

Eighth Sunday after Pentecost

Dominica Octava post Pentecosten — II classis — *Missale Romanum*, editio typica 1962, printed pages 387–388

Latin collated against the Vatican typical edition; English quoted from an identified 1861 witness. Not a liturgical book.

Proper	TLM text / reference	Scriptural axis	Connection
Introit (<i>Int.</i>)	<i>Suscépi-mus, Deus, misericórdiam tuam (Ps. 47, 10-11; verse Ps. ibid., 2)</i>	Zion hymn; mercy received inside the sanctuary	Opens with something already received, before anything is asked. The same antiphon opens the Purification (2 February), where the temple is literal.
Collect (<i>Coll.</i>)	<i>Largíre nobis, quásumus, Dómine</i>	Composed oration; no direct citation	One gift in two motions, thinking and doing what is right, grounded in a confessed inability to exist without God.
Epistle (<i>Ep.</i>)	<i>Fratres: Debitóres sumus non carni (Rom. 8, 12-17)</i>	Life in the Spirit; adoption; inheritance	Names the debt owed, then the status that makes it payable: sons, therefore heirs. The lection stops inside verse 17.
Gradual (<i>Grad.</i>)	<i>Esto mihi in Deum protectórem (Ps. 30, 3; verse Ps. 70, 1)</i>	Two psalms of refuge; twin openings	Answers the Epistle from below: the heir is still a fugitive asking shelter. The two psalms quoted nearly duplicate each other.
Alleluia (<i>All.</i>)	<i>Magnus Dóminus, et laudábilis valde (Ps. 47, 2)</i>	Greatness of God in his city	Returns to the Introit's psalm and city under the Alleluia — and, as printed, in a different Latin form.
Gospel (<i>Gosp.</i>)	<i>Homo quidam erat dives, qui habébat villicum (Luc. 16, 1-9)</i>	Parable of the dismissed steward	An audited manager buys shelter with goods never his. The lection stops at <i>aéterna tabernácula</i> , before the sayings that qualify it.
Offertory (<i>Off.</i>)	<i>Pópulum húmílem salvum fácies (Ps. 17, 28 et 32)</i>	Royal thanksgiving; the low saved, the high brought down	Carries the gifts up on the one disposition the steward lacked, and ends asking who God is — which the Epistle has just answered.
Secret (<i>Sec.</i>)	<i>Súscipe, quásumus, Dómine, múnera</i>	Composed oration; no direct citation	Says aloud that what is offered was first given; asks the mysteries to work on conduct now and joy afterwards.
Communion (<i>Comm.</i>)	<i>Gustáte et vidéte (Ps. 33, 9)</i>	Thanksgiving of the delivered poor man	The day's one scriptural proper whose Latin agrees word for word with the Clementine psalter. Knowledge here is by tasting.
Postcommunion (<i>Postcomm.</i>)	<i>Sit nobis, Dómine, reparátio mentis et córporis</i>	Composed oration; no direct citation	Asks that the rite just performed be felt in its effect; the shortest oration, and the only one naming body as well as mind.

The book also prints inside this formulary **Credo** after the Gospel and **Præfatio de Ssma Trinitate** after the Secret. No Tract, sequence, commemoration, second oration, or seasonal variant is appointed here.

Sense	Synthesis
Literal	A dismissed estate manager, ordered to produce his accounts, discounts his master's debtors' bills so that they will house him; the master commends the shrewdness, and Christ draws a lesson about using money to make friends against the day it fails. Around that reading the Mass sets Paul's claim that those led by the Spirit are sons and heirs, and psalm verses of received mercy, refuge, humility, and tasting.
Allegorical	The audited steward is the creature holding what is not his own; the reckoning is judgment. Augustine reads the Offertory's "who is God but the Lord?" as the sons possessing God himself as "the hoped-for inheritance" (<i>Enarr. in Ps. 17.32</i>) — the Epistle's <i>herédes quidem Dei</i> .
Moral	Everything in hand is administered, not owned, and the audit is already announced. The Collect therefore asks not for one right act but for a standing <i>spíritus cogitándi et agéndi</i> ; the Offertory supplies the posture, humility, that the steward never reaches.
Anagogical	The Gospel's <i>aéterna tabernácula</i> and the Secret's <i>gáudia sempitérna</i> name the same end; the Postcommunion asks that its effect be felt already, and the Communion's <i>gustáte</i> gives the mode — the end is tasted before it is seen.

1 Scriptural Date and Location

Seven passages are directly appointed; the composed orations quote none of Scripture directly and are not inventoried. Psalm numbers follow the missal's Vulgate reckoning, with the modern number in parentheses.

Proper	Citation	Location	Date
Grad. v.; Off.	Ps. 17 (18), 28 and 32	Israel; royal thanksgiving in the mouth of David after deliverance	Setting claimed: united monarchy, c. 1000 BC
The title assigns the psalm to David “in the day that the Lord delivered him . . . from the hand of Saul”; the same canticle stands again at 2 Kings (2 Samuel) 22 with the same occasion clause, a doublet observable in the text itself. Modern study fixes no author, date, or place of writing. Verse 28 turns from rescue to a rule about the low and the high; verse 32 denies any other God.			
Grad. resp.	Ps. 30 (31), 3	Israel; an individual under threat, no place named	Setting claimed: Davidic; composition undated
The Vulgate title reads only <i>In finem. Psalmus David, pro exstasi</i> , which Augustine took as a transport of mind, not a place or occasion. No event, city, or reign is named, so historical placement is unavailable; only the literary situation is, a speaker encircled and asking to be hidden.			
Comm.	Ps. 33 (34), 9	Israel; Philistine Geth, in the title's setting	Setting claimed: David's flight from Saul, c. 1000 BC
The Latin title places the psalm “when he changed his countenance before Achimelech.” The narrative pointed to, 1 Kings (1 Samuel) 21:10–15, names the king of Geth <i>Achis</i> ; title and narrative disagree, and the disagreement is old enough that Augustine expounds the psalm using <i>Achis</i> . It is an alphabetic thanksgiving with no further anchor.			
Int.; All.	Ps. 47 (48), 2 and 10–11	Jerusalem: Mount Zion and the temple precinct	Setting claimed: monarchic Jerusalem; composition undated
A Korahite Zion song — the title assigns it to “the sons of Core,” the temple singers' guild — whose horizon is one city and one mountain, with the kings of the earth troubled before them. It is the only appointed psalm whose place is unambiguous and the only one naming a temple: verse 10 speaks from inside that sanctuary, verse 11 carries the praise to the ends of the earth. No reign or festival is securely identifiable behind it.			
Grad. v.	Ps. 70 (71), 1	Israel; an old man's prayer, no place named	Claimed by the Latin title: the Rechabites and the first exiles
The Hebrew psalm has no title; the Greek and Latin supply one — “of the sons of Jonadab, and of the first captives” — pointing to the family praised for obedience in Jeremiah 35 and to the deportations of 597 BC. That is an inherited liturgical ascription, not a datable authorship claim. The speaker is aged; verses 1–3 repeat Psalm 30:2–4 almost word for word.			
Gosp.	Luc. 16, 1–9	<i>Composition:</i> a Greek-writing author, for Theophilus and a largely Gentile readership; place disputed	<i>Composition:</i> commonly c. AD 62–90
<i>Narrated event</i>	<i>Lk 16:1, with 15:1–2 and 16:14</i>	<i>On the journey to Jerusalem (Lk 9:51–19:44); no town named; Pharisees within earshot</i>	<i>c. AD 28–33; day and season unstated</i>
Tradition names Luke, physician and companion of Paul; the attribution is early and uncontested in antiquity. Modern judgment divides over whether the author travelled with Paul, and over dating before Paul's death, after AD 70, or later; Antioch, Achaia, Ephesus, and Rome are each proposed as the place of writing, none established. The narrated setting is firmer in shape than in coordinates: the parable falls inside Luke's travel narrative, follows three parables spoken against complaining Pharisees, and is overheard by the covetous Pharisees of 16:14.			
Ep.	Rom. 8, 12–17	<i>Writer:</i> Corinth or Cenchreae; <i>recipients:</i> the Christians at Rome	<i>Composition:</i> c. AD 56–58
Pauline authorship is not seriously contested. The letter places its own writing at the close of the Aegean mission, the collection gathered and Spain still intended (15:22–28); Phoebe of Cenchreae carries it and Gaius of Corinth hosts the writer (16:1, 16:23), which is why Corinth is the standard identification. Paul writes to a church he did not found and had not seen; the appointed verses report no event.			

2 The Propers: Themes and Movement

Governing thesis

This Mass is built on one grammatical move: from what has been *received* to what must now be *administered*. It opens by announcing a gift already taken up, names the debt that gift creates, then reads the Church a parable in which a man who administered what was never his is called to account — and it lets the parable’s scandal stand, unglossed, in the last words before the Creed.

1. **Received.** (*Int.*) Mercy is “taken up” (*suscépi-mus*) inside the sanctuary, in the perfect tense, before the Mass asks for anything at all.
2. **Owed.** (*Coll., Ep.*) A debt is named — and named negatively, “not to the flesh” — and the debtor is told what he is: son, therefore heir.
3. **Audited.** (*Grad., All., Gosp.*) The heir turns out also to be a steward with an accounting due. The chants ask for shelter before the summons is even read out.
4. **Administered.** (*Off., Sec., Comm., Postcomm.*) What was received goes back up in the one posture the steward never reached, and returns as something tasted.

1. The opening act is a receipt, not a request (*Int., Coll.*)

The Introit’s verb governs the day. *Suscépi-mus* is perfect and plural: the congregation reports a completed reception before it petitions. What was received is *misericórdiam tuam*, and the place of reception is *in médio templi tui*. The antiphon then does something unusual for an entrance chant: instead of asking, it measures — *secúndum nomen tuum, Deus, ita et laus tua in fines terræ* — so that the praise owed is calibrated to the name possessed, and the reach of the praise is the whole earth. The identical antiphon, with the identical psalm verse, opens the Purification on 2 February (printed p. 467), where the “midst of thy temple” is the literal Jerusalem sanctuary into which the Child is carried. On this Sunday the same words are sung with no narrative to anchor them, and the temple becomes the place where the Mass is being said.

Only after that receipt does the Collect ask, and what it asks for is a habit rather than an outcome: *semper spíritum cogitándi quæ recta sunt . . . et agéndi*. Two gerunds, one *spíritum*, and the adverb *propítius* planted between them. The petition’s ground is a confession: *qui sine te esse non pòssumus* — we cannot so much as *be* without you. The Collect therefore concedes at the outset the point the Gospel’s steward will discover under audit, that nothing in hand is self-supplied.

2. The Epistle names the debt and confers the status (*Ep.*)

Paul’s opening is a negation with a missing positive: *Debitóres sumus non carni*. He says what the debt is not, and does not say what it is. Chrysostom, preaching on exactly these verses, supplies it in one stroke — “we are debtors to the Spirit” — and draws the reason from the direction of the transaction: what God has done for us “is not matter of debt, but of mere grace,” but “after this, what we do is no longer matter of free-will offering, but of debt.”¹ The Mass has just sung a receipt; the Epistle turns the receipt into an obligation.

The obligation, however, is not laid on a servant. The passage moves deliberately from leading (*spíritu Dei agúntur*) to sonship (*filii Dei*) to the negative contrast (*non . . . spíritum servitútis*) to the cry *Abba (Pater)* and finally to inheritance: *herédes quidem Dei, coherédes autem Christi*. Two features of the printed lection are worth noticing at once, because the rest of the Mass depends on them. First, the appointed text stops *inside* verse 17, at *coherédes autem Christi*, so the condition Paul immediately attaches — “if so be that we suffer with him” — is not read. Second, the inheritance named here is not a thing but a person: Aquinas, expounding this very verse, defines an heir as one who receives the principal goods, and then observes that “the principal good by which God is rich is God himself.”² The Offertory will ask, three chants later, “who is God besides thee, O Lord?”

¹John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistle to the Romans*, Homily XIV (on Rom. 8:12–13), NPNF 1st ser. vol. 11.

²Thomas Aquinas, *Super Epistolam ad Romanos*, cap. 8, lect. 3.

3. The chants hold the interval open (*Grad., All.*)

Between the conferring of the inheritance and the reading of the audit, the Mass places two chants that refuse to move forward. The Gradual asks for a protector and a place of refuge; its verse asks not to be confounded *in ætérnum*. The two psalms it draws on, 30 and 70, are near duplicates of one another at exactly these verses — Psalm 70:1–3 repeats Psalm 30:2–4 almost word for word — so the Gradual is not moving from one witness to a second but saying the same thing twice, more slowly.

The Alleluia then returns to the Introit’s psalm and to its city. Structurally this is the Mass’s one full return: the congregation is put back where it began, in *civitate Dei nostri*, but now under the Alleluia and with the greatness of God rather than the mercy received as the object. The formulary’s shape at this point is a circle, not a line, and the Gospel breaks it.

4. The audit, and the scandal the book leaves standing (*Gosp.*)

Luke 16:1–9 is the hardest text in the temporal cycle to preach and the Mass does nothing to soften it. A steward is denounced, told to produce his accounts, and dismissed in advance; he cannot dig and will not beg; he discounts his master’s debtors’ bills to buy their hospitality; and *laudávit dñm villicum iniquitátis, quia prudénter fecisset*. The lection then closes on the sentence that has divided commentators since the second century: make friends of the *mammóna iniquitátis*, so that when you fail they may receive you into everlasting dwellings. Immediately after that sentence the book prints **Credo**.

Two boundaries do interpretive work here, and both are the missal’s, not the evangelist’s. The pericope begins at verse 1, so the parable arrives detached from the three parables of the lost that precede it in Luke 15 and from the crowd of publicans and sinners drawn there. And it ends at verse 9, so the qualifying sayings of verses 10–13 — fidelity in little, the unjust mammon, and finally *non potéstis Deo servíre et mammonæ* — are not read. What the congregation hears is the commendation and the counsel, without the warning that follows them. The detailed commentary takes up what the tradition has made of that, and where it has failed to agree.

5. The return: humility, offering, and a tasted end (*Off., Sec., Comm., Postcomm.*)

The Offertory answers the Gospel directly, and by contrast. The steward’s whole problem was that he could not accept a lower place — *fódere non váleo, mendicáre erubéscó* — and the Offertory sings that God saves *pópulum húmílem* and brings down *óculos superbórum*. It then ends on a question, *quóniam quis Deus præter te, Dómine?*, which is the Epistle’s inheritance turned back into an interrogative. Augustine, on this verse, answers it in terms the Epistle would recognise: God is the one “whom after good service we sons shall possess as the hoped-for inheritance.”³

The Secret then says aloud what the Introit assumed: the gifts brought are *de tua largitáte* — they were his first. It asks two things of the mysteries, in two tenses: that they sanctify *præséntis vitæ . . . conversatióne*, conduct in this present life, and that they lead to *gáudia sempitérna*. That pairing — present administration, permanent dwelling — is the Gospel’s own pairing, with the fraud removed.

The Communion supplies the mode of knowing. *Gustáte et vidéte* puts tasting before seeing, and the Postcommunion completes the circuit by asking that “of the rite we perform, we may feel the effect” — *cuius exséquimur cultum, sentiámus efféctum*. The Mass that opened with something already received closes by asking that the reception be perceptible. Nothing in the formulary asks for more possessions; everything in it asks for a different relation to what is held.

Two limits govern all of this. The synthesis above reads an *arrangement* whose author is unknown: the evidence for every connection claimed here is the printed order of the book, and no source consulted states why these particular texts were put together. And “the appointed text” is not simply “the Bible” — six of the seven appointed scriptural passages diverge from the Clementine Vulgate somewhere, and Psalm 47:2 is printed twice in this one formulary in two different Latin forms. The commentary sets out each divergence and resolves none of them.

³Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 17.32 (NPNF numbers it as Ps. 18); English NPNF 1st ser. vol. 8.

3 The Propers: Detailed Commentary

3.1 The formulary as the book prints it

Identity, rank, and boundaries

The heading is *DOMINICA OCTAVA post Pentecosten*; beneath it the book prints *II classis*. The formulary occupies printed pages 387–388 of the 1962 Vatican typical edition and carries the missal’s own marginal numbers 1512 to 1521. It begins immediately below the Postcommunion of the Seventh Sunday (no. 1511) and ends immediately above the heading *DOMINICA NONA post Pentecosten*. Ten elements are appointed, together with two directions — **Credo** after the Gospel, **Præfatio de Sma Trinitate** after the Secret — and nothing else: no Tract, no sequence, no commemoration, no second oration, no seasonal substitution, no alternate conclusion.

The rank is not an inference from the formulary. The missal’s own *Rubricæ generales*, printed at page XII of the front matter, state at n. 10 that Sundays are of the first or second class, list the first-class Sundays at n. 11 (Advent, Lent, Passiontide, Easter, Low Sunday, Pentecost), and conclude at n. 12: *Omnes aliæ dominicæ sunt II classis*. Number 16 then fixes what that rank does in occurrence — a second-class Sunday is preferred to second-class feasts — with two stated exceptions: a first- or second-class feast of the Lord falling on a second-class Sunday takes the Sunday’s place with all its rights and privileges and no commemoration of the Sunday is made; and a second-class Sunday is preferred to the Commemoration of All the Faithful Departed. Number 14 adds that the Office and Mass of an impeded Sunday are neither anticipated nor resumed. This Sunday is therefore ordinarily celebrated, and when a feast of the Lord displaces it, the whole formulary is simply lost for that year.

Where it stands in the temporal cycle

The Sundays after Pentecost read Romans semi-continuously and then leave it. In the 1962 book the Sixth Sunday has Rom 6:3–11, the Seventh Rom 6:19–23, the Eighth Rom 8:12–17, and the Ninth turns to 1 Cor 10:6–13. The Eighth Sunday is thus the last Roman epistle of the series.

One feature of that arrangement repays attention, because it is verifiable in the book and easily missed. The *Fourth* Sunday after Pentecost, printed p. 382, has as its Epistle Rom 8:18–23. The later passage is read on the earlier Sunday, and the earlier passage four Sundays afterwards. Between the two lections falls exactly one clause: the second half of Rom 8:17, *si tamen compatimur, ut et conglorificemur* — “yet so, if we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified with him.” The Eighth Sunday stops just before it; the Fourth Sunday starts just after it. Whatever the historical explanation, a reader who hears both Sundays in one year hears the whole of Rom 8:12–23 with only that condition unread — and the condition is precisely the hinge on which Aquinas hangs his commentary on the verse.

3.2 Introit: mercy taken up inside the temple (*Int.*)

Ant. ad Introitum — no. 1512 — Ps. 47, 10-11

Suscépiamus, Deus, misericórdiam tuam in médio templi tui: secúndum nomen tuum, Deus, ita et laus tua in fines terræ: iustítia plena est dextera tua. Ps. ibid., 2 Magnus Dóminus, et laudábilis nimis: in civitáte Dei nostri, in monte sancto eius. V. Glória Patri.

English (1861 witness). “We have received thy mercy, O God, in the midst of thy temple: According to thy name, so also is thy praise unto the ends of the earth : thy right hand is full of justice. *Ps.* Great is the Lord, and exceedingly to be praised ; in the city of our God, on his holy mountain. *V.* Glory.”

Psalm 47 is a Zion song of the Korahite guild. Its argument is that the city God has founded cannot be shaken: the kings of the earth assemble, see, and are troubled; what had been heard is now seen; and the city is to be walked round and its towers told, so that another generation may be informed. Verses 10–11, which the Introit takes, come at the point where the psalm turns from the routed kings inward, to the sanctuary.

Three things in the antiphon are worth pressing.

First, the tense. *Suscépinus* is perfect: the Mass opens by reporting something already done. An entrance chant that petitions is ordinary; one that issues a receipt is not. Everything the formulary later asks for is asked by a congregation that has already said it holds something.

Second, the measure. *Secúndum nomen tuum, Deus, ita et laus tua in fines terræ* sets praise proportional to name and then extends the proportion to the ends of the earth. Augustine, expounding this verse, uses precisely the extension as an argument: against those who claim that God’s praise survives only in their own small party, “according to Your Name, O God, so is Your praise, not in a part, but unto the ends of the earth.”⁴ The claim is anti-sectarian: universality is the proof.

Third, the place. *In médio templi tui*. The identical antiphon, with the identical psalm verse and the same reference, is printed at no. 2107 for the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary on 2 February (printed p. 467), where the words have a literal referent — the child carried into the Jerusalem sanctuary. On the Eighth Sunday the same words are sung with no narrative attached, and the only temple available is the building the congregation is standing in.

A caution about citing Augustine here

Augustine’s exposition of Psalm 47:10 cannot be quoted as commentary on the Introit *as sung*, because his Latin text is different. His lemma reads *in medio populi tui* — “in the midst of thy people” — and his whole exegesis depends on it: he asks how a people can receive mercy in the midst of itself, answers that not all who carry the sacraments belong to the mercy, and develops the threshing-floor on which wheat and chaff both belong to the floor but not both to the barn.⁵ None of that transfers to *templi*. What does transfer, because it does not depend on the variant, is where the section ends: “He came unto His own, and His own received Him not, yet, in the midst of them, as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God.” Augustine closes his comment on the Introit’s psalm verse on John 1:12 — and the Epistle that follows the Introit is about becoming sons of God. That convergence is real; its textual warrant is the psalm, not the antiphon.

On the psalm’s opening verse, which returns as the Alleluia, Augustine reads the “city” and the “holy mountain” as one thing, the Church, and reaches it through Daniel 2:35: the stone cut without hands grew until it filled the whole face of the earth, “and by filling the whole face of the earth, that mountain came to us. Why then seek we the mountain as though absent, and not as being present ascend to it?”⁶ The mountain is not travelled to; it has arrived.

3.3 Collect (*Coll.*)

Oratio — no. 1513

Largíre nobis, quæsumus, Dómine, semper spíritum cogitándi quæ recta sunt, propítius et agéndi: ut, qui sine te esse non póssumus, secúndum te vívere valeámus. Per Dóminum.

English (1861 witness). “Grant us, O Lord, we beseech thee, the spirit of thinking and doing what is right, that we, who cannot even subsist without thee, may live according to thee. Thro’.”

The oration is composed, not scriptural, and it quotes nothing. Its structure is a single request with an unusual internal joint. *Spíritum cogitándi . . . et agéndi* is one gift governing two gerunds, thinking and doing; and *propítius* — “mercifully,” modifying God’s granting — is planted between them, so that the mercy of the giving is heard exactly at the seam between intention and act. The 1861 English witness quietly drops the adverb; readers of that translation lose the joint.

The petition’s ground is a confession of a very strong kind: not that we cannot act well without God, but that we cannot *be* — *qui sine te esse non póssumus*. The conclusion is correspondingly modest: *secúndum te vívere valeámus*, that we may have strength to live according to you. The Mass has just said it received mercy; the Collect says it cannot even exist unaided; the Gospel will show a man discovering the same thing under audit.

⁴Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 47.9 (New Advent numbers the exposition as Ps. 48). NPNF 1st ser. vol. 8; checked 2026-07-25.

⁵*Enarr. in Ps.* 47.8. The reading *in medio populi tui* governs the whole section.

⁶*Enarr. in Ps.* 47.2.

Two claim-boundaries should be marked here. The word *spírítum* is not demonstrably the Holy Spirit of the Epistle: the oration asks for “a spirit of thinking and doing,” a disposition. The juxtaposition with Rom 8:14 in the same Mass is a fact of the formulary and an invitation to the reader; it is not a documented compositional intention, and none is claimed. Likewise the oration’s shape resembles Phil 2:13, “it is God who worketh in you, both to will and to accomplish” — the verse Aquinas cites when explaining how the Spirit’s leading in Rom 8:14 leaves the will free.⁷ That is doctrinal illumination of the Collect’s logic, not evidence that the Collect quotes Philipians.

3.4 Epistle: Romans 8:12–17 (*Ep.*)

Léctio Epístolæ beáti Pauli Apóstoli ad Romános — no. 1514 — Rom. 8, 12-17

Fratres: Debitóres sumus non carni, ut secúndum carnem vivámus. Si enim secúndum carnem vixéritis, moriémini: si autem spírítu facta carnis mortificavéritis, vivétis. Quicúmque enim spírítu Dei agúntur, ii sunt fílii Dei. Non enim accepístis spírítum servitútis íterum in timóre, sed accepístis spírítum adoptiónis filiórú, in quo clamámus: Abba (Pater). Ipse enim Spírítus testimónium reddit spírítui nostro, quod sumus fílii Dei. Si autem fílii, et herédes: herédes quídem Dei, coherédes autem Christi.

English (1861 witness). “Brethren: We are debtors, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh. . . . For whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God. For you have not received the spirit of bondage again in fear: but you have received the spirit of adoption of sons, whereby we cry: Abba, (Father.) For the Spirit himself giveth testimony to our spirit, that we are the sons of God. And if sons, heirs also: heirs indeed of God, and joint heirs with Christ.”

The complete context

Romans 8 opens with “no condemnation” for those in Christ and closes with the declaration that nothing can separate us from the love of God. Between them Paul argues that the Spirit who raised Christ dwells in the believer and will quicken his mortal body (8:9–11); the appointed verses draw the consequence. The chapter is the answer to chapter 7, where the will that approves the good does not perform it. Verse 18 onward — read on the Fourth Sunday — turns to the sufferings of the present time and the groaning of creation.

A debt with the creditor unnamed

Debitóres sumus non carni. Paul says whose debtors we are *not*, and does not say whose we are. Chrysostom, preaching on exactly these verses, treats the omission as deliberate and supplies the missing term: “But this is not what he says, for he words it in a much more striking and powerful way, thus, we are debtors to the Spirit. For saying, we are debtors not to the flesh, indicates this.” He then states the reason the debt runs only one way: “what God has done for us is not matter of debt, but of mere grace. But after this, what we do is no longer matter of free-will offering, but of debt.”⁸ He also guards the flesh itself against a Manichaean reading: what Paul abrogates is not the body’s service but living *according to it* — “it must be the follower, not the leader.”

Aquinas reaches the same conclusion by a different route, drawing it as a corollary from the preceding verses: *ergo debitores sumus spírítui sancto propter beneficia ab eo recepta, ut vivamus secúndum spírítum et non secúndum carnem.*⁹ Both readings turn on the same observation: a Mass that begins *suscépi-mus* has already fixed the direction of the transaction.

⁷Thomas Aquinas, *Super Epistolam ad Romanos*, cap. 8, lect. 3: *non tamen per hoc excluditur quin viri spirituales per voluntatem et liberum arbitrium operentur, quia ipsum motum voluntatis et liberi arbitrii spiritus sanctus in eis causat*, citing Phil 2:13. Latin checked at Corpus Thomisticum, 2026-07-25.

⁸John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistle to the Romans*, Homily XIV, which opens on Rom 8:12–13. NPNF 1st ser. vol. 11; checked 2026-07-25.

⁹*Super Rom.*, cap. 8, lect. 2, on *ergo debitores*. Corpus Thomisticum divides the chapter so that vv. 12–13 close lect. 2 and vv. 14–17 form lect. 3.

Adoption, and a word said twice

Paul's contrast is not bondage against freedom but bondage against *sonship*. Chrysostom notices the substitution: "not staying to mention that which stands in contradistinction to bondage, that is, the spirit of freedom, he has named what is far greater, that of adoption, through which he at the same time brings in the other." What the "spirit of bondage" was he answers historically — the letter of the Law, since the people of the Jews "did not receive the Spirit" — and he identifies the cry *Abba* as Hebrew and as the initiate's word: "how great this is, the initiated know, being with good reason bidden to use this word first in the Prayer of the initiated." For Chrysostom the verse is a liturgical fact before it is a doctrine: it is the Our Father in the mouth of the newly baptized.

Why the word is given twice, in two languages, has a long and stable answer. Augustine: "God's children, however, exclaim, *Abba*, Father, — one of which words they of the circumcision utter; the other, they of the uncircumcision, — the Jew first, and then the Greek; since there is one God, which justifies the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith."¹⁰ Aquinas repeats the move almost verbatim eight centuries later: *et ideo duo ponit idem significantia, scilicet abba, quod est Hebraeum, et pater, quod est Latinum vel Graecum, ut ostendat hoc ad utrumque populum pertinere.*¹¹ He adds an observation about the verb: *clamamus* is not loudness but intensity — *hoc autem dicimus non tantum sono vocis, quantum intentione cordis* — and cites the Lord's word to a silent Moses, "Why criest thou to me?"

Heirs of a Father who does not die

Heredes quidem Dei. Aquinas begins from the Roman-law sense: an heir is one who receives the *principal* goods, not one given a few presents, and he illustrates the difference from Genesis 25:5, where Abraham gave all he had to Isaac and mere gifts to the sons of the concubines. Then the identification: *bonum autem principale quo Deus dives est, est ipsemet* — the principal good by which God is rich is God himself; therefore *ipsum Deum adipiscuntur filii Dei pro haereditate.*

He then raises the difficulty the term itself creates. An heir inherits only when the father dies, and God does not die. Aquinas gives two answers: spiritual goods, unlike temporal ones, can be held by many at once, so no one need die for the sons to inherit; and, more subtly, God "may be said to die to us in so far as he is in us by faith, and he will be our inheritance in so far as we shall see him face to face." In the *Summa* he makes the same reply and names his source — *sicut Glossa dicit, Rom. VIII, super illud, si filii, et heredes* — adding that the spiritual inheritance is received whole by all at once *sine detrimento patris semper viventis.*¹²

What *co-heir* adds is the last word of the appointed lection and the reason the lection can stop there: *cohaeredes autem Christi, quia ipse cum sit principalis filius a quo nos filiationem participamus, ita est principalis haeres, cui in haereditate coniungimur.* The inheritance is not divided with Christ; it is entered through him.

The clause the lection does not read

Immediately after *coheredes autem Christi*, Paul writes *si tamen compatimur, ut et conglorificemur*. The 1962 lection stops before it. Aquinas, who did not stop there, makes the clause the explanation of why glory is delayed at all: Christ, the principal heir, came to the inheritance of glory through his passion, *non autem nos faciliiori modo debemus haereditatem adipisci* — and we ought not to obtain the inheritance by an easier route. The congregation at this Mass hears the inheritance conferred and not the terms. That is an observation about the printed boundary, not a complaint about it; and the Fourth Sunday after Pentecost, which begins at verse 18, supplies the sequel from the same book.

¹⁰ Augustine, *De spiritu et littera* 32.56. NPNF 1st ser. vol. 5; checked 2026-07-25.

¹¹ *Super Rom.*, cap. 8, lect. 3.

¹² *ST* III q. 23 a. 1 ad 3; cf. *Super Rom.*, cap. 8, lect. 3. Corpus Thomisticum, checked 2026-07-25. The same question holds that adoption belongs to the rational creature "and not to every one, but only to him who has charity" (a. 3), that adopting is the work of the whole Trinity (a. 2), and that Christ, being the natural Son, can in no way be called an adopted son (a. 4).

3.5 Gradual and Alleluia (*Grad.*, *All.*)

Graduale — no. 1515 — Ps. 30, 3; verse Ps. 70, 1
<i>Esto mihi in Deum protectorem, et in locum refúgii, ut saluum me fácias. V. Ps. 70, 1 Deus, in te sperávi: Dómine, non confúndar in ætérnum.</i>
Alleluia — no. 1516 — V. Ps. 47, 2
<i>Allelúia, allelúia. V. Ps. 47, 2 Magnus Dóminus, et laudábilis valde: in civitáte Dei nostri, in monte sancto eius. Allelúia.</i>

English (1861 witness). Gradual: “Be thou unto me a God, a protector, and a place of refuge to save me. V. O God, on thee have I relied ; let me never, O Lord, be put to shame.” Alleluia: “V. Great is the Lord, and exceedingly to be praised in the city of our God, on his holy mountain. Alleluia. Alleluia.”

Two psalms that are one psalm twice

The Gradual’s responsory is referenced to Ps 30:3 and its verse to Ps 70:1. These are not two independent witnesses. Psalm 70:1–3 repeats Psalm 30:2–4 almost word for word: both open *in te, Domine, speravi; non confundar in aeternum*, both continue *inclina ad me aurem tuam*, and both then say *esto mihi in Deum protectorem . . . ut saluum me facias*. The Gradual therefore does something formally odd and pastorally exact: it says the same prayer twice, out of two psalms, at the moment when the congregation has just been told it is an heir and has not yet been told it is under audit.

A chant reading that belongs to neither psalm

The responsory, printed under the reference Ps 30:3, reads *et in locum refúgii*. The Clementine Psalm 30:3 reads *in domum refugii*; the Clementine Psalm 70:3 reads *in locum munitum*. The chant has the noun of the one and the genitive of the other. Nothing is emended here: the missal’s reading is printed as printed and the divergence recorded.

The verse likewise diverges. The Clementine Ps 70:1 reads *In te, Domine, speravi; non confundar in aeternum*; the Gradual reads *Deus, in te sperávi: Dómine, non confúndar in ætérnum*. That transposed form is *not* an invention of the chant books: it is the lemma Augustine expounds. “O God, in You I have hoped, O Lord, I shall not be confounded for everlasting. Already I have been confounded, but not for everlasting. . . . Confounded you are in Adam, withdraw from Adam, draw near unto Christ, and then you shall not be confounded.”¹³ He takes the two clauses as two times: shame now, in Adam, is admitted; the petition concerns only shame for ever.

Two sections later, on Ps 70:3, he turns the very noun the Gradual half-borrowed: “Behold, God Himself has become the place of your fleeing unto, who at first was the fearful object of your fleeing from.” The refuge and the thing fled are the same person. That is the most useful single sentence in the reception of this Gradual, and it should be noted that Augustine reaches it on Psalm 70, which is where the missal’s responsory got its *locum*.

On Psalm 30 itself Augustine assigns the speech: “first the Mediator Himself speaks: then the People redeemed by His Blood gives thanks”; and at verse 3 he glosses *esto mihi in Deum protectorem* by splitting it — “Be unto Me God, and Protector” — and reads the house of refuge as a house “wherein taking refuge I may be saved.”¹⁴ His text, again, is not the chant’s.

¹³Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. 70*, sermo 1, §3 (New Advent numbers it as Ps. 71). Checked 2026-07-25.

¹⁴*Enarr. in Ps. 30*, Enarratio I, §§1 and 3 (New Advent: Ps. 31). His lemma at v. 3 is *in domum refugii*, the Clementine reading, not the Gradual’s *in locum refugii*.

One verse, two Latin forms, in one Mass

The Alleluia verse and the Introit's psalm verse are both Psalm 47:2, and both carry that reference in the printed book. They do not agree. The Introit reads *laudábilis nimis*; the Alleluia reads *laudábilis valde*. The Clementine reading is *nimis*. The 1962 book prints both without a note, and the same split appears in the 1861 hand missal (printed p. 412), so the divergence is transmitted rather than a setting error in this edition. What this guide does *not* do is assign the two forms to named Latin psalters: that would require collation against psalter witnesses which was not undertaken here, and the question is left open in the research record.

Functionally, the effect is that the Mass returns to its own opening psalm at the highest point of the chant and returns to it in a different voice. The Introit sang the verse as the psalm of a receipt; the Alleluia sings it as sheer acclamation, drops *misericórdiam* altogether, and leaves the congregation standing in the city just before the Gospel takes it out into an estate office.

3.6 Gospel: the dismissed steward (*Gosp.*)

+ Sequéntia sancti Evangélíi secúndum Lucam — no. 1517 — Luc. 16, 1-9

In illo témpore: Dixit Iesus discíplulis suis parábolam hanc: Homo quidam erat dives, qui habébat villicum: et hic diffamátus est apud illum, quasi dissipásset bona ipsíus. Et vocávit illum, et ait illi: Quid hoc áudio de te? redde ratióne villicatiónis tuæ: iam enim non póteris villicáre. Ait autem villicus intra se: Quid fáciám, quia dóminus meus aufert a me villicatióne? fódere non váleo, mendicáre erubésco. Scio quid fáciám, ut, cum amótus fuero a villicatióne, recípiant me in domos suas. Convocátis itaque singulis debitoribus dómini sui, dicébat primo: Quantum debes dómino meo? At ille dixit: Centum cados olei. Dixitque illi: Accipe cautióne tuam: et sede cito, scribe quinquaginta. Deínde álíi dixit: Tu vero quantum debes? Qui ait: Centum coros trítici. Ait illi: Accipe líttas tuas, et scribe octoginta. Et laudávit dóminus villicum iniquitátis, quia prudénter fecísset: quia filíi huius sæculi prudentiôres filíis lucis in generatióne sua sunt. Et ego vobis dico: fácite vobis amícos de mam móna iniquitátis: ut, cum defeceritis, recípiant vos in æténa tabernácula.

What the story says before anyone interprets it

A *villicus* — Jerome notes that the Greek is *oikonomos*, a household manager, and that *villicus* properly means the man who runs a *villa* and takes his name from it — is denounced to his employer for squandering the estate. He is not tried. He is told to produce the accounts and informed that he is already finished: *iam enim non póteris villicáre*. His soliloquy admits two disqualifications, one physical and one social: *fódere non váleo, mendicáre erubésco*. He then summons the debtors individually, has each rewrite his own bond in his own hand — *accipe cautióne tuam ... scribe quinquaginta* — and reduces one debt by a half and the other by a fifth. The amounts are large: a hundred *cadi* of oil and a hundred *cori* of wheat are estate-scale obligations, not household loans. The haste is written into the text (*sede cito*), and so is the fact that the debtors, not the steward, do the writing. Then comes the sentence everything turns on: *et laudávit dóminus villicum iniquitátis, quia prudénter fecísset*.

Crux 1: who is the *dóminus* who commends?

The Latin *dóminus* in verse 8 is the same word used for the employer throughout. Augustine reads it as the employer and treats the praise as a datum, not an endorsement: the parable works *e contrario*, exactly like the unjust judge who is compared to God though “in no respect” comparable — *si laudari potuit ille a domino qui fraudem faciebat, quanto amplius placeant Deo qui secundum eius praeceptum opera illa faciunt*.¹⁵ Jerome sharpens the same reading by pressing who suffered the loss: *et passus dispendia Dominus, laudat dispensatoris prudentiam* — the master who praises is the master who was defrauded.¹⁶ On this reading the *a fortiori* is the whole point: if a cheated employer

¹⁵Augustine, *Quaestiones Evangeliorum* II.34, as transmitted verbatim in Thomas Aquinas, *Catena aurea in Lucam*, cap. 16, lect. 2 (Corpus Thomisticum, checked 2026-07-25).

¹⁶Jerome, *Epistola* 121 *ad Algasiam*, q. 6 (PL 22, coll. 1018–1021). Latin read in the *Patrologia Latina* text at Corpus Corporum, mlat.uzh.ch, 2026-07-25.

could admire foresight, how much more will Christ, “who can suffer no loss and is inclined to clemency,” commend disciples who are merciful.

Crux 2: was the fraud commended?

Here the tradition does not agree, and the disagreement is not a matter of emphasis.

Ambrose — the steward is not censured <i>Nec reprehenditur villicus, in quo discimus non ipsi esse domini, sed potius alienarum villici facultatum. Et ideo licet peccaverit, tamen quia sibi in posterum ex indulgentia domini quaesivit auxilia, praedicatur.</i> “The steward is not censured; from which we learn that we are not owners but rather managers of other men’s resources. And so, although he sinned, yet because he sought himself help for the future out of his master’s indulgence, he is commended.”^a ^aAmbrose, <i>Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam</i>, lib. VII, §245 (PL 15, col. 1764), read in the <i>Patrologia Latina</i> text at Corpus Corporum, 2026-07-25. Note the limit of the witness: at this point Ambrose comments on Luke 16 verses 13, 9 and 12, in that order, and passes over the narrative of the parable entirely. His treatment of v. 9 runs to a few sentences; he is not a verse-by-verse commentator on this pericope.
Augustine — you may not defraud God in order to give alms <i>Non tamen omnia debemus ad imitandum sumere; non enim domino nostro facienda est in aliquo fraus, ut de ipsa fraude eleemosynas faciamus.</i> “We ought not to take everything in it for imitation; for no fraud whatever is to be practised on our Lord, so that we may give alms out of the fraud itself.” In the sermon on this very verse he is blunter: some, “by a bad understanding of this, plunder the goods of others, and bestow some of that upon the poor ... This understanding of it must be corrected, yea, must be utterly effaced from the tablets of your heart. ... Give alms of your righteous labours. ... For you cannot corrupt Christ your Judge.”^a ^a<i>Quaest. Evang.</i> II.34, as in the <i>Catena aurea</i>, cap. 16, lect. 2; and <i>Sermo</i> 113 §§1–2 (NPNF, Sermon 63 on the New Testament), checked at New Advent 2026-07-25.

Jerome takes a third position, neither Ambrose’s nor exactly Augustine’s: he splits the single act in two and praises only one half. *Quod adversus Dominum quidem fraudulenter, sed pro se prudenter egerit* — “because towards his master he acted fraudulently, but for himself prudently.” The fraud is named as fraud and left standing as fraud; what is commended is the calculation.

A fourth position is preserved in the *Catena aurea* under the name of Origen, and it deflates the commendation altogether: *dominus laudavit villicum, quia prudenter egisset; hoc est callide et perperam. Et forsitan quod dixit laudavit, non secundum veram commendationem, sed abusive dictum est* — “the lord praised the steward because he had acted prudently, that is, cunningly and wrongly; and perhaps the word ‘praised’ was said not in the sense of true commendation but loosely.” The attribution needs care. Jerome, writing about this very parable, records that he searched for Origen’s and Didymus’s explanations of it and could not find them — *Origenis et Didymi in hanc parabolam explanationem invenire non potui* — and could not tell whether the works had perished or had never been written. The passage is therefore cited here as the *Catena*’s Origen, and not as Origen.

Crux 3: what makes the mammon “of iniquity”?

At least five answers are on record, and Aquinas, remarkably, stacks four of them in a single reply without choosing among them.

1. **Allurement.** Ambrose: *iniquum mammona dixit, quia variis divitiarum illecebris nostras avaritias tentat affectus, ut velimus servire divitiis* — riches are called unjust for what they do to the affections, not for how they were got.
2. **Provenance.** Jerome: *mammona autem, non Hebraeorum, sed Syrorum lingua, divitiae nuncupantur, quod de iniquitate collectae sint* — so called because gathered out of iniquity. This also contradicts Augustine on the language: Augustine says mammon is “a Hebrew word, and cognate to the Punic language,” where Jerome says it

is Syriac and not Hebrew. Chrysostom takes the same provenance line when he speaks of “the wealth unrighteously gathered.”

3. **Valuation.** Augustine: *non sunt istae divitiae nisi iniquis, qui in eis spem constituunt* — these are riches only to the wicked, who lodge their hope in them; to the just they are money, and their riches lie elsewhere. He offers a variant in the same sermon: all worldly riches whatever their source are misnamed riches, “for they are full of poverty, and always liable to accidents.”
4. **Inherited injustice.** Basil, as the *Catena* transmits him: *in pluribus enim praedecessoribus necesse est aliquem reperiri qui iniuste usurpaverit aliena* — among the many predecessors from whom an estate descends, someone must be found who seized what was another’s.
5. **Inequality.** Aquinas’s own: *vel omnes divitiae dicuntur iniquitatis, idest inaequalitatis, quia non aequaliter sunt omnibus distributae uno egente et alio superabundante* — riches are called *iniquitatis*, that is, *inaequalitatis*, because they are not equally distributed, one man being in need while another has more than enough.¹⁷

The practical question underneath — may alms be given out of ill-gotten goods? — Aquinas answers in the body of the same article with a threefold distinction. If what was wrongly acquired is owed back to the person it came from (robbery, theft, usury), restitution is due and no alms can be made of it. If it may not be kept but is not owed back, because both giving and taking were against divine law (simony), it *must* be given away in alms. If the acquisition itself was not unlawful and only its source was disgraceful — his example is *turpe lucrum*, a prostitute’s fee — it may be kept, and alms may be made of it. His *sed contra* is Augustine’s sermon: *de iustis laboribus facite eleemosynas*.

Crux 4: who receives, and into whose dwellings?

Recipient vos in aeterna tabernacula. The Latin does not say *whose* dwellings, and the tradition divides on the omission.

- **Angels and saints.** Ambrose: *ut largiendo pauperibus, Angelorum ceterorumque sanctorum gratiam comparemus* — by giving to the poor we procure the favour of the angels and the other saints.
- **The least of Christ’s.** Augustine: “who are they that shall have everlasting habitations, but the Saints of God? And who are they who are to be received by them . . . but they who serve their need?” He identifies the receivers with the *minimi* of Matthew 25, those who left all and followed; and he rules out one reading expressly — those who receive us are not to be understood as God’s own debtors.
- **Patrons, not beneficiaries.** Gregory: *si autem eorum amicitia aeterna tabernacula acquirimus, dantes pensare debemus quia patronis potius munera offerimus quam egenis dona largimur* — if we acquire eternal dwellings by their friendship, we who give must reckon that we are offering gifts to patrons rather than bestowing presents on the needy. The social direction of almsgiving is inverted.
- **Not the friends at all.** Chrysostom argues from the wording: *attende etiam, quod non dixit: ut suscipiant vos in suis mansionibus: non enim ipsi sunt qui suscipiunt* — observe that he did not say “into *their* dwellings”; it is not they who receive us, but our own work. He makes a parallel point elsewhere about the adjective: the text says not simply “tabernacles” but “*eternal* tabernacles.”¹⁸

Jerome adds a restriction that sits badly with Augustine’s practice. He concludes that we should make friends “not of any poor whatever, but of those who are able to receive us into their houses and into eternal dwellings” — *non quoslibet pauperes; sed eos qui nos possint recipere*. Augustine, in a sermon on the same verse, counsels the opposite: do not be too selective, because we cannot examine hearts; when you do it with all, then you will reach the few who are worthy.

Aquinas neither harmonises nor adjudicates. He offers three modes in which the poor may be said to receive anyone into eternal dwellings: by impetration, obtaining pardon through prayer; by congruous merit through their other

¹⁷All five in *ST* II-II q. 32 a. 7 ad 1, where Aquinas gathers Augustine’s two readings, Ambrose’s, and Basil’s, and adds the fifth; the Ambrose and Basil forms also stand in the *Catena aurea*, cap. 16, lect. 2. Corpus Thomisticum, checked 2026-07-25.

¹⁸Ambrose *Exp. in Lucam* VII.245; Augustine *Serm.* 113 §1 and *Quaest. Evang.* II.34; Gregory *Moralia in Iob* XXI.19.29; Chrysostom *Hom. in Heb.* I. The Latin forms quoted are those of the *Catena aurea*, cap. 16, lect. 2; Chrysostom’s argument was additionally read in English at NPNF 1st ser. vol. 14, Homily I on Hebrews, and Augustine’s sermon in NPNF 1st ser. vol. 6, both 2026-07-25.

good works; or “materially speaking,” in that the works of mercy done to them merit the giver’s own reception. The third is Chrysostom’s position kept alive inside a scheme that also keeps the first two.

Crux 5: *cum defecéritis* — who or what fails?

The Vulgate’s *cum defecéritis* is second person plural: when *you* fail. Augustine glosses it accordingly — *cum deficere coeperitis*, when you begin to fail — and Bede reads it of the end of this life. But Cyril of Alexandria’s text reads otherwise. In the Syriac version translated by Payne Smith his lemma runs: “Make for yourselves friends of the unrighteous mammon: that *when it has failed*, they may receive you into eternal tabernacles,” and he expounds it of the money: “that when their earthly wealth fails them, they may gain a place in their tabernacles.”¹⁹ The difference is not decorative: on one reading the parable is about your death, on the other about your money’s exhaustion, and the urgency lands in a different place.

Method: allegory refused, allegory offered

Two of the tradition’s most careful readers here refuse to allegorise. Jerome states the rule before applying it: he has quoted the parable entire *ut non nobis intelligentiam aliunde quaeramus, et in parabola certas nitamur invenire personas; sed interpretemur eam quasi parabolam, hoc est similitudinem* — so that we do not look elsewhere for the sense, nor strain to find definite persons in the parable, but interpret it as a parable, that is, a likeness. Cyril is firmer still: “we are not to search into all the parts of the parable in a subtil and prying way,” since asking who the rich man is, who the accuser is, who the debtors are, and why one owed oil and the other wheat will make the discourse “at once obscure and redundant.”

And yet Jerome himself preserves, at length and without endorsing it, a thoroughgoing allegory that he ascribes to Theophilus of Antioch: the rich man is God, the steward is St Paul — who “dissipated his Lord’s substance” by persecuting — *fodere non valeo* means the commandments of the Law are abolished, and the two debtors are the Gentiles and the Jews, reduced by a half and by a fifth respectively. Jerome reports it and then says plainly that he prefers *priorem interpretationem*, the former reading. Theophilus’s commentary survives, so far as this study could establish, only inside Jerome’s letter; it is cited here as Theophilus *apud Hieronymum*.

Cyril’s own alternative is not allegory but compression: the steward simply *is* the rich man in the congregation, already accused before God because he administers for himself what was entrusted to him for the poor. Bede generalises the same identification into a rule — *villici sane vocabulo dicimus eos qui pecunias habent, non jam dominos suae, sed alienae potius rei dispensatores esse putandos*: we call stewards those who have money, and they are to be reckoned not owners of their own property but dispensers of another’s. He then eschatologises the excuses: once the stewardship is taken away we cannot dig, because this life is the only time for working, and to beg then is the shameful begging of the foolish virgins.²⁰ Augustine had already put the identification in one sentence: *omnes enim villici sumus*.

Bede also supplies the most economical limitation of the commendation in verse 8. The children of this world are not called wise; they are called *prudentiores . . . in generatione sua*, prudent *in their own generation*, and Bede glosses that against Isaiah’s woe on those wise in their own eyes. He then turns the epithet into a rule of naming: *cuius enim quisque agit opera, eius cognominatur et filius* — whose works a man does, of him he is called a son.

What the missal’s boundary does

Two decisions of the printed book shape what a congregation actually hears. The lection begins at verse 1, so the parable arrives detached from Luke 15, where the murmuring of Pharisees and scribes at Jesus receiving sinners provoked three parables of the lost; Jerome, who read the passage continuously, found the change of audience at 16:1

¹⁹Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Gospel of St Luke*, Sermon 108, tr. R. Payne Smith (Oxford), pp. 507–510, read in the Internet Archive scan [p2commentaryupon00cyriuoft](#), 2026-07-25. The translator’s own note at this point discusses the diacritic distinguishing the tenses and reports the Peshitta and Philoxenian readings; the underlying Greek variation is between a third-person singular and a second-person plural verb. This guide reports the divergence and does not adjudicate the Greek text.

²⁰Bede, *In Lucae Evangelium Expositio*, lib. V, on Luke 16 (PL 92, coll. 528–531), read in the *Patrologia Latina* text at Corpus Corporum, 2026-07-25. Bede reproduces Augustine’s *Quaest. Evang.* II.34 nearly verbatim and adds the material quoted here.

decisive and concluded that the parable exhorts the disciples to *clemency in remitting debts* — an exegesis harder to reach once the seam is cut. And the lection ends at verse 9, so the sayings that follow — fidelity in what is least, the unjust mammon, and *non potéstis Deo servíre et mammonæ* — go unread. What remains is the commendation and the counsel, with the closing prohibition removed.

The one control the book does supply is placement. It sets this Gospel between an Epistle about being an heir and an Offertory about being humbled, and prints **Credo** immediately after *ætérna tabernácula*. Whether that placement was intended as an answer to the parable’s difficulty cannot be shown from any source consulted here, and no such intention is claimed.

What remains genuinely unsettled

It is worth stating plainly what this section has *not* resolved, because a guide that manufactured a consensus here would misrepresent its sources. Whether the steward’s act is left uncensured (Ambrose) or expressly excluded from imitation (Augustine) is a real disagreement between two Doctors. Whether “mammon of iniquity” describes provenance, allurements, valuation, inheritance, or maldistribution has five answers, four of which Aquinas holds together in one reply. Whether the friends receive us, or only our works do, is argued grammatically by Chrysostom against the plain sense assumed by Ambrose and Gregory. And whether it is you or your money that fails turns on a variant that a Latin missal cannot register. A reader who wants a single meaning for Luke 16:9 will have to choose among Fathers, and ought to know that this is what he is doing.

3.7 Offertory (*Off.*)

Ant. ad Offertorium — no. 1518 — Ps. 17, 28 et 32

Pópulum húmílem salvum fácies, Dómine, et óculos superbórum humiliábis: quóniam quis Deus præter te, Dómine?

English (1861 witness). “Thou wilt save the humble people, O Lord: and thou wilt humble the eyes of the proud, for who is God besides thee, O Lord.”

The antiphon is a splice, and both halves are adjusted. Clementine Ps 17:28 opens *Quoniam tu populum humilem salvas facies*; the chant drops the causal opening and inserts a vocative *Dómine*, converting a statement about God into an address to him. Clementine Ps 17:32 reads *Quoniam quis Deus præter Dominum? aut quis Deus præter Deum nostrum?*; the chant reads *quóniam quis Deus præter te, Dómine?*, turning third person into second and dropping the parallel clause. The result is that a psalm which spoke *about* God at both points now speaks *to* him at both — at the moment when the gifts are carried up.

Augustine’s exposition of these two verses supplies exactly the two links this Mass needs. On verse 28 he identifies the parties: “For You will make whole the humble people. Now this seems froward to the froward, that You will make whole those who confess their sins. And You will humble the eyes of the proud. But them that are ignorant of God’s righteousness, and seek to establish their own” — reading the proud straight through Romans 10:3.²¹ The humble are not the socially low but the self-accusing; the proud are those constructing a righteousness of their own. Both descriptions fit the Gospel’s steward, who accused himself accurately (*quid fáciam*) and then built his own security anyway.

On verse 32 Augustine turns the question into the Epistle’s answer: “For who is God, but the Lord? whom we serve. And who God, but our God? . . . Whom after good service we sons shall possess as the hoped-for inheritance.” The Offertory asks who God is; Augustine answers that he is what the sons inherit; the Epistle sung earlier in the same Mass said *herédes quidem Dei*; and Aquinas, commenting on that phrase, wrote *bonum autem principale quo Deus dives est, est ipsemet*. Three witnesses, centuries apart, converge on the same identification of the inheritance with the testator. It is the tightest documented link in the whole formulary, and it runs not between two chants but between a chant and a lesson.

²¹Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps.* 17.28 (New Advent numbers it as Ps. 18); its inline verse numbering runs one lower than the Vulgate. Checked 2026-07-25.

3.8 Secret (*Sec.*)

Secreta — no. 1519

<i>Súscipe, quæsumus, Dómine, múnera, quæ tibi de tua largitáte deférimus: ut hæc sacrosáncta mystéria, grátia tuæ operánte virtúte, et præsentis vitæ nos conversatióne sanctificent, et ad gáudia sempitérna perdúcant. Per Dóminum.</i>
--

English (1861 witness). “Receive, we beseech thee, O Lord, the offerings we bring, which are the gifts of thine own bounty: that these most holy mysteries may, by the power of thy grace, make our conduct in this life holy, and bring us to those joys that will never end. Thro’”

The Secret’s first clause is the Introit’s grammar applied to the gifts: *quæ tibi de tua largitáte deférimus*, which we bring you out of your own bounty. Nothing is offered that was not first given. Read beside the Gospel this is sharper than it looks: the steward’s crisis was that he disposed of goods that were not his, and the Church at the offertory says aloud that she is doing the same thing — with the difference that she says so.

The petition is then double and tensed. *Et præsentis vitæ nos conversatióne sanctificent* asks that the mysteries sanctify us in the conduct of this present life; *et ad gáudia sempitérna perdúcant* asks that they bring us to everlasting joys. That is the Gospel’s own pair — what you do with what you administer now, and where you are received afterwards — with the fraud removed and the agency reversed. In the parable the steward’s cleverness secured the reception; here the mysteries do both verbs, and grace’s power (*grátia tuæ operánte virtúte*) is named as the operative cause.

The book then prints *Præfatio de Sma Trinitate*. In the 1962 temporal cycle that is the ordinary Sunday preface and not a comment on this formulary; nothing is inferred from it here.

3.9 Communion (*Comm.*)

Ant. ad Communionem — no. 1520 — Ps. 33, 9

<i>Gustáte et vidéte, quóniam suávis est Dóminus: beátus vir, qui sperat in eo.</i>

English (1861 witness). “Taste, and see, how sweet is the Lord ! blessed is the man who putteth his trust in him.”

This is the one scriptural proper of the day whose Latin agrees with the Clementine psalter word for word; only the punctuation differs. After an Introit, a Gradual, an Alleluia, and an Offertory that each depart from the Vulgate somewhere, the Communion is textually quiet.

Psalm 33 is an alphabetic thanksgiving whose Latin title places it “when he changed his countenance before Achimelech, and he dismissed him, and he went his way” — pointing to 1 Kings (1 Samuel) 21:10–15, where David feigns madness before the king of Geth. The narrative names that king *Achis*, not Achimelech, and Augustine expounds the psalm using *Achis*, so the disagreement between title and narrative is at least as old as his exposition and is no modern discovery.

Augustine’s exposition of this verse is the strongest patristic warrant in the whole formulary for the use the missal makes of it, because he reads the verse as the psalm’s moment of speaking openly about the Eucharist. He introduces it: “Now will He speak openly of the same Sacrament, whereby He was carried in His Own Hands. O taste and see that the Lord is good.” The reference back is to his own reading of the psalm’s title earlier in the sermon, where the David who “was carried in his own hands” is Christ, who “when He commended His Own Body and Blood . . . took into His Hands that which the faithful know; and in a manner carried Himself, when He said, This is My Body.” He then makes the objection in John 6 the psalm’s own foil: when the Lord said, “Except a man eat My Flesh and drink My Blood, he shall have no life in him,” those in whom “error and ignorance” reigned asked, “How can this man give

us his flesh to eat?” — and Augustine’s reply is the antiphon itself. “If you are ignorant, Taste and see that the Lord is good: but if you understand not, you are king Achis.”²²

The ordering of the verbs is what the Mass borrows: *gustáte* before *vidéte*. The Introit reported a reception; the Communion supplies the mode of knowing what was received. It is not demonstration but taste, and the antiphon’s second clause makes it a beatitude of hope rather than of sight.

3.10 Postcommunion (*Postcomm.*)

Postcommunio — no. 1521

Sit nobis, Dómine, reparátio mentis et córporis cæléste mystérium: ut, cuius exséquimur cultum, sentiámus efféctum. Per Dóminum.

English (1861 witness). “May this heavenly mystery, O Lord, renew us both in soul and body: that we may find in ourselves the effects of what we celebrate. Thro’”

The shortest of the three orations, and the only one that names the body. Its request is not for a benefit added to the rite but for the rite’s own effect to be perceived: *cuius exséquimur cultum, sentiámus efféctum* — of the worship we carry out, may we feel the effect. *Exsequi* is the verb for performing an office through to its end; *efféctus* is what it produces. The oration therefore closes the Mass on the same distinction the Gospel opened with, between administering something and possessing it, and asks that in this one case the administration be felt.

Read against the Communion the sequence is exact: taste, then see, then feel the effect. Read against the Introit, the Mass ends where it began — something received — with one word added: that the reception should now be perceptible.

3.11 The Latin the book actually prints

Every divergence below was found by collating the appointed wording against the Clementine Vulgate; none was resolved in favour of either witness and none was emended. The Communion antiphon does not appear, because it has none: it is the one appointed scriptural proper whose Latin agrees with the Clementine word for word, differing only in punctuation. The complete record is in [propers/verified.md](#).

Proper	As printed in 1962	Clementine Vulgate	Difference
Int.	<i>secúndum nomen tuum, Deus, ita et laus tua</i>	<i>Secundum nomen tuum, Deus, sic et laus tua</i>	<i>ita</i> for <i>sic</i>
Int. vs. All.	<i>laudábilis nimis</i> (Int.) / <i>laudábilis valde</i> (All.)	<i>laudabilis nimis</i>	one verse, printed twice in this formulary in two forms
Ep.	<i>ii sunt filii Dei</i>	<i>hi filii Dei sunt</i>	pronoun and word order
Ep.	ends at <i>coherédes autem Christi</i>	verse continues <i>si tamen compatimur...</i>	pericope stops inside v. 17
Grad.	<i>in locum refúgii</i>	<i>in domum refugii</i> (Ps 30:3); <i>in locum munitum</i> (Ps 70:3)	noun of one verse, genitive of the other
Grad. v.	<i>Deus, in te sperávi: Dómine...</i>	<i>In te, Domine, speravi...</i>	transposed; agrees with Augustine’s lemma
Off.	<i>Pópulum húmílem saluum fácies, Dómine ... quóniam quis Deus præter te, Dómine?</i>	<i>Quoniam tu populum humilem saluum facies ... Quoniam quis Deus præter Dominum? aut quis...</i>	opening dropped and vocative added; third person to second; second clause dropped
Gosp.	<i>Quid fáciam, quia ... villicatióne?</i>	<i>Quid faciam? quia ... villicationem.</i>	sense-division only

²²Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps.* 33, sermo 2, §11 (New Advent numbers the exposition as Ps. 34, and its inline verse numbers run one lower than the Vulgate); the sacramental frame is set in §1. Checked 2026-07-25.

4 The Propers: Notable and Quotable

Few pericopes in the temporal cycle have had a stranger second career than this one. The gallery below collects five documented later uses of wording from the appointed Gospel in which the register or force of the phrase is genuinely turned — into satire, into anti-clerical polemic, into a swindler’s private code, into a theory of political language, into a parliamentary insult. Straight exegesis and devotional citation are excluded; those belong to the commentary above.

One philological note governs the whole gallery. The English phrases that entered the language are the Authorised Version’s — “the mammon of unrighteousness,” “everlasting habitations,” “wiser in their generation” — not the Douay’s “mammon of iniquity” and “everlasting dwellings,” and not the Latin of the missal. The afterlives below therefore attach to a Protestant rendering of the verses this Mass appoints. Where Latin is given it is the appointed text; where an English phrase is quoted it is the later author’s own wording, and the difference is part of the evidence.

1. The swindler’s only regret (*Gosp.*, Lk 16:9)

Appointed phrase: *fácite vobis amícos de mammóna iniquitátis*

Later use: Anthony Trollope, *The Way We Live Now* (1875), ch. LXXXI, “Mr. Cohenlupe Leaves London.”

Exact wording: “But why had he, so unrighteous himself, not made friends to himself of the Mammon of unrighteousness? Why had he not conciliated Lord Mayors? . . . Why had he been insolent at the India Office?”

Context: Augustus Melmotte, the collapsing financier, walks toward Westminster on the afternoon before his suicide, conducting a self-examination. Trollope has just told the reader that “never once, not for a moment, did it occur to him that he should repent of the fraud in which his whole life had been passed.”

The turn: Christ’s counsel becomes the swindler’s single article of contrition — and a technical one. Melmotte does not regret the frauds; he regrets a failure of network management. The verse Augustine laboured to keep from licensing plunder is here quoted, unsignalled and accurately, by a man whose only moral standard is that he did not cultivate enough useful friends. The list that follows — Lord Mayors, the India Office, Abchurch Lane — supplies the parable’s “debtors” with a Victorian address book.

Dependence and rights: Echo: exact Authorised Version wording, capitalised, unattributed. Public domain; read in the Project Gutenberg text (ebook 5231), 2026-07-25.

2. “And he was commended.” The House of Commons, 1931 (*Gosp.*, Lk 16:8–9)

Appointed phrases: *laudávit dóninus villicum iniquitátis; recípiant vos in æténa tabernácula*

Later use: Sir Hilton Young MP, House of Commons, Representation of the People (No. 2) Bill, 3 February 1931, HC Deb vol. 247, cc. 1662–1663, with an interjection by Mr Ernest Brown; the Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald, replies at c. 1664.

Exact wording: Young: “Let me remind hon. Members opposite and the Prime Minister of the parable of the unjust steward; how he had wasted his master’s substance; how he was to be called to account; and how he busied himself in making friends with the mammon of unrighteousness in order that he might be received into the everlasting habitations—” MR ERNEST BROWN: “And he was commended.” SIR H. YOUNG: “He was commended in those days, and there are still some who would commend him. But there are no everlasting habitations for a Government which is prepared to govern without the will of the people.” MacDonald, in reply, accused his critics of holding that reformers are “guilty of all the evils of the unjust steward and corrupt politicians.”

The turn: Two turns at once. First, the eschatological *tabernácula* are demoted to a ministry’s tenure of office. Second, and more remarkable, a backbencher’s four-word interjection puts the pericope’s central exegetical crux on the floor of the House — *he was commended* — and Young’s improvised answer, “He was commended in those days, and there are still some who would commend him,” is in substance Augustine’s *e contrario* reading delivered as a debating point. The Prime Minister then names the parable back across the despatch box.

Dependence and rights: Documented on both sides: the parable is named three times in the debate. Parliamentary copyright; quoted under the Open Parliament Licence from the Historic Hansard text, read 2026-07-25.

3. Kingsley turns two verses into anti-clerical ammunition (*Gosp.*, Lk 16:3 and 16:6–7)

Appointed phrases: *fódere non váleo, mendicáre erubéscó; accipe cautiónem tuam . . . scribe quinquagínta*

Later use: Charles Kingsley, *Westward Ho!* (1855), ch. XVIII, “How They Took the Pearls at Margarita.”

Exact wording: Amyas Leigh: “No wonder that young men . . . will not listen to the Gospel, while it is preached to them by men on whom they cannot but look down; a set of soft-handed fellows who cannot dig, and are ashamed to beg.” His brother Frank, immediately after: “. . . Popish priests and friars, who are vowed not to be men, and get their bread shamefully and rascally by telling sinners who owe a hundred measures to sit down quickly and take their bill and write fifty.”

The turn: Two different verses of the same appointed Gospel, redirected in consecutive speeches by two brothers, against two different clerical castes. The steward’s excuse becomes a muscular-Christian sneer at unmanly Protestant clergy, his physical incapacity read as effeminacy. Then the steward’s fraudulent write-down becomes a figure for sacramental absolution: the priest as a crooked accountant discounting sinners’ bills. A parable the Fathers used to defend almsgiving is here made to attack the remission of sins.

Dependence and rights: Documented: “a hundred measures . . . write fifty” is unmistakably signalled. Public domain; read in the Project Gutenberg text (ebook 1860), 2026-07-25.

4. A steward at a garden party fears he is *the* steward (*Gosp.*, Lk 16:1–9)

Appointed phrases: *villicum iniquitátis; fácite vobis amícos de mammóna iniquitátis*

Later use: Anthony Trollope, *Barchester Towers* (1857), ch. XXXIX, “The Lookalofts and the Greenacres.”

Exact wording: “But Mr. Plomacy was not quite happy in his mind, for he thought of the unjust steward and began to reflect whether he had not made for himself friends of the mammon of unrighteousness.”

Context: Mr Plomacy is Miss Thorne’s actual steward, policing the Ullathorne Sports. Wheedled by Farmer Greenacre into letting an uninvited plasterer stay to the feast, he suffers an instant scruple of conscience out of Luke 16 — and then, unruffled, rises to say grace.

The turn: The joke depends on an exact congruence of office and a total incongruity of scale. Plomacy is a steward; he has just shown irregular leniency with his employer’s provisions to a man who may be useful; the verse fits him with uncomfortable precision — and the stake is who gets fed at a village fête. Trollope thereby stages, comically, the difficulty Ambrose and Augustine argued over: whether a small act of unauthorised generosity with someone else’s goods is commendable foresight or plain fraud. The novel declines to decide and serves dinner.

Dependence and rights: Documented: Trollope names the unjust steward. Public domain; read in the Project Gutenberg text (ebook 3409), 2026-07-25.

5. Words as unjust stewards (*Gosp.*, Lk 16:1–2)

Appointed phrases: *villicum; redde ratiónem villicatiónis tuæ*

Later use: John Ruskin, *Sesame and Lilies* (1865), lecture I, “Of Kings’ Treasuries.”

Exact wording: “There never were creatures of prey so mischievous, never diplomatists so cunning, never poisoners so deadly, as these masked words; they are the unjust stewards of all men’s ideas: whatever fancy or favourite instinct a man most cherishes, he gives to his favourite masked word to take care of for him; the word at last comes to have an infinite power over him.”

The turn: The parable migrates out of economics into what would later be called ideology-critique. Ruskin’s “masked words” — abstractions everyone uses and no one defines — are entrusted with meanings, embezzle them, and end by ruling the man who deposited them. The transfer is exact on every term: the goods are ideas, the owner is the speaker, the wasting is semantic drift, and the accounting Ruskin demands of his readers is *redde ratiónem villicatiónis tuæ* applied to vocabulary. It is the only use in this gallery in which the steward is not a person at all.

Dependence and rights: Documented by the phrase “unjust stewards.” Public domain; read in the Project Gutenberg text (ebook 1293), 2026-07-25.

5 The Propers: Interpretive Possibilities

What this section is

Everything below is exploratory editorial and AI proposal. None of it is sourced historical intent, attributed patristic or Doctoral teaching, or liturgical rubric. Each proposal was checked against the corpus this guide searched and against a targeted precedent search recorded in `research/scope.md`; where no precedent was located, that result is bounded by the search actually run and is correctable. Each ends with the strongest objection the author could find against it.

1. The congregation signs the first line of its own audit (*Int.* + *Gosp.*)

Anchors. Introit *Suscipimus, Deus, misericórdiam tuam* (no. 1512); Gospel *redde ratióñem villicatióñis tuæ* (no. 1517).

Mechanism. The Introit is in the perfect and the first person plural: the congregation's opening act is to state, on the record, that it has received something. Half an hour later the Gospel opens with an employer requiring exactly that kind of statement from a man who has been handling goods that were not his. The two texts are not verbally related, but they are the same *speech act* at two ends of one Mass: an acknowledgement of receipt, and a demand for one. On this reading the liturgy has arranged for the assembly to make its declaration *before* the summons is read out, so that when the summons comes the congregation has already conceded the premise on which the whole parable turns — that what is in hand came from somewhere else.

Fruit. The parable stops being a story about a rogue and becomes a document already initialled. It also explains why the Mass can afford to leave the parable's scandal unresolved: the hearer's own position has been fixed liturgically before the difficulty arrives, so he does not need the steward to be exonerated in order to know what to do.

What the element-by-element reading misses. Read seriatim, the Introit is a devotional pleasantry about mercy and the Gospel a hard case in moral theology. The order of speech acts is invisible unless the two are set side by side.

Strongest limit. There is no verbal dependence whatever: *suscipere* and *reddere rationem* share no root, and the Introit's *nos* is not the steward's *ego*. No source consulted connects them. If the Introit was chosen for its temple imagery — which its shared use at the Purification makes likely — then this correspondence is a coincidence of the calendar and not a composition.

2. The antiphon that lacks a body, and the oration that supplies one (*Int.* + *Postcomm.*)

Anchors. Introit *in médio templi tui* (no. 1512), which the same book prints verbatim at no. 2107 for the Purification on 2 February; Postcommunion *reparatio mentis et corporis* (no. 1521).

Mechanism. On 2 February the words “in the midst of thy temple” have a body attached: the Child is carried into the sanctuary, and the antiphon describes what the arms of Simeon are doing. On the Eighth Sunday the book reuses the antiphon with no narrative, so the phrase names a place with nothing in it. The formulary then closes with the only oration of the three that asks for something bodily — *reparatio mentis et corporis* — immediately after the congregation has received a body. The proposal is that the Sunday's formulary is completed at its end by the thing its opening antiphon leaves unspecified: the mercy received in the midst of the temple turns out, at the Postcommunion, to have been received in bodies.

Fruit. It gives the Purification's antiphon a non-arbitrary reason to be here, without asserting that the compilers intended the link; and it supplies a concrete referent for *templi* that does not require allegorising the church building.

What the element-by-element reading misses. Treated alone, the Introit is a Zion text and the Postcommunion a brief request for interior effect. The shared use with 2 February is not visible from this page of the missal at all; it is visible only from page 467.

Strongest limit. The Pauline identification of the body as a temple (1 Cor 6:19) is *not* appointed in this Mass, so the bridge depends on a verse the congregation does not hear. And a simpler explanation of the shared antiphon is available and probably true: *Suscipimus* is a well-known chant that fits any Mass with a mercy-and-sanctuary theme, and its reuse says nothing about either formulary's argument.

3. The steward's two refusals are the Offertory's two classes (*Gosp.* + *Off.*)

Anchors. Gospel *fódere non váleo, mendicáre erubésco* (no. 1517); Offertory *Pópulum húmílem saluum fácies ... et óculos superbórum humiliábis* (no. 1518).

Mechanism. The steward names exactly two ways down and rejects both. Digging is the labour of the poor; begging is the posture of the poor. The next proper the congregation hears sorts the world into precisely two classes — the *pópulus húmilis* who are saved and the *óculi superbórum* who are brought low — and the steward has just declined membership in the first on both available counts. On this reading his real disqualification is not dishonesty at all. He is commended for foresight and condemned by the following chant for pride, and the two verdicts are about different things.

Fruit. It offers a way of holding Ambrose and Augustine together without pretending they agree. Ambrose can be right that the steward is not censured *for what he foresaw*; Augustine can be right that the act is not for imitation; and the Offertory can locate the actual fault in a third place that neither disputes — the refusal to be lowered. It also gives the offertory procession an argument rather than a mood.

What the element-by-element reading misses. The Offertory is normally read as a general thanksgiving verse. Its adjacency to a man who has just said, in effect, “I am too good to dig and too proud to beg,” is lost when the two are treated as separate items.

Strongest limit. Augustine, expounding the Offertory's own verse, reads *pópulum húmílem* not as the manual labourer but as those “who confess their sins,” and the proud as those who “seek to establish their own” righteousness. That is a moral, not a social, division, and it weakens the neat mapping of *fódere* onto poverty. The digging half of the proposal is an extension beyond what any checked witness says.

4. The debtors write in their own hands; the assembly says the Creed in its own voice (*Gosp.* + the printed **Credo**)

Anchors. Gospel *Accipe cautiónem tuam: et sede cito, scribe quinquagínta ... Accipe líttaras tuas, et scribe octogínta* (no. 1517); the direction **Credo**, printed in this formulary immediately after *ætérna tabernácula*.

Mechanism. The parable's one piece of stage business is that the steward does not alter the bonds himself. He hands each debtor his own document and has him rewrite it in his own hand — which is what makes the new figure binding and the debtor complicit. The missal then prints, as the next thing that happens in the church, the one text of the Mass that every person present recites in the first person singular. *Credo* is an instrument executed in one's own voice, immediately after a story whose hinge is an instrument executed in one's own hand.

Fruit. It gives the Creed a function in this particular Sunday's argument instead of being liturgical furniture, and it names something true about both acts: neither can be performed by proxy, and both create an obligation the speaker cannot afterwards disown.

What the element-by-element reading misses. A ten-element map of the propers does not include the Creed at all, because the Creed is not proper. Anything it contributes is therefore invisible to the standard reading.

Strongest limit. This is the weakest anchor in the section, and deliberately so marked. **Credo** is prescribed on Sundays by general rubric, not chosen for this formulary; the same direction appears on the Seventh, Ninth, and every other Sunday after Pentecost. Any argument that its placement here is significant must explain why it is not equally significant everywhere else, and this proposal cannot.

5. A withheld condition and a partial mode of knowing (*Ep.* + *Comm.*)

Anchors. Epistle ending at *coherédes autem Christi* (no. 1514), before Paul's *si tamen compatimur, ut et conglorificemur*; Communion *Gustáte et vidéte* (no. 1520).

Mechanism. The Mass does two withholding things. It hands the congregation an inheritance and stops one clause short of the terms on which the inheritance is held; and it then offers a mode of knowing that is by design incomplete — taste before sight, the sense that reports presence without reporting extent. The proposal is that these two are the same gesture at different points in the rite: the day gives the hearer more than he can yet account for and less than he will eventually be told, and it does so twice. Under this reading the truncated verse is not an accident of length but of a piece with a formulary that ends by asking to *feel* an effect rather than to see a result.

Fruit. It supplies a reason why this Mass, uniquely among the Sundays that read Romans 8, can end serenely after a Gospel about a reckoning: the serenity is not obliviousness but a deliberate partiality of knowledge, which the Postcommunion then names.

What the element-by-element reading misses. Each element alone is unremarkable — pericope boundaries are inherited, and *gustáte et vidéte* is the commonest of Communion antiphons. Only the conjunction suggests a pattern, and the conjunction is only visible if one knows where Rom 8:17 breaks.

Strongest limit and the disconfirming condition. The proposal is vulnerable at its foundation, and the disconfirming evidence sits in the same book. The 1962 missal appoints Rom 8:18–23, the immediate sequel, on the *Fourth* Sunday after Pentecost. The condition of co-suffering is therefore not withheld from the liturgical year at all — only from this Sunday, and only because a lection had to end somewhere. If the pericope division is inherited from an earlier lectionary for reasons of length or of the ancient Roman station, then nothing is being withheld and this proposal collapses into a coincidence of scissors. The proposal survives, if at all, as a reading of the formulary’s effect on a hearer, never as a claim about its design.

6. Saying one thing twice as a figure of catholicity (*Grad.* + *Ep.*)

Anchors. Gradual, responsory from Ps 30:3 with verse from Ps 70:1 (no. 1515), two psalms whose openings are near duplicates of each other; Epistle *in quo clamámus: Abba (Pater)* (no. 1514), one address given twice in two languages.

Mechanism. The Mass contains two instances of the same rhetorical figure within a few minutes, and only one of them has ever been explained. The Epistle’s doubling is expounded by Augustine, and after him by Aquinas, as a sign of two peoples brought into one cry: *abba* is what the circumcision says, *pater* what the uncircumcision says, and the redundancy is the point. The Gradual’s doubling is formally identical — one prayer surviving in two psalms, quoted as though it were two witnesses — and nobody explains it at all. The proposal is to read the Gradual’s redundancy by the light of the Epistle’s: repetition in the liturgy need not be emphasis or filler, but the same thing said from two mouths, and the Psalter here doing what the two languages do in Romans 8.

Fruit. It supplies a positive account of a feature that usually gets apologised for. A reader who notices that Psalm 70 repeats Psalm 30 is normally told that the Psalter is repetitive; this reading says instead that the Gradual quotes a prayer which outlived its first speaker, and that the Mass sets it beside a verse whose whole doctrine is that one cry can have two origins.

What the element-by-element reading misses. Treated separately, the Gradual is a request for shelter and the Epistle a doctrine of adoption. That they perform the same verbal gesture, in the same quarter-hour, is not visible from either alone.

Strongest limit. The parallel is formal, not material. The Epistle’s two words are two *languages*, which is exactly what carries Augustine’s and Aquinas’s argument; the Gradual’s two psalms are both Latin, and its doubling is far more plausibly explained by the ordinary practice of pairing a responsory with a verse drawn from elsewhere in the Psalter. No source consulted connects them, and the resemblance may be nothing more than a resemblance.

6 Appendix: Scope and Qualifications

Edition and formulary identity. This guide covers one formulary: the Mass of the Eighth Sunday after Pentecost, *Dominica Octava post Pentecosten, II classis*, as printed at pages 387–388 of the *Missale Romanum*, editio typica (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1962), marginal numbers 1512–1521. The rank and its occurrence effects come from the same book’s *Rubricæ generales*, nn. 10–18, printed page XII. In the repository’s stable temporal series this leaf is catalogue identity 22, a catalogue position and not an occurrence schedule; the Sunday fell on 19 July in 2026, but the guide is dated to no civil year.

Text verification. Every appointed Latin form, heading, rank, marginal number, scriptural reference, ligature, accent, and formulary boundary was collated on 2026-07-25 against 300-dpi page images of the Church Music Association of America facsimile of the 1962 Vatican typical edition, SHA-256 648fdb8f...3518a, read column by column. The facsimile’s embedded machine text located the leaf only and is preserved unedited in `propers/retrieved.txt`; no second image witness was needed, because no reading was unclear. Transcriptions and recorded divergences are in `propers/verified.md`.

Translation and rights. No public-domain conclusion is claimed for the 1962 typical edition. This repository’s rights record for the facsimile finds that edition’s own status unresolved, and more likely than not restored in the United States under 17 U.S.C. §104A to the end of 2057 (that record is `missale-romanum-1962-facsimile-rights-v1.toml`, under `src/sources/inventories/`). What permits the Latin quoted here is 17 U.S.C. §103(b): the copyright in a revised edition extends only to what that edition itself contributed, and “does not affect or enlarge the scope, duration, ownership, or subsistence of” any copyright in the preexisting material. This formulary is preexisting material. All ten appointed elements of it — Introit, Collect, Epistle, Gradual, Alleluia, Gospel, Offertory, Secret,

Communion and Postcommunion, in the same order and at the same scriptural references — are printed in two Missals this repository tracks as public-domain text, the Pustet printing of Ratisbon, 1862 and the Venice Missal of 1570, so the 1962 edition's copyright does not reach them; the element-by-element check and its bounds are recorded in `propers/verified.md`. That is this project's own reading of the statute and of the evidence, not a clearance anyone granted, and it is not legal advice. No page image of the facsimile is reproduced here, and none of the 1962 edition's own new matter — the 1955 Holy Week, the 1960 Code of Rubrics, the sanctoral added after 1920, its front matter — is published in this guide; the edition's rank, pagination and marginal numbers are cited as facts about the book. Every English rendering of an appointed text here is quoted from one identified public-domain witness — *The Roman Missal translated into the English language for the use of the laity* (Philadelphia: Eugene Cumiskey, 1861), printed pp. 411–413, read as page images in the Internet Archive scan `romanmissaltran00churgoog`. That is a nineteenth-century hand-missal translation with pre-1962 headings and old orthography: not an approved liturgical translation, quoted as a historical witness, and nothing here may be used for recitation. Scripture quoted outside the appointed texts is Douay–Rheims (Challoner) and Clementine Vulgate at `drbo.org`; patristic quotations in English are NPNF, and Cyril of Alexandria is R. Payne Smith's translation from the Syriac. Neither the project licence nor this guide relicenses Scripture, liturgical text, or any third-party translation.

Source scope, and what it does not cover. Patristic, medieval, and Doctoral reception was searched for every directly appointed passage across the corpora named in `research/scope.md`: New Advent, CCEL's NPNF volumes, Documenta Catholica Omnia, the *Patrologia Latina* text at Corpus Corporum, Corpus Thomisticum, and the Internet Archive. Every retained witness was read at its own work and locus. The search is bounded and correctable: no critical edition (CSEL, CCSL, SC, Leonine) was used; machine-read Migne is flagged at the citation; Greek witnesses were reached in translation except where a variant is discussed; and no claim is made that all witnesses everywhere have been found.

Material negative results. Ambrose does not comment on the narrative of Luke 16:1–8 at all; his treatment covers verses 13, 9 and 12, in that order. Gregory the Great has no homily on this pericope — his Luke 16 homily is on Dives and Lazarus — so his contribution comes from the *Moralia*. No connected Chrysostom exposition of Lk 16:1–9 was located, and Jerome records that he searched for Origen's and Didymus's explanations and found neither. These absences are evidence, recorded rather than papered over.

Disagreement retained. On the Gospel this guide preserves five unresolved cruces: who commends, whether the fraud is censured, what makes the mammon iniquitous, who receives into the eternal dwellings, and whether it is the hearer or the money that fails. No consensus is asserted, and agreement should not be inferred from the proximity of names.

Unresolved textual question. Psalm 47:2 is printed twice in this one formulary in two Latin forms, *laudábilis nimis* at the Introit and *laudábilis valde* at the Alleluia. The divergence is transmitted, not peculiar to this edition; assigning the two forms to named Latin psalters would need collation against psalter witnesses this study did not undertake, and the question is left open.

Claim classes. Textual observation, documented historical orientation, documented reception, and source-grounded synthesis appear together in the map, the thematic section, and the commentary. Exploratory editorial and AI proposal appears only in *Interpretive Possibilities*, which carries its own notice; nothing there is attributed to any source.

Review state. This guide is generation-provenanced and source-audited by its own records. It has received no independent specialist, theological, canonical, or ecclesiastical review, and none is claimed. It is a hand-missal companion for study and prayerful understanding: not a liturgical book, not a critical edition, not a homily, not a substitute for its sources.

As of, and audit records. Checks and collations reported here were made on 2026-07-25 unless another date is given at the citation; web witnesses are mutable, and only the controlling facsimile is pinned by hash. Retrieval mechanics, the reception matrix, the notable-and-quotable and interpretive-proposal audits, rejected leads, and negative results are in `research/scope.md` and `research/source-audit.md`; verified texts in `propers/verified.md`; bound sources in `research/source-bindings.toml`.

7 References

Only sources actually used for a published claim are listed. Loci are given at the precision needed to verify the claim they support. Dates are the dates on which the source was read for this guide.

Liturgical books

- *Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Summorum Pontificum cura recognitum*, editio typica (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1962). *Controlling witness for every appointed Latin form*. Formulary at printed pp. 387–388 (nos. 1512–1521); *Rubricæ generales* nn. 10–18 at printed p. XII; Fourth Sunday after Pentecost at printed p. 382; Purification of the B.V.M. at printed p. 467 (no. 2107). Read as 300-dpi page images of the CMAA facsimile, <https://media.churchmusicassociation.org/pdf/missale62.pdf>, SHA-256 648fdb8fe830ed65a08aa4a95de6f94424c533ddf2398c8fc26b18735fd3518a, 2026-07-25.
- *The Roman Missal translated into the English language for the use of the laity* (Philadelphia: Eugene Cumiskey, 1861). *Identified public-domain English witness for every appointed text quoted in English*. Printed pp. 411–413 = scan leaves 419–421, read as page images at <https://archive.org/details/romanmissaltran00churgoog>, 2026-07-25.

Scripture

- Clementine Vulgate and Douay–Rheims (Challoner), as presented at <https://www.drbo.org/>. *Canonical-context control and the standard of comparison for every collation*. Ps 17; Ps 30; Ps 33; Ps 47; Ps 70; Luke 16; Romans 8; 1 Kings (1 Samuel) 21:10–15; 2 Kings (2 Samuel) 22:1. Read 2026-07-25.

Patristic and medieval witnesses

- Ambrose, *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam*, lib. VII, §245 (PL 15, col. 1764). Latin read in the *Patrologia Latina* text at Corpus Corporum, <https://mlat.uzh.ch/>, 2026-07-25. *The steward is not censured; the allurements reading of mammona iniquitatis; angels and saints as the receivers*.
- Augustine, *Quaestiones Evangeliorum* II.34, as transmitted verbatim in Aquinas, *Catena aurea in Lucam*, cap. 16, lect. 2 (Corpus Thomisticum, 2026-07-25). *Fraud excluded from imitation; the e contrario structure; riches only to the wicked; the receivers are the just and holy, not God’s debtors*.
- Augustine, *Sermo* 113 (NPNF: Sermon 63 on the New Testament), §§1–2, <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/160363.htm>, 2026-07-25. *The saints and the minimi as receivers; mammon as a Hebrew word cognate to Punic; the refutation of “plunder and then give.”*
- Augustine, *De spiritu et littera* 32.56, <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1502.htm>, 2026-07-25. *“Abba, Father” as the two peoples in one cry*.
- Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 17.28 and 17.32; 30 (Enarratio I) §§1 and 3; 33 (sermo 2) §§1 and 11; 47 §§2, 8 and 9; 70 (sermo 1) §§3 and 5. NPNF 1st ser. vol. 8, at New Advent, which numbers the expositions by the Hebrew psalm number (18, 31, 34, 48, 71) and whose inline verse numbers run one lower than the Vulgate. Read 2026-07-25.
- John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistle to the Romans*, Homily XIV (opening on Rom 8:12–13), NPNF 1st ser. vol. 11, <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/210214.htm>, 2026-07-25. *Debtors to the Spirit; the spirit of bondage as the letter; “Abba” as the initiate’s word; joint-heirship*.
- John Chrysostom, *Homily I on Hebrews*, NPNF 1st ser. vol. 14, <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/240201.htm>, 2026-07-25; Latin form as in the *Catena aurea*, cap. 16, lect. 2. *“It is not they who receive us, but our own work.”*
- Jerome, *Epistola* 121 *ad Algasiam*, q. 6 (PL 22, coll. 1018–1021). Latin read in the *Patrologia Latina* text at Corpus Corporum, 2026-07-25. *The defrauded master’s praise; fraud toward the master and prudence for himself; mammona as Syriac; the parable as an exhortation to remit debts; the restriction to those able to receive; the report of Theophilus of Antioch’s allegory; the negative result on Origen and Didymus*.

- Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* XXI.19.29, as transmitted in the *Catena aurea*, cap. 16, lect. 2 (Corpus Thomisticum, 2026-07-25). *The poor as patroni*.
- Bede, *In Lucae Evangelium Expositio*, lib. V, on Luke 16 (PL 92, coll. 528–531). Latin read in the *Patrologia Latina* text at Corpus Corporum, 2026-07-25. *Every possessor of money is a steward; the excuses eschatologised; prudentiores in generatione sua limited; “whose works a man does, of him he is called a son.”*
- Basil, as transmitted in the *Catena aurea*, cap. 16, lect. 2, and cited by Aquinas at *ST* II-II q. 32 a. 7 ad 1. *Inherited injustice in a patrimony*. Cited at the level of transmission; the underlying Basilian work was not verified for this guide.
- “Origen,” as transmitted in the *Catena aurea*, cap. 16, lect. 2. *The commendation as abusive dictum*. Attribution unverified and expressly bounded in the commentary; Jerome reports that he could not find Origen on this parable.
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Gospel of St Luke*, Sermon 108, tr. R. Payne Smith (Oxford), pp. 507–510, read in the Internet Archive scan [p2commentaryupon00cyruioft](#), 2026-07-25. *The refusal to allegorise; the rich man as the steward; “when it has failed”; the translator’s note on the tense*.

Thomas Aquinas

- *Super Epistolam ad Romanos*, cap. 8, lect. 2 (on *ergo debitores*) and lect. 3 (on vv. 14–17), Corpus Thomisticum, <https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/cro05.html>, 2026-07-25. *Debtors to the Holy Spirit; the Spirit’s leading and free will with Phil 2:13; abba and pater as the two peoples; clamamus as intensity of heart; God himself as the principal good inherited; the objection from the father’s death; cohaeredes; the necessity of si tamen compatimur*.
- *Summa theologiae* II-II q. 32 a. 7 (whether alms may be given from ill-gotten goods), with its *sed contra* from Augustine and its *ad 1* stacking five readings of *mammona iniquitatis*; and III q. 23 aa. 1–4 on adoption, especially a. 1 ad 3 citing the Gloss on Rom 8. Corpus Thomisticum, <https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/sth3027.html> and <https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/sth4016.html>, 2026-07-25.
- *Catena aurea in Lucam*, cap. 16, lect. 1–2, Corpus Thomisticum, <https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/clc14.html>, 2026-07-25. *Used as the checked Latin transmission of Augustine, Ambrose, Gregory, Chrysostom, Basil, Theophylact, and “Origen” on this pericope; each retained witness is identified as transmitted, and the underlying work is named where it was separately verified*.

Documented later uses (Notable and Quotable)

- Anthony Trollope, *The Way We Live Now* (1875), ch. LXXXI; and *Barchester Towers* (1857), ch. XXXIX. Project Gutenberg ebooks 5231 and 3409, read 2026-07-25.
- Charles Kingsley, *Westward Ho!* (1855), ch. XVIII. Project Gutenberg ebook 1860, read 2026-07-25.
- John Ruskin, *Sesame and Lilies* (1865), lecture I, “Of Kings’ Treasuries.” Project Gutenberg ebook 1293, read 2026-07-25.
- United Kingdom, House of Commons, Representation of the People (No. 2) Bill, 3 February 1931, HC Deb vol. 247, cc. 1662–1664. Historic Hansard, <https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/commons/1931/feb/03/representation-of-the-people-no-2-bill>, read 2026-07-25. Parliamentary copyright; quoted under the Open Parliament Licence.

Last revised (UTC): 2026-08-02T05:22:00Z

Reuse and rights. To the extent Triptych holds the rights, project-created content and design are licensed under CC BY 4.0. Scripture, liturgical or official texts, received prayers or hymns, quotations, fonts, and other third-party material retain their own status; public-domain material remains public domain. Identify changes. Attribution implies neither Triptych nor ecclesiastical approval. See `LICENSE` and `THIRD_PARTY.md` in the source.