



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,

In recent months, a considerable amount of publicity has been stirred by comments made by the new Vatican II “pope” Francis I (George Bergoglio). Among his statements, there are two in particular which caught my attention: his views on homosexuality and his sermon on the Blessed Virgin Mary.

As far as the first issue of homosexuality, Francis I stated, “If someone is gay and he searches for the Lord and has good will, who am I to judge . . . A person once asked me if I approved of homosexuality. I replied with another question: Tell me: when God looks at a gay person, does he endorse the existence of this person with love, or reject and condemn this person?” Here the supposed head of the Catholic Church claimed that he cannot judge in a matter so explicitly condemned in Sacred Scripture in both the Old and New Testaments. In the Old Testament, God destroyed the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha for this unnatural sin. (Genesis XIX) and also Almighty God called it “an abomination.” (Leviticus XVIII:22) and declared to Moses the penalty for such a crime; “let them be put to death.” (Leviticus XX:13) In the New Testament, St. Paul declares that homosexuality is unnatural, shameful and a perversity. (Romans 1:27) and that those who practice this vice will not enter the kingdom of God. (1 Cor. 6:9)



Every Catholic with the least sense of Catholicism should be appalled that “The Advocate” the LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bi-Sexual, Transsexual) magazine has declared Francis I the “Person of the Year” for his “understanding” toward them. TIME magazine named him their “Person of the Year” because he shifted the “Church’s” stance towards “mercy” and away from “condemnation.”

In contrast to Francis I’s compromising statement on homosexuality, another public figure raised controversy by his remarks on the same subject. Phil Robertson of “Duck Dynasty,” a long bearded “red neck,” duck call manufacturer, known for his passion for duck hunting, remarked, “Start with homosexual behavior and just morph out from there. Bestiality, sleeping around with this woman and that woman and those men . . . Don’t be deceived. Neither adulterers, the idolaters, the male prostitutes, the homosexual offenders, the greedy, the drunkards, the slanderers, the swindlers — they won’t inherit the kingdom of God. Don’t deceive yourself. It’s not right.” How preposterous

that a “red neck” Duck Dynasty guy knows more moral theology than the man who supposedly guides the Catholic Church!

The second matter to be considered is the sermon of Francis I this past December on the Blessed Virgin Mary. There are no other words to describe his comments other than blasphemous. When he spoke of Mary at the foot of the Cross, he speculates that the Blessed Virgin, in her heart, may have accused God of being a liar. Francis I stated, “The Gospel does not tell us

anything: if she spoke a word or not . . . she was silent, but in her heart, how many things told the Lord! ‘You, that day, this and the other that we read, you had told me that he would be great, you had told me that you would have given him the throne of David, his forefather, that he would have reigned forever and now I see him there!’ Our Lady was human! And perhaps she even had the desire to say: ‘Lies! I was deceived!’”

The teachings of the Catholic Church on the sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin Mary are perfectly clear. The Council of Trent proclaimed it as a general belief: “If anyone says that man, after justification can avoid throughout his entire life every sin, even venial, unless it be by a special privilege of God — as the Church believes concerning the Blessed Virgin — let him be anathema.” (Denzinger 833)

Furthermore, Pope Pius IX, in the Bull *Ineffabilis*, 1854, expressly taught “The ineffable God, from the beginning and before all ages, chose and gave to His Son a Mother of whom He, being made man, would be born in the determined fullness of time. He loved her among all creatures with a singular love and delighted in her alone with all the benevolence of His will. And so it was that above all the angelic spirits and all the saints, He showered upon her an abundance of all heav-

enly favors drawn from the treasure of the Divinity, and in such a marvelous manner that, always preserved absolutely from all stain of sin, all-beautiful and all-perfect, there was in her a plenitude of innocence and holiness such that no greater can in any way be conceived under God, and that no thought other than that of God can attain it. In fact, it was entirely fitting that so august a Mother should always shine with splendors of the most perfect sanctity and that, exempt even from the stain of original sin, she should achieve a complete victory over the serpent of old.”

For us who have recognized the Great Apostasy from the Catholic Faith which was begun with the Second Vatican Council, the scandalous statements of Francis I are no surprise. However, in recent months even some in the secular media have been shocked by the remarks made by the one who purports to be the Vicar of Christ. One of them posed the question quite seriously, “Is the Pope Catholic?” The true question should be, “How can this man be the Pope?”

Let us stand in spirit with Mary, Virgin most faithful, at the Foot of the Cross that we might persevere in these difficult times.

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



Rev. Mr. Nino Molina visits Immaculate Conception Church in St. Cloud, MN



Candlelight Rosary in honor of Our Lady of Lourdes on February 11th

The Martyr of Denver

Fr. Leo Heinrichs, O.F.M.

People could not understand the man's hatred. On the Sunday morning of February 23, 1908, Giuseppe Alia entered St. Elizabeth's church in Denver, a revolver hidden under his coat. The 6 o'clock Mass was being offered. Alia waited until time for Communion, then went to the rail with others. When the Host was placed on his tongue, Alia spat it out, then shot the priest in the heart and killed him.

Alia was captured as he ran from the church. Weeks later, just before his execution for murder, he said: "Provided he who died was a priest, anything else matters little."

The city was stunned. It was difficult to believe that a man could hate so much that he would kill another for no other reason than that his victim was a priest. Alia belonged to a secret society of anarchists—men who despised all forms of authority, especially the Catholic Church. Out of delusions of freedom they attacked the one institution that had fought for freedom since its first days.

Alia's victim was Father Leo Heinrichs, a Franciscan who had come to America a few years before as a missionary. Born in Germany in 1867, Father Leo had studied in Holland after Chancellor von Bismark restricted the Church's activities in his homeland. He was ordained in Newark, N.J., then worked in various eastern cities before his assignment to Denver. Not until after his death did even his confreres realize what a holy man he had been.

He practiced remarkable penances. He knew he had a quick temper; to control it he wore leather pronged bands around his arms and waist as reminders of charity. Nobody knew this until he was pre-

pared for burial. It was discovered that he did not use his bed, but instead slept on a plain board hidden in his room. He slept little, spending most of his nights translating spiritual books from German into English. They, too, were found after his death.

Children and the sick were his constant concern. As a pastor, he insisted that the utmost care be given to

the proper training of children. During a smallpox epidemic, he virtually moved into the quarantine ward and spent endless hours comforting the sick and assisting the dying.

He seemed to know his death was near. A few days previous, he had commented that he wanted to die at Mary's feet: When he was shot it was at the foot of Our Lady's altar that he fell. Also, he normally went to confession on Thursdays; the Saturday evening before his death he asked his confessor to hear him.

But it was later that the most unusual events occurred. In 1911, his remains were transferred to a new grave at Paterson, N.J., and it was found that though the coffin, its trimmings and his garb had

all decayed in three years, he himself was untouched by the passage of time. Then reports arrived from people who claimed their prayers had been answered directly through his intercession. The reports increased and in 1926 preliminary investigations toward Father Heinrichs' beatification were begun.

Thus, in a unique way, a burst of hate unleashed a flood of love. Because one man's heart was owned by Satan, a martyr's crown went to another whose soul belonged to God and who may well one day become known to the world as St. Leo of Denver.



Father Connell Answers Moral Questions

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

A Forgotten Sin

Question: While the priest is giving absolution, a penitent recalls a mortal sin which he forgot to confess. Should he interrupt the priest in order to confess it, or should he wait until the priest has finished the absolution and then tell it? In the latter supposition, must the priest give absolution again?

Answer: The proper procedure for the penitent is to allow the priest to complete the words of absolution and only then to confess the forgotten sin. For, supposing that the penitent gave due diligence to the examination of his conscience, his confession possessed formal integrity and accordingly constituted the matter for a valid and fruitful absolution. And, once the priest has begun the formula of absolution, it is unnecessary and even incongruous to interrupt him, even though the penitent has become conscious of some necessary matter not expressed adequately in his confession. Of course, there is an obligation to confess the forgotten sin subsequently, and ordinarily this should be done at once. In the words of Pruemmer: “If a person while still in the confessional, after receiving absolution, recalls a grave sin that has been omitted, he must at once confess it and receive absolution . . . Such is the common practice. For he must certainly confess this sin, nor is there usually a sufficient reason for deferring it until the next confession” (Pruemmer, O.P., *Manuale Theologiae Moralis* [Fribourg Brisgov., 1936], III, n. 386). But the same author adds: “If, however, there is a sufficient reason—for example, if the penitent thinks he can explain the sin better to another confessor—he can abstain from confessing it until the next confession” (loc. cit.).

According to Lehmkuhl (*Theologia Moralis* [Fribourg Brisgov., 1908], II, n. 325), some authors have held that there is no need for another absolution if the forgotten sin is confessed immediately after the penitent has received absolution for the sins he remembered. But Lehmkuhl himself justly rejects this view. For there is an obligation to receive the *direct* sacramental remission of all mortal sins, and in the case presented the forgotten sin has been remitted only *indirectly*. Consequently, when this sin is confessed, even though this takes place immediately after absolution has been pronounced, the priest must again pronounce the words of sacramental pardon. Furthermore, he should also impose a sacramental penance, at least by adding a light satisfactory work to the penance already enjoined. In a word, the confessor should see to it that all that is required for the essence and integrity of Penance is present, since actually the sacrament is being conferred a second time.

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