

Cum ex Apostolatus Officio: Infallible and retained in the Code

© Copyright 2007, T. Stanfill Bennis (*None of what appears below — in whole or in part — may be used without the express and written permission of the author. All emphasis within quotes are the author's unless otherwise specified.*)

"You know, then, how to discern the face of the sky, and can you not know the signs of the times?" (Matt. 16:4), Jesus directed this question to the Pharisees who repeatedly baited and tempted Him by requesting additional signs; all His miracles and the fulfillment of so many prophecies was not sufficient for them. As Rev. George Haydock observed, "The reasoning of Jesus is this: you know how to judge of the weather from observation and cannot you then know the certain signs so often promised and now completed in My coming?" (Comprehensive Commentary on the Douay-Rheims Books of the New Testament, 1859).

Dr. Carlos Disandro clearly perceived these signs in his "Doctrinal Precisions." (See www.betrayedcatholics.com/) This work first appeared in 1979 (and again in 1987), testifying to the inviolability and urgent importance of Pope Paul IV's Bull Cum ex Apostolatus Officio, which expunges as heretics even those who appear to occupy the See of St. Peter. Had those then attempting to better understand the crisis in the Church taken Dr. Disandro's work seriously, they would not hold the opinions they hold today. It is incredible that Disandro was the first individual to present Cum ex in its Latin original, with commentary, and yet to date no one referring to this Bull (to the best of my knowledge) has ever credited its original presenter. Dr. Disandro tried to warn others of the "signs of the times" in his day, but received only rebukes from those not wishing to accept the Bull for what it truly is. His Doctrinal Precisions, written in Spanish, was not available in translation until recently. But surely, in 30 years time, someone could at least have mentioned Disandro's work on Cum ex. That no one has done so explains why, after all this time, we are still searching for answers to problems that were resolved almost 450 years ago.

Donald Attwater describes a papal bull as "The most solemn and weighty form of papal letter," (A Catholic Dictionary, 1941), Though largely disciplinary in nature, even if the Bull could not be called infallible, it could teach nothing contrary to Divine law since matters pertaining to discipline are indirectly infallible, (see "Discipline," 1911 Catholic Encyclopedia, <http://www.newadvent.com/>). And whatever disciplinary measures are contained in Cum ex exist only to enforce the integrity of those offices it safeguards from heresy, apostasy and schism. Either the document is infallible in its premise and its implementation of the means to uphold and defend the Faith or it is not. One cannot separate the cause, (heresy etc.) from its effect (punishments necessary to protect the faith). As Rev. Amleto Cicognani observed in his Canon Law: "Since moreover in the Catholic Church *faith* is above all things the beginning and the foundation, the *Ecclesia docens* as

well as the *Ecclesia discens* should begin by faith, continue by faith, and do all by faith. By faith first of all do we please God; **and discipline must rest on faith**," (Canon Law, 1935). It has been said that no canonists cite Cum ex in their works; that it has not been retained in the Code; that it is not certainly infallible. That those making these claims have not even thoroughly examined the matter is bad enough. But that they prevent others from esteeming a Bull that has direct bearing on their salvation is truly indefensible. Having made this observation, let Catholics decide for themselves.

Canonists cite Cum ex

As to the argument that no one has mentioned or endorsed Cum ex, that is not actually true. First of all, Pope St. Pius V renewed the Bull in his Intermultiplices. This renewal, which entrusted much of the enforcement to the office of the Inquisition, was made not just by Paul IV's successor, but by a great saint. Disandro includes a translation of the Intermultiplices with his 1987 translation of Cum ex. Otherwise the Bull's lack of mention can be explained by its absorption into the Code, which we will prove below.

As canon lawyer Rev. Ignatius Szal noted, Paul IV's condemnation of schismatics alongside heretics was a doctrinal first in the 1500s. Prior to this time the Church's teaching on schismatics was not clear: "The earliest Bulla to contain an enacted excommunication against schismatics was that of Paul IV in 1559," Szal wrote. "The status of the schismatic before the year 1559 was at most one of doubtful excommunication," (The Communication of Catholics With Schismatics, 1948). And because it is assumed that the bull was abrogated and no longer is in effect, it continues to *appear* that the subject of schismatics and their culpability remains in question, when this matter was settled by the Bull.

Cardinal Manning's nephew, Rev. Henry Ryder, writing in 1882, mentions Cum ex in his Catholic Controversy. In his commentary he noted: "It may be urged that there are certain irregularities which, though secret, would invalidate a Pope's election, and so all his papal acts; such as...heresy held at any previous time, (see Constit. Pauli IV, Ex Apostolatus Officio, Bullarum Romanum, A.D. 1559)."

Rev. A.H. Ayrinhac also cited Cum ex in his Penal Legislation in the New Code of Canon Law, (1935). He observed that the Bull was the *first* to declare excommunicated those who "deviate from the faith or fall into some heresy." This requires that those reading the bull understand that the word deviation (*deviasse*) equals apostasy. Commenting on the Code of Canon Law where schismatics are concerned, Ayrinhac wrote: "Schism is formally assimilated now to heresy and apostasy **in every respect**," (emph. mine). Rev. Adolphe Tanquerey holds the same position. "Apostates, heretics and schismatics incur, on the ordinary conditions of full guilt, knowledge, etc., an excommunication specially reserved to the Holy See..." (Can. 2314).

So surely it cannot be said that *no one* was aware of this Bull, nor cited it in theological works. Thus is fallacy one overturned. It is further strengthened by the following.

The Latin version of the Code definitely lists Cum ex... in its footnotes, also recorded by Peter Cardinal Gasparri's in his Fontes (sources). This is true not only for Can. 188§4 but also for several other Canons dealing with heresy, (Codex Iuris Canonici, Peter Cardinal Gasparri, Newman Press, 1957.) The Code lists Cum ex... as a source not only for Can. 188§4, but also for Canons 167§3, 2264, 2314, 2316 and 2317, and there may be others, (actual copies of this listing are available upon request). Rev. Cicognani comments: "Under the canons are placed footnotes or notes...first from the 'Codicis Iuris Canonici,' the Constitutions of Popes, from the Sacred Congregations, and from Liturgical Books...In the Code there are nearly 26,000 citations of the old law. Of these, 8,400 are from Gratian's Decretum; about 1,200 from Ecumenical Councils; about 4,000 from Papal Constitutions; about 11,200 from the Sacred Congregations and 800 from liturgical Books.

"Surely this is a very eloquent reply to those who think that since the Code the old laws of the Church have lost all utility, and the history of their sources is become meaningless...(emph. mine). Outside the Code there still remains in force...the old written law, contained (at least implicitly) in the Code," along with several other laws, customs and privileges listed by Cicognani. He continues: "In a commentary on the Canons the footnotes must never be neglected, lest that occur of which Quintilian spoke: 'the pediments are viewed, the foundations are hidden,'" (Canon Law). Canon 6§4 specifically instructs canonists to consult the old law whenever there is doubt concerning any provision in the Code. Cicognani further notes that Cardinal Gasparri had already prepared some six volumes of the footnotes under the title Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes and more volumes were in preparation.

This effectively refutes the contention by certain Traditionalists that the provisions contained in Cum ex are not mentioned in the Code, hence they are abrogated under Can. 6§5 and have lost all force of law. On the contrary; with the exception of Can. 1325, the entire basis for the Code's treatment of heresy, apostasy and schism is firmly grounded on Cum ex. In addition, the Bull of Pope Paul IV, as well as that of Pope St. Pius V's Quo Primum, is further protected from any sort of abrogation by virtue of its makeup. according to Rev. Nicholas J. Neuberger' (Canon 6: The Relation of the Codex Iuris Canonici to Preceding Legislation, Catholic University of America, 1927). Calling it an "oath," Rev. Neuberger comments on the phrase "*hac immutabili et in perpetuum valitura constitutione*" (roughly translated, "our constitution is to remain unchanged in perpetuity,") found in various papal documents. He states that while such a phrase does not curtail the power nor invalidate future acts of a (legitimate) successor of the Roman Pontiff, nevertheless "the legislator attaches an especial juridical sanction to laws which have such a clause appended. Pihring advances the theory that the laws of general councils are not abolished unless a derogatory clause is annexed next to the posterior enactment...If a prior law is bound up with an oath which reads into it immunity from abrogation, the law is not countermanded

unless express mention is made to that effect. The reasons for this assertion are that the legislator is mindful of a law which has an oath attached and hence abrogation would be invalid."

Cum ex is bound up both with an oath *and* a holy curse. (For that very reason alone, no one should ever presume to consider it as abrogated in any way.) Paragraph eight states the Bull is to remain "valid in perpetuity" and that it derogates or supercedes any and all other appointments, decrees, privileges, indults, and so forth in regards to spiritual matters, whether issued or granted by the hierarchy or the secular authorities. This is a statement issuing directly from papal authority. Paragraph nine contains the oath and holy curse: "No one at all, therefore, may infringe this document of our approbation, reintroduction, sanction, statute and derogation of wills and decrees, or by rash presumption contradict it. **If anyone, however, should presume to attempt this, let him know that he is destined to incur the wrath of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul.**" Both the election laws of Pope St. Pius X (1904) and Pope Pius XII's slightly revised version of Pius X's election law (1945) contain this same oath and holy curse. While Pope Pius XII's 1945 election law explicitly abrogates that of Pope St. Pius X (footnote to Can. 160; also Appendix III, Revs. Woywod-Smith), commentators note that Pius XII basically restated the law of his predecessor in clearer language, retained all the excommunications, and made only a few minor changes.

Quo Primum retains its force not only because it contains a similar oath and the same holy curse, but also because, as Neuberger explains, "liturgical laws are immune from the principles of abrogation." This also is mentioned in Can. 6§6. And the Code does not expressly abrogate Cum Ex; rather it retains the principles embodied in the Bull in several different Canons. Also, none of the commentators seem to treat the case of violators incurring the curse of a Bull such as Cum ex, Quo Primum or the election laws, for no canonist anticipates extraordinary events, but only those that are most likely to happen. Clearly any laws accompanied by such an oath can be modified validly only by the Supreme Pontiff. Anyone else daring to declare that the Bull no longer applies in part, or that the entire Bull has been abrogated risks incurring the attached holy curse. Next we will briefly summarize, according to Neuberger's norms, how and in what manner Cum ex has been retained in the Code.

Why Cum ex is still in force

First Neuberger states that "The old legislation...is destitute of legal value unless the Code has embodied it in Canons." He then lists three different ways a law may be retained in the Code.

- 1.) The old law is retained by either stating it verbatim;
- 2.) Mentioning the subject matter followed by the phrase *ad normam Constitutionis* (referring one to the specific Constitution) or
- (3) By expressing the enactment in different terminology.

The Canons mentioned above restate the law in different terminology without any change in the law, (3). Can. 188§4 comes the closest to repeating the old law verbatim. This directs us to Can. 6§2, which states: Those Canons which restate the old law *without change* **must be interpreted upon the authority of the old law**, and therefore according to the interpretations already given by approved authors. There is a general admission by the majority that Can. 188§4 is based on Cum ex, but no one specifically notes that it has been officially retained as a source in the Code. This suggests duplicity in these commentators' evaluations of this Canon and Cum ex itself, since it suggests they are afraid to point this out lest someone else discover the numerous retentions of the Bull's various points in the Fontes. Further evidence of this duplicity arises from the fact that they refuse to consult Cum ex where Can. 188§4 is concerned. Canon 6§4 states: "In case of doubt whether some provisions of the Canons differs from the old law, one must adhere to the old law." It doesn't say the old law must be consulted or reviewed, it says it must be followed. If Can. 188§4 issues from Cum ex, and these Traditionalists agree that it does, why have they not formally invoked this Bull to resolve any doubts concerning heretics usurping the Holy See?

The only provisions in Cum ex that are not retained in the Code are those prescribing that the secular authorities are to pursue heretics; also that lay governmental leaders are to be expelled from their offices and their goods confiscated for commission of heresy, apostasy or schism. This law was enforceable in Catholic countries only and can no longer be applied at this time. Can 167§3 concerning the invalidation of elections for heresy, apostasy or schism clearly states that if a common law bars certain electors from participating, then they cannot do so. Pope Pius XII's papal election law bars those deposed from participation in the conclave. Those excommunicated for other reasons are allowed to vote. Could one merely suspected of heresy be allowed to vote since they are not yet deposed?

Not according to Can. 2200, which states that if the suspicion is certain, they are to be presumed guilty until they can prove their innocence. But this is not actually heresy *per se*, so does it come under the umbrella of those other excommunications that do not involve heresy? When in doubt we consult Cum ex, which states that: "...Each and, every one of their statements, deeds, enactments, and administrative acts, of any kind, and any result thereof whatsoever, shall be without force and shall confer no legality or right on anyone. The persons themselves so promoted and elevated shall, *ipso facto* **and without need for any further declaration**, be deprived of any dignity, position, honor, title, authority, office and power, without any exception as regards those who might have been promoted or elevated before they deviated from the faith, became heretics, incurred schism, or committed **or encouraged** any or all of these," (emph. mine). Can. 18 also tells us how to decide this question: "The ecclesiastical laws are to be interpreted according to the proper meaning of the terms of the law considered in their context. If the meaning of the terms remains doubtful or obscure, one must have recourse to parallel passages of the Code, (if there are any) or to the purpose of the law and its circumstances, and the intention of the legislator,"(Can. 18, Woywod-Smith). And so we go to the history of the law and the mind

of the legislator.

Pope Paul IV suspected Cardinal Giovanni Morone of heresy, which prompted him to write Cum ex. Morone was tried for his heresy and imprisoned. When Paul IV died, he was back in the running for the papacy, but he ran full force into Cardinal Ghislieri, the future Pope St. Pius V. The historian Hergenrother, in his The History of the Popes reports that Morone's campaign was "quashed by the intervention of Cardinal Ghislieri, who pointedly remarked that **Morone's election would be invalid owing to the question mark hanging over his orthodoxy,**" (emph mine). And this is the opinion not only of a great Pope, but of a great saint. We also have the following quote from Paul IV himself, provided by author Glenn Kittler: "If I discovered that my own father was a heretic, I would gather the wood to burn him," Paul IV said. During the trial of Cardinal Morone, Kittler says that Paul IV "decreed that any cardinal *accused* of heresy could not be elected pope," (The Papal Princes, pg. 254). And there is to be no exception concerning those who deviated from the faith "secretly" before their election; that is, some heresy that was committed pre-election but became public only after the election. They too are automatically deposed.

The restatement of other canons is documented and explained in detail elsewhere, (www.betrayedcatholics.com). More important even than the retention of Cum ex in the Code, however, is the true orientation of the Bull itself. This is explained next.

Cum ex as Divine positive law

Can. 6§6 states: *All other disciplinary laws of the old law, which were in force until now and which are neither implicitly or explicitly contained in the Code have lost all force of law with the exception of the laws contained in the approved liturgical books and laws derived from the natural and the positive divine law.*

Even if Cum ex was not officially retained in the Code, which it most certainly is, this Canon alone would guarantee its *survival*, not its abrogation. What is Divine positive law? We turn to Rev. Cicognani for a definition: "Positive law is what is decreed by the free will of the legislators, whether Divine or human...The Divine Law, both of the Old and New Testament, contains *dogmas*, that is dogmatic precepts (the rule of faith) and *disciplinary precepts*, (the rule of conduct). Dogmas peculiar to both Testaments, as the belief in the coming of Christ, ceased with His Advent; not, however, those common to both Testaments, as the unity of God," (Canon Law).

Concerning the application of Divine Law, the Church teaches: "That must be considered as the true sense of Sacred Scripture which Holy Mother Church has held and holds, whose office it is to judge concerning the true understanding and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures; and for that reason, no one is permitted to interpret Sacred Scripture itself contrary to this sense...(DZ 1788). "Further, by Divine and Catholic Faith, all those things must be believed which are contained in the written word of God and in tradition, and those which are proposed by the Church, either in a solemn pronouncement, or in Her ordinary and universal teaching power, to be believed as divinely revealed," (DZ 1792; Can. 1324). Clearly Cum ex is an act of the solemn magisterium, especially because it *defines Holy*

Scripture and proposes it for Catholic belief, as can be seen below.

“1. Whereas We consider such a matter to be so grave and fraught with peril that the Roman Pontiff, who is Vicar of God and of Jesus Christ on earth, holds fullness of power over peoples and kingdoms, and judges all, but can be judged by no one in this world — (even he) may be corrected if he is apprehended straying from the Faith. Also, it behooves us to give fuller and more diligent thought where the peril is greatest, lest false prophets (or even others possessing secular jurisdiction) wretchedly ensnare simple souls and drag down with themselves to perdition and the ruin of damnation the countless peoples entrusted to their care and government in matters spiritual or temporal; *and lest it befall Us to see in the holy place the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet*, We wish, as much as possible with God’s help, in line with our pastoral duty, to trap the foxes that are busily ravaging the Lord’s vineyard,” (Cum ex, para. 1).

Here Pope Paul IV has officially and authoritatively defined the meaning of the abomination of desolation. This act and its inevitable consequences explained throughout the Bull, but most importantly in paragraph six, make Cum ex part of the Deposit of Faith. That no one to date has fully drawn out the consequences of this definition and its import for those of us who have witnessed the actual event is truly regrettable. This particular Scriptural phrase can be found in both Testaments and all the commentators agree that the abomination here mentioned refers not only to the Jewish antichrist Antiochus, but to the actual Antichrist of our day spoken of by Christ Himself in Matthew 24. As Cicognani says, this prophecy or dogma, common to both Testaments, has not ceased. Scripture commentators, writing from the teachings of the Fathers, insisted that the abomination referred to the liturgy, the worship of idols and to the altars used to worship false gods. It is the able Rev. George Haydock who observed, however, that all the abominations of the Temple in Old Testament times can be fulfilled completely only in the reign of Antichrist and the cessation of the Holy Sacrifice. These two events are simultaneous according to Holy Scripture. In the Roman Breviary we also read St. Jerome as follows: "It is possible to apply this text [on the abomination] easily to either the Antichrist... (or to the idols placed in the Jewish Temple). "In the Old Testament, however, the term abomination is applied deliberately to idols. To identify it further 'of desolation' is added to indicate that the idol was placed in a desolate or ruined temple," (which cannot help but put us in mind of the Church after it was gutted by Roncalli and the rest.) "The abomination of desolation can be taken to mean as well every perverted doctrine. When we see such a thing stand in the Holy Place, we should flee," (Breviary Lesson for the 24th and Last Sunday after Pentecost).

Every antipope revered as a true pope is an idol; and every invalidly consecrated host adored by the faithful as the Body of Christ is especially an idol. St. Paul told us that Antichrist would sit in the temple of God showing himself *as* God, and Pope Paul IV tells us that this "god" would be a heretic (the primary mover and shaker in a series of heretics) masquerading as Pope. Henry Cardinal Manning, in his work The Present Crisis of the Holy See Tested by Prophecy, demonstrates that it has long been the contention of noted

theologians of the Church Herself that in the end times Rome would abandon the faith and return to its former paganism. Many other corollaries could be drawn from Pope Paul IV's definition, but they must wait until another day. Suffice it to say that this law is not just any law, but Divine positive as well as infallible law. As such it deserves only our full and unhesitating acceptance, not the rejection and shoddy treatment it has received to date. Why it is not included in Denzinger's Sources of Catholic Dogma is unknown; although conjectures on a logical reason could be made. Perhaps it went the way of Pope Leo's long version of the St. Michael's Prayer, edited out of the *Raccolta*; or Pope Nicholas' I's decree, which suffered a regrettable omission in the 1955 edition of Denzinger's. Anything is possible when we once realize that the one making the "revised" translations of the last editions of Denzinger's work was none other than Karl Rahner, S.J., (Rahner's name is mentioned on the Imprimatur page, also in the Introduction to the 1955 edition. See also Ecclesiastical Discipline at www.betrayedcatholics.com/)

Finally we must note that Henry Cardinal Manning, in his The Vatican Decrees and Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance, tells us that the Vatican Council was not called only to define infallibility for the future; it was specifically called to remove all doubt that *previous* papal decrees, possessing the necessary marks, are indeed infallible. Manning explained that the fathers and theologians clearly stated the reasons for calling the council before it ever took place, after studying the timeliness and necessity of an Ecumenical Council at that time. "The reasons...were publicly stated as follows, in 1869, before the Vatican Council met." Number 14 among these reasons states: "Because it is needed to place the pontifical acts during the last 300 years, both in declaring the truth...and in condemning errors...beyond cavil or question...Still more to make manifest that the active infallibility of the Church, between Council and Council, is not dormant, suspended or intermittent..." Manning further states: "The Pope, speaking *ex cathedra*, is infallible: this definition by retrospective action makes all [such] Pontifical acts infallible, the Bull Unam Sanctam included; and by prospective action will make all similar acts in future binding upon the conscience." Unam Sanctam was written well before Cum ex, so Manning illustrates that the definition retroactively covers any papal document possessing the five marks of infallibility laid down at the Vatican Council.

What are these marks? Manning tells us that in such documents the Pope speaks *ex cathedra* when he addresses the whole Church, as Supreme Teacher, defining a doctrine, to be held by the whole Church, on a matter of faith and morals. Rev. J. C. Fenton further explains what the Vatican Council declared to be included in the term *ex cathedra*: "The pontifical definition of which the Council speaks consists in a solemn judgment of the Holy Father terminating with absolute finality some question which has arisen about the content of revealed truth...The infallible and solemn definition of the Holy Father may take the form of a positive statement or it may be proposed as the condemnation of an heretical teaching...The solemn exercise of the apostolic power by the Holy Father is a declaration, a pronouncement, a definition...that the particular dogmatic truth, expressed in the definite formula utilized in the pronouncement, was actually revealed by God and forms a part of that Christian message which all men must accept with the assent of divine belief if they are

to be joined to God in the bonds of faith," (The Concept of Sacred Theology). And from what has been explained above, it is clear that questions existed concerning heresy, schism and the meaning of certain passages of Holy Scripture.

Does Cum ex possess the marks necessary to infallibility? Clearly Pope Paul IV is speaking to the whole Church as Supreme Teacher on a matter of faith, for Cum ex states: "*The Apostle's office, entrusted to Us by God though beyond any merit of Ours, lays upon Us the general care of the Lord's flock. Hence We are bound, to watch over the flock assiduously, as a vigilant shepherd, with faithful protection and wholesome guidance. We must see attentively to driving away from Christ's fold those who, in Our time more consciously and balefully than usual... rebel against the rule of right Faith.*" Later on in the document he renews all censures ever enacted against heresy, apostasy or schism "*by Our Apostolic authority;*" thus all the necessary marks are present. On several different heads and in all respects, then, Cum ex is infallible and binds every Catholic conscience today in *all* its applications.

Conclusion

There are those who currently maintain that the entire doctrinal structure of the Church would be destroyed if one accepted as Pope fell into heresy and was *ipso facto* deposed. They assert that because the hierarchy and faithful accepted John 23 and perhaps even Paul 6, this renders them valid. Obviously Pope Paul IV wrote his infallible Bull to prevent a heretic from ascending to the papacy. **He would not have written this Bull had he not believed that such an event was possible in the first place, and in writing it he was assisted by the Holy Ghost.** He told us precisely what the actual event would entail — the arrival of the abomination of desolation, synonymous, commentators agree, with Antichrist. If we rely only on Holy Scripture to guide us in this matter, we learn from St. Paul that Antichrist cannot come until the Great Apostasy has occurred. It is a documented fact that from the time of Roncalli's reign to the introduction of the NOM, baptisms in the U.S. and Great Britain were cut in half, and some 10,000 men abandoned the priesthood in the U.S. alone. But this is not evidence of a Great Apostasy? Acceptance of a man as Pope who teaches heresy and the celebration by all of an impotent and sacrilegious liturgy is not the Great Apostasy?

St. Paul writes: "Let no man deceive you by any means. For unless there come a revolt first, and the man of sin be revealed...who sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God," (2 Thess. 2: 3-4). The revolt began with the Protestant Reformation and the misinterpretation of Holy Scripture, which prompted Pope Paul IV to write his Bull to warn the faithful. The Reunionists of the 19th century, who later became Modernists and emerged as ecumenists in the 1930s, led the way in agitating for liturgical reform. This was only the completion of the Protestant Revolt; the abolition of the Tridentine Mass so zealously pursued by Luther and the adoption of Cranmer's mass by the cursed liturgical reformers. The 20th century renewal of this revolt began before Roncalli and Montini ever usurped the papacy, but was successful in great part because they themselves promoted it.

So it was only fitting that in the process of this revolt, the Man of Sin would be revealed, as St. Paul teaches. How could those remaining in the Church during Paul VI's reign be truly Catholic, when so many already had become Traditionalists, lapsed Catholics, Protestants or out and out apostates? We cannot deny what happened. We cannot twist reality to suit our own wishes and needs. The infallible teachings of Paul IV, long suppressed all these years, belong to the Deposit of Faith. They are to be accepted with unhesitating assent, and can in no way compare with the mere opinions of theologians. All the opinions in the world cannot change the fact that in defining the abomination, Pope Paul IV acted as Christ's faithful Vicar, to warn us living today how to proceed in such an event.

Several important questions pondered by Catholics today are answered by Cum ex.

Who and what is the *abomination* referred to in Daniel;

Whether the Holy Sacrifice has ceased entirely, (See Doctrinal Conclusions Drawn From Cum ex at www.betrayedcatholics.com);

Whether acceptance of a man elected as Pope validates the election despite the existence of heresy. (The election of a heretic, according to paragraph six of Cum ex, "cannot be declared valid or become valid through his acceptance of the office, his consecration, subsequent possession or seeming possession of government and administration, **or by the enthronement of or homage paid to the same Roman Pontiff, or by universal obedience accorded him**, or by the passage of any time in said circumstances, nor shall it be held as quasi-legitimate.")

Whether anyone can judge a pope and the exceptions to this rule;

Whether Angelo Roncalli was an antipope, (see Death Knell for "Good Pope John" at www.betrayedcatholics.com).

That a man who has once disseminated heresy as "pope" can never regain the office.

Rather than debate a teaching of the Church that is clearly infallible hence still in force, it is time all of us recognized Paul IV's Bull for the gem that it truly is. In the future, any conclusions on the crisis in the Church should be drawn solely from its teachings. Many dead ends, bad decisions and longwinded discussions could have been avoided if the Bull's true status had not been obscured. But now that we know better, we must do better.