anything for himself from God. A few years later Archbishop Fenelon held that “there is an habitual state of love of God which is pure charity without any admixture of personal interest. Neither the fear of punishment nor the desire of reward has any more part in it. God is no longer loved for the sake of merit or perfection, nor for the happiness in loving Him,” and in this state of holy indifference “we no longer wish our salvation as our own salvation, as eternal liberation, as the reward of our merits, as our own supreme interest; but we wish it with our full will as the glory and pleasure of God, as a thing which He wills and which He wishes us to will for His sake.” These ideas were condemned by the Church.

According to Catholic principles, God wills that we strive for our own happiness, that we desire our happiness for our own sake as well as for the glory of God. Hence, even the purest act of love of God does not exclude at least an implicit desire of our own eternal happiness. As St. Thomas says: “Charity does not exclude, but even makes us keep our eye on the reward.”

Hope resides in the will, for its object is the supernatural *good*. Hope can be present in this life in the soul of anyone. Probably hope is retained by the souls in purgatory. However, hope leaves the soul when it is admitted to the beatific vision, for the object of hope is a good not yet possessed, and the blessed in heaven possess God forever.

We say that hope is *certain*, and that we have firm confidence when we hope, in the sense that we are certain that *God* will give us the means necessary for eternal life. But from *our* standpoint hope is uncertain, in that we cannot be sure that we shall co-operate with God’s graces.

Fear is one of the adjuncts of hope. The fear of God’s punishments is in itself good, for God has imposed sanctions to urge us to obey His laws. However, there is a kind of fear known as *servilely servile fear*, which means that while a person is determined not to break God’s law because he fears punishment, he has at the same time a positive desire to sin, and would sin in the event that there were no punishment. Such an attitude is sinful, not because of the withdrawal of the will from sin, but because of the (hypothetical) will to sin, in the supposition that there were no punishment.

Adsum, a publication 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
www.materdeiseminary.org