

# Fr. Cekada Discredits Jurisdictional Pharisees



R. J. M. I.

By

The Precious Blood of Jesus Christ,  
The Grace of the God of the Holy Catholic Church,  
The Mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary,  
Our Lady of Good Counsel and Crusher of Heretics,  
The Protection of Saint Joseph, Patriarch of the Holy Family,  
The Intercession of Saint Michael the Archangel  
and the cooperation of

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

To Jesus through Mary

*Judica me Deus, et discerne causam meam de gente non sancta  
as homine iniquo et doloso erue me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

Original version: 2/2004; Current version: 8/2007

**Mary's Little Remnant**

302 East Joffre St.

TorC, NM 87901-2878

Website: [www.JohnTheBaptist.us](http://www.JohnTheBaptist.us)

(Send for a free catalog)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>HOME-ALONERS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>FR. CEKADA’S INCOMPLETE DEFINITION OF HOME-ALONERS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>THE MAIN POINT OF HIS ARTICLE IS TRUE .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>CATHOLIC BISHOPS AND PRIESTS, IN EMERGENCY CASES, ARE FREE FROM THE LETTER OF THE LAW .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>PRIESTS CAN ONLY GIVE SACRAMENTS TO CATHOLICS, EXCEPT BAPTISM FOR CATECHUMENS .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>OTHER ERRORS AND HERESY IN CEKADA’S ARTICLE .....</b>	<b>9</b>
BISHOPS LEFEBVRE AND THUC WERE NOT CATHOLIC .....	9
CEKADA DISCREDITS OTHERS BY APPEALING TO HIS “GREAT” INTELLECT .....	10



## Home-aloners

Home-aloners are self-professed Catholics who rightly believe the Holy See and local sees are vacant and do not attend the Masses of or receive sacraments from bishops and priests that they believe are illegal or for other reasons. Even though they profess to be Catholic, not all home-aloners are Catholic. However, the only Catholics there are in these latter days of the Great Apostasy are home-aloners, unless there is a Catholic priest in hiding that I do not know about.

### Fr. Cekada's incomplete definition of home-aloners

Fr. Cekada's article, *Traditional Priests, Legitimate Sacraments*<sup>1</sup> (hereafter TPLS), 2003,<sup>2</sup> only deals with one type of home-aloner, the Jurisdictional Pharisee:

TPLS: "A traditional Catholic may come across a tract by a traditionalist type popularly called a 'home-aloner.' This is someone who rejects Vatican II and the New Mass, but at the same time denounces the sacramental ministrations of all (or most) traditional Catholic priests as illegal..."

Fr. Cekada's definition of home-aloners is incomplete and dishonest. Not all who profess to be Catholic and stay home alone believe in the same things. Even though they all profess to be Catholic, some are and others are not. Those who are not Catholic stay home for the wrong reasons.

Fr. Cekada's article only refers to one type of home-aloner, the non-Catholic, Jurisdictional Pharisee. These type stay home, not because self-professed Catholic bishops and priests are, in fact, not Catholic, but because they believe they have no jurisdiction. They place jurisdictional matters over the faith; the worst among them ignore the faith issues. Even if there were true Catholic bishops and Catholic priests, they would not attend their Masses or receive the sacraments from them because they do not believe in exceptions to the letter of ecclesiastical laws in emergency situations for any reason, be it by an exemption from the law, also known as *Epikeia*, or by an intrinsic cessation of the law, or for any other reason. Some do believe exemptions from these laws can apply in certain cases but do not apply it to the cases in which it does. These are true Pharisees like the ones Jesus contended with.<sup>3</sup>

There is also another type of non-Catholic home-aloner. These rightly avoid bishops and priests because they believe they are not Catholic, but they hold one or more heresies themselves, such as the heresy of Natural Family Planning, or that certain men who died worshipping false gods and practicing false religions can be saved, or that fallen-away Catholics do not have to specifically abjure their sins against the faith to enter the Church, etc.

There is also another type of non-Catholic home-aloner. These stay home not because the priest is not Catholic and not because they believe he does not have jurisdiction, but

---

<sup>1</sup> Legality (legitimacy) and validity are separate issues. A priest can be valid and not Catholic, such as the Greek Schismatic and the Thucite priests. They can validly confect the Holy Eucharist, but they do so illegally and thus commit sacrilege every time they do. A Catholic is forbidden to illegally receive the sacraments under pain of the mortal sin of sacrilege. (See: my book *Against the Thucites*, "The Thuc Line is Valid.")

<sup>2</sup> For a full text of the article, either view it on Fr. Cekada's website at [www.traditionalmass.org](http://www.traditionalmass.org) or request it at his following address. 11144 Reading Rd., Cincinnati, OH, 45241.

<sup>3</sup> See: my *Epikeia Debate* and *Epikeia Controversy* and *Condemnation and Refutation of Patrick Henry*.

because they personally do not want to attend Mass in a church with non-Catholics, while not believing it is a dogma of faith that Catholics cannot knowingly pray in communion with non-Catholics, which includes notorious heretics and schismatics, under pain of five mortal sins. Thus, they hold the heresy that Catholics can knowingly pray in communion with notorious heretics and schismatics if they so choose even though they choose not to.<sup>4</sup>

And then you another type of home-aloner, the Catholic, such as myself and the rest of Mary's Little Remnant. We stay home alone for all the right reasons. We rightly avoid, in religious matters, non-Catholic bishops and priests, precisely and only because they are not Catholic, and we hold, profess, and practice the full deposit of the Catholic faith.

## **The main point of his article is true**

The main point of Fr. Cekada's article is true and is one I constantly make with the non-Catholic home-aloners who are more concerned about jurisdictional problems than with the Catholic faith, the Jurisdictional Pharisees. These non-Catholic home-aloners stay home on Sunday for the wrong reasons. These Pharisees, such as Patrick Henry and Sr. Mary Cabrini, go by the letter of the law while not knowing the spirit of the law. I showed them the truth several times and they pridefully and stubbornly refused to accept it. For instance, they always refuse to address my questions that prove God allows exceptions to the letter of laws that do not deal with faith or morals—even divine laws—such as King David eating the showbread, Jesus' Sabbath Day healings, His allowing the apostles to pick corn on the Sabbath Day when they were hungry, and His allowing for the work of circumcision on the Sabbath Day, all of which are against the letter of the law, of the divine law. Yet, Jesus allowed and justified these exceptions.

I also warned them that the non-Catholic Thucites, such as Fr. Cekada, would discredit them if they do not defend the jurisdiction problem of being free from obeying the letter of laws that do not deal with faith or morals, properly. They do not believe a Catholic can be freed from the letter of these laws in emergency situations, whether by the principle of Epikeia or cessation of the law or for any reason, which is contrary to the teaching and practice of the Church, and also illogical. They are also hypocrites, because they publicly teach the faith to others without the authorization of a Catholic bishop or superior with ordinary jurisdiction, which the letter of Canon Laws 1384 and 1385 requires. Being they do not believe they can be exempted from these laws, they violate them when they attempt to publicly teach the faith.

Indeed, Fr. Cekada took the Jurisdictional Pharisees to task on this point and discredited them. Thus again, God used an evildoer, the non-Catholic heretic and schismatic Fr. Cekada, to expose and discredit other evildoers.

## **Catholic bishops and priests, in emergency cases, are free from the letter of the law**

A Catholic bishop or a Catholic priest can be free from the letter of the law in emergency situations when access to proper authorities is impossible, in order to help

---

<sup>4</sup> See my book *Faith before the Mass*.

save souls. Simply, if a bishop or priest is truly Catholic in word and deed, then he can function as such even though he does not have access to legitimate Church authorities to receive jurisdiction from them. Instead, the Church supplies him with the jurisdiction. A future pope would never condemn any truly Catholic bishop or priest for doing what he can to spread the faith and help save souls. The future pope will judge all these bishops and priests in light of the faith, whether they were or are Catholic or not.

That means Catholic bishops can legally consecrate Catholic bishops, legally ordain Catholic priests, legally confirm Catholics, etc. That means Catholic priests can legally hear confessions of Catholics, legally offer Mass to Catholics, legally give them Holy Communion, and legally preach sermons and teach the faith, etc.<sup>5</sup> As long as they are Catholic, bishops and priests can legally function, short of claiming territory, which only a pope can give. That is common sense and what *Epikeia*, or as some teach an intrinsic cessation of the law, is all about. Fr. Cekada teaches this. He rightly qualifies his argument by saying Catholic bishops and Catholic priests can provide sacraments uninhibited to Catholics. The key word is “Catholic.”

TPLS: “OUR LORD’S commands to baptize (Mt 28:19), forgive sins (Jn 20:22), offer Mass (Lk 22:19), etc. constitute a **divine law** that binds all Catholic bishops and priests until the end of time... In any case, the grave obligation to dispense the sacraments that *divine* law imposes on traditional Catholic priests in charity and in virtue of their ordination takes precedence over the human ecclesiastical laws cited against them... this same divine law necessarily endows traditional Catholic bishops and priests with legitimate deputation or an apostolic mission to dispense sacraments.”

Conversely, Fr. Cekada rightly implies the same does not apply to non-Catholic bishops and non-Catholic priests or else the Greek Schismatics can legally administer the sacraments.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, Fr. Cekada believes he can legally administer sacraments to his flock based upon the premise that he is a Catholic priest: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself...” (TPLS) If Fr. Cekada were Catholic, then he is correct. Sadly, Fr. Cekada is not a Catholic priest. He is a notorious heretic and schismatic; therefore, he is not Catholic.

1. He is a heretic, schismatic, and hypocrite for supporting and defending Bishop Thuc and his heretical and schismatic lineage. He denounces all the other bishops that signed the Vatican II documents but does not denounce Bishop Thuc who signed them also. He also dishonestly teaches that Bishop Thuc abjured from his crimes while there is no public record that Thuc ever abjured.<sup>7</sup>
2. He is an apostate and heretic for believing certain men can be in the way of salvation and be saved who live and die worshipping false gods and practicing false religions, and even men who do not believe in Jesus Christ, all of which is a denial of the Salvation Dogma, No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church. Not even the heresiarch

---

<sup>5</sup> However, they can never be exempted from laws dealing with faith or moral and must keep the letter of the Ecclesiastical Laws that they can keep.

<sup>6</sup> Non-Catholic priests can only legally administer the sacraments of penance and extreme unction under certain strict conditions to Catholics who are in danger of death, or to all Catholics if they are occult heretics under certain strict conditions. See my book *Faith Before the Mass*, “Catholics’ Reception of Sacraments from non-Catholic priests.”

<sup>7</sup> See my book *Against the Thucites*, “(3) Bishop Thuc did not abjure his apostate and heretical errors.”

Martin Luther taught such an abominable thing. He at least taught one needed to believe and profess faith in Jesus Christ in order to be saved.<sup>8</sup>

3. He believes and promotes the contraception heresy of Natural Family Planning, also known as The Rhythm Method.<sup>9</sup>
4. He, by implication, denies a Catholic's obligation to profess the faith and do the spiritual acts of mercy of admonishing and converting the sinner, which is heresy. He believes there is no way for Catholic bishops without ordinary jurisdiction or Catholic priests and laymen to identify and denounce true (formal<sup>10</sup>) apostates, heretics, or schismatics; thus, they cannot firmly and with conviction tell notorious criminals that they are on the road to hell and call them to repentance and conversion. By logical conclusion, Cekada effectively denies automatic (*latae sententiae*) excommunications, because he heretically believes there is no way to tell if an offender incurred such a censure unless he was warned and tried by Church authorities and declared to have been excommunicated by name, which defeats and denies the purpose of automatic excommunications. Just ask Fr. Cekada to denounce publicly, from the pulpit or in writing, John Paul II as a truly guilty (formal) idolater, (formal) apostate, and (formal) heretic who is definitely on the road to hell. He will at best tell you we can only say he is a material one, meaning John Paul II may not truly be guilty of the notorious crimes he commits—that is what he told me during a phone conversation; therefore, according to Cekada, there is no way a Catholic can profess the faith as he is bound to or fulfill the spiritual acts of mercy of admonishing and converting the sinner, because he has no way to know for sure if anyone is truly a guilty sinner.
5. He allows his flock to attend Mass at non-Catholic churches in which Mass is offered by notorious heretic or schismatic priests, as long as the priests are valid and they offer the Tridentine (Pius V) Mass. Thus, he, and his flock that follow his advice, incur five mortal sins every time they knowingly pray in communion with notorious heretics or schismatics.<sup>11</sup>
6. He does not demand fallen-away Catholics to take a specific abjuration in order to enter the Church, which is contrary to the Church law and places him in communion with non-Catholics and also makes him guilty of sacrilegious administration of Holy Communion and the other sacraments. He does not truly care if his flock holds and practices the full deposit of the Catholic, for he has no way of knowing what they believe point-by-point, which is also the mortal sin of religious indifferentism.<sup>12</sup>
7. Even though he disobeyed Bishop Lefebvre and left the Society of St. Pius X (SSPX), he does not denounce Bishop Marcel Lefebvre as a notorious heretic and schismatic or his SSPX as a heretical and schismatic sect; thus, he shares in the guilt of Lefebvre's and the SSPX's crimes by sins of omission. Which also makes his separation from Lefebvre and act of true rebellion, because he believed, as he does

---

<sup>8</sup> See my book *The Salvation Dogma*.

<sup>9</sup> See: my article *Natural Family Planning is Contraception*.

<sup>10</sup> Formal is the word modern theologian use to mean a truly guilty, in the internal forum, apostate, heretic, or schismatic.

<sup>11</sup> See my book *Faith Before the Mass*, "Mortal Sins for knowingly praying in communion with heretics and schismatics."

<sup>12</sup> See my book *The Abjuration from the Great Apostasy*



today, that Lefebvre and his sect were Catholic, and thus he had no right to separate from Lefebvre and the SSPX.

Therefore, Fr. Cekada's proper teaching in his article TPLS disqualifies him from legally confecting and dispensing the sacraments because he is not a Catholic priest. He cannot make legal his administration of the sacraments to his non-Catholic flock by appealing to *Epikeia* or a cessation of the law any more than the Greek Schismatics can. *Epikeia* or a cessation of the law can only justify the acts of Catholics or catechumens who are preparing to become Catholic, such as when they are baptized or abjure.<sup>13</sup>

## **Priests can only give sacraments to Catholics, except baptism for catechumens**

It is an infallible dogma that Catholic priests are forbidden to knowingly give the sacraments to heretics or schismatics.

Canon 731. "It is forbidden to administer the Sacraments of the Church to heretics and schismatics... unless they shall have previously renounced their errors and obtained reconciliation with the Church."

In Fr. Cekada's article, he rightly teaches that sacraments can only be given to Catholics.

TPLS: "Priests with the *cura animarum* [cure of souls] were gravely bound by divine law to provide the sacraments to faithful Catholics qualified to receive them... These priests were then bound by divine law to provide sacraments for Catholics... Applying these laws would deprive Catholics of the sacraments and thus directly impede the common good"

Again, the key word is Catholic. Fr. Cekada stands condemned by his own proper teaching, because neither he nor his flock is Catholic. Therefore, his flock is forbidden to receive the sacraments from any priest, Catholic or non-Catholic, until they enter the Church by abjuration and become Catholic.

## **Other Errors and heresy in Cekada's article**

### ***Bishops Lefebvre and Thuc were not Catholic***

Fr. Cekada's article has one serious error that is heretical and schismatic. In one place he rightly teaches that most of the bishops and priests after Vatican II defected from the Catholic faith:

TPLS: "After Vatican II nearly all bishops and priests with the *cura animarum* defected to the new religion. The few priests who resisted, on the other hand, were professors, outcasts in their religious orders or dioceses, retired, etc.

"These priests were then bound by divine law to provide sacraments for Catholics, who, since their pastors had apostasized, were now 'obviously in serious need.' The priests were not obliged to 'seek permission. Rather, they were **obliged**, both in charity and in virtue of their ordination, to baptize, absolve, offer Mass, etc."

---

<sup>13</sup> See my book *Strange Voices*, Book Two, *Epikeia* in the day of the Great Apostasy, Only Catholics and penitent non-Catholics can be justified by *Epikeia*.

Certainly included among the bishops who defected and apostasized from the faith are those who signed any one of the heretical Vatican II documents. Yet, Cekada refers to Bishops Lefebvre and Thuc as Catholic, as not having defected from the faith, even though they signed the Vatican II documents. He includes them among the faithful Catholic bishops and priests who had not defected from the Catholic faith and thus had the right to legally administer the sacraments.

TPLS: “Not only that, but the bishops among them — Abps. Lefebvre and Thuc — were **obliged** to confer Holy Orders on worthy candidates who would then continue to provide sacraments for faithful Catholics throughout the world.

“Their obligation arose from the sacred order of episcopacy they had both received. The one-sentence exhortation to the candidate in the Rite of Episcopal Consecration expresses this obligation succinctly: ‘It is the **duty of a bishop** to judge, to interpret, **to consecrate, to ordain**, to offer sacrifice, to baptize and to confirm.’”

Yes, a Catholic bishop has this duty and right, not a non-Catholic one, as Cekada admits elsewhere in his article. That rules out Bishops Lefebvre and Thuc, because neither they nor their flocks are Catholic. By implying they were Catholic, Cekada sins by omission and shares in the guilt of Lefebvre and Thuc’s notorious crimes by not condemning them or their crimes.

Also, Bishop Lefebvre did not recognize the emergency situation. He never denounced John Paul II as a non-Catholic apostate, heretic and antipope. He lived and died believing John Paul II was the legitimate Roman Pontiff and the bishops under him were legitimate Roman Catholic bishops with ordinary jurisdiction. Therefore, Lefebvre acts of consecrating bishops and ordaining priests without the approval of John Paul II cannot be justified by *Epikeia* (an exemption from the law) or for any reason, because he had easy access to what he believed were proper Church authorities. As a matter of fact, the man he believed was the pope, John Paul II, explicitly forbade him to consecrate bishops and ordain priest, and he did nevertheless. That is a bold act of schism at all times and all places. A Catholic bishop under emergency conditions can legally make priests and bishops without the knowledge or direct approval of a pope, but never, never, never can a bishop legally consecrate bishops or ordain priests contrary to the expressed will of the pope, or man he believes is the pope as was the case with Lefebvre.<sup>14</sup>

Also, as stated above, Bishop Thuc never abjured from his crimes of signing the Vatican II documents. In 1982, he made a deficient declaration, not an abjuration. Beware of those who dishonestly say it was an abjuration.<sup>15</sup>

### ***Cekada discredits others by appealing to his “great” intellect***

“*Woe to you that are wise in your own eyes, and prudent in your own conceits.*” (Isa. 5:21) Fr. Cekada is a typical pseudo-intellect of the type that accused Jesus, St. Peter, and St. John of being uneducated and thus not capable of grasping the deep truths that only they could.

“Now, about the midst of the feast, Jesus went up into the temple and taught. And the Jews wondered, saying: How doth this man know letters, having never learned?” (Jn. 7:14-15) “And Annas the high priest and Caiphas and John and Alexander: and as many as were of the kindred

---

<sup>14</sup> See my book *Strange Voices*, Book Two, “SSPX cannot be justified by Epikeia” and my *Refutation And Condemnation Of Catholic Apologetics*, Part Two, “Lefebvre was no St. Athanasius.”

<sup>15</sup> See my book *Against the Thucites*, “3) Bishop Thuc did not abjure his apostate and heretical errors.”

of the high priest... Now seeing the constancy of Peter and of John, understanding that they were illiterate and ignorant men, they wondered: and they knew them that they had been with Jesus.” (Acts 4: 6, 13)

To pseudo-intellects, knowledge and educational degrees are the sole guides as to who does and does not have the truth, regardless if they are accompanied with true wisdom.

TPLS: “I decided to return to the topic because several new home-aloner tracts have appeared over the past few years, the most recent claiming that traditionalist clergy violate not merely *canon* law, but *divine* law.

“Now, making credible arguments based on such concepts requires a fairly high degree of specialized knowledge in moral theology, canon law, sacramental law, and dogmatic theology. Ordinarily this can only be acquired by taking formal courses in these disciplines at a Catholic seminary or university, and then augmenting this basic knowledge through comparative study of major canonical and theological works, all of which are in Latin. (Some are listed in the bibliography below.)

“No home-aloners I know of have this background...”

Actually, neither does Fr. Cekada qualify for all the conditions he sets out above, which makes him a hypocrite also. If it were true that who ever has the most hard knowledge and educational degrees and titles has the truth, then John Paul II greatly excels Fr. Cekada, because he has more knowledge, more education, more degrees, more titles, and knows more languages than Cekada, sixteen including Latin. Therefore, according to Cekada’s standards, John Paul II is to be trusted more to know and tell the truth than he. Many in the Vatican II Church have more knowledge, education, degrees, and titles than Cekada, and Satan has more hard knowledge than all of them combined. So, Cekada discredits himself, as do all pseudo-intellects, because of their Luciferian, arrogant, pride.

Not all the books one needs to learn from are in Latin. There are English ones also. Just because a book is in Latin is no guarantee that it is a good book. There are many, many, many bad books with imprimaturs in Latin, English, and the other languages, especially those of the modern theologians from the 19<sup>th</sup> century onward. I do not know Latin; yet, God provides me with the information I need in English, as all my writings prove. Again, God is using the weak, those without formal theological education, degrees, and titles, to smite the proud just as He used St. Peter and St. John, poor and ignorant by the standards of men; even Jesus confounded them because He had no formal theological education, degrees, and titles.

“But the foolish things of the world hath God chosen, that he may confound the wise: and the weak things of the world hath God chosen, that he may confound the strong. And the base things of the world and the things that are contemptible, hath God chosen: and things that are not, that he might bring to nought things that are: That no flesh should glory in his sight.” (1 Cor. 1:27-29)

Lastly, jurisdictional Pharisees like Patrick Henry are ignorant of the true meaning of the canon laws, not because they do not know Latin or have formal theological training—they know what the canons teach and have enough commentaries in English to know the true meaning, of which common sense and good will alone could guide them—but because they have no true wisdom. They take out of context what they read, purposely omit things, and all because they do not have the humility to admit when they are wrong. Pride, not education, is the root of the problem. My *Epikieia Debate* with Patrick Henry, in 2000, proves this. He had the information he needed but refused to accept it.

There are other errors in Fr. Cekada's article regarding the divine law and the reasons why one can be freed from the letter of ecclesiastical laws in emergency situations, which I will only briefly mention here, as it does not concern the main topics of this article.

He erroneously implies that there can be no exemptions from divine laws. One can be exempted from the letter of divine laws that do not deal with faith or morals.<sup>16</sup>

*The History, Nature, & Use of Epikeia*: "Henno. The theologian asserts unhesitatingly that the use of epikeia in reference to divine law is lawful ... It is the contention of Viva that epikeia... may be used in reference to the divine law."<sup>17</sup>

He erroneously teaches that Catholic bishops and priests are free from the letter of ecclesiastical laws in emergency situations because it ceases to bind, instead of the true reason, which is because they are exempted from the law, much like a dispensation, while the law continues to bind those who can keep it.

RJMI, *Strange Voices, Book Two*, "Epikeia Applies to Invalidating Laws": "Those who held the minority opinion, that denied the use of epikeia for human invalidating laws, did not deny that a subject can be freed from the obligation of obeying the letter of the law in extraordinary situations, but justified their opinions in different ways. They taught that the subject was not bound to human invalidating laws in extraordinary circumstances, not because of an exemption due to **epikeia**, but because the law **ceased** to bind in a particular case, or is **suspended**, or the law is **interdicted**."

This is a valid point of contention among theologians. The worst among the Jurisdictional Pharisees believe that no one can be exempted from the letter of laws that do not deal with faith or morals for any reason. In my debates with and refutation of Patrick Henry, he was among these worst of the Jurisdiction Pharisees. He eventually admitted that exemptions for the letter of the law would apply to the election of the next pope, something he previously denied. He is still a Jurisdictional Pharisee on many other points. See my article *Patrick Henry is a Schismatic and Heretic*.

Taken from Exurge Michael, Issue 23, February 2004.

---

<sup>16</sup> See my book *Strange Voices*, Book Two, "God Foresees Exceptions: Epikeia and Divine Laws" and my article *Epikeia Controversy...*, "Patrick Henry's errors regarding Epikeia: 2) Epikeia Does not Apply to Any Divine Laws."

<sup>17</sup> *The History, Nature, & Use of Epikeia in Moral Theology*, Fr. Lawrence Joseph Riley, A.B. S.T.L., Imprimatur +Ricardus Jacobus Cushing D.D., May 7, 1948, The Catholic University of America Press, pp. 299, 301.