

Ninth Sunday after Pentecost

Dominica Nona post Pentecosten · II classis · Green

1962 *Missale Romanum*, editio typica, pp. 388–389 · *Credo* · Preface of the Most Holy Trinity

The Propers: Map

Proper	1962 Missal text / reference	Scriptural axis	Connection
Introit (<i>Int.</i>)	<i>Ecce Deus adiuvat me</i> (<i>Ps.</i> 53:6–7, with <i>v.</i> 3)	Psalm of a hunted man	Antiphon takes the later verses, psalm verse the earlier: confidence is sung before the cry for rescue.
Collect (<i>Coll.</i>)	<i>Páteant aures misericórdiæ tuæ</i> (<i>composed oration</i>)	God's ears opened, the petitioner's mouth formed	Grants what is asked only after asking God to make us ask what pleases him. Desire is the thing prayed over.
Epistle (<i>Ep.</i>)	<i>Non simus concupiscéntes malórum</i> (<i>1 Cor.</i> 10:6–13)	The wilderness generation read onto the baptized	Craving, idolatry, fornication, testing, murmuring — then: let him who thinks he stands watch that he not fall.
Gradual (<i>Grad.</i>)	<i>Dómine Dóminus noster</i> (<i>Ps.</i> 8:2)	One psalm verse split at its caesura	Answers the warning against self-estimate with a name filling the earth and majesty above the heavens.
Alleluia (<i>All.</i>)	<i>Eripe me de inimícis meis</i> (<i>Ps.</i> 58:2)	Lament of a man watched by those who mean to kill him	Puts a plea for rescue directly before the Gospel in which the Lord approaches a city that will not know him.
Gospel (<i>Gosp.</i>)	<i>Cum appropinquáret Iesus Ierúsalem</i> (<i>Lk.</i> 19:41–47)	Approach, tears, oracle, Temple action, teaching	Christ weeps, foretells the siege, clears the Temple with a text about prayer, then keeps teaching there daily.
Offertory (<i>Off.</i>)	<i>Iustítiæ Dómini rectæ</i> (<i>Ps.</i> 18:9, 10, 11, 12)	Four verses centonised from a Law psalm	Calls the Lord's judgments upright and sweeter than honey — right after a Gospel in which judgment fell on a city.
Secret (<i>Sec.</i>)	<i>Concéde nobis, quæsumus, Dómine</i> (<i>composed oration</i>)	A <i>quia</i> clause supplying the reason	As often as this victim's memorial is celebrated, the work of our redemption is carried on.
Communion (<i>Comm.</i>)	<i>Qui mandúcat meam carnem</i> (<i>Jn.</i> 6:57 <i>Vulg.</i> ; 6:56 <i>modern</i>)	Indwelling as a reciprocal pair	Eating and drinking named as the way one abides in Christ and Christ in him: the only proper running both ways.
Postcommunion (<i>Postcomm.</i>)	<i>Tui nobis, quæsumus, Dómine</i> (<i>composed oration</i>)	One subject, two objects	One act is asked to confer purification and to bestow unity: a personal fruit and a corporate one.

The four senses

Sense	Synthesis
Literal	Christ weeps over Jerusalem, foretells its siege because it did not know the time of its visitation, clears the Temple with a word about the house of prayer, and goes on teaching there daily (<i>Gosp.</i>). Paul lists what happened to Israel in the desert and says it was written to correct readers like his own (<i>Ep.</i>).
Allegorical	The victim whose memorial is celebrated is the one who wept over the city, and in that memorial the work of our redemption is carried on (<i>Sec.</i>); the Communion says how that work reaches the communicant, by an eating that makes an abiding (<i>Comm.</i>).
Moral	The Epistle will not leave the warning in the past tense: <i>qui se exístimat stare, vídeat ne cadat</i> (<i>Ep.</i>). The Collect asks what makes such a warning survivable — that God form what we ask (<i>Coll.</i>) — and the Offertory calls judgments sweeter than honey to a servant who keeps them (<i>Off.</i>).
Anagogical	What the city missed was a <i>tempus visitatiónis</i> (<i>Gosp.</i>); the Introit answers with a visitation already recognized (<i>Int.</i>), the Alleluia with the plea of one still under threat (<i>All.</i>). The Postcommunion names the end: purification and unity, neither yet complete (<i>Postcomm.</i>).

Scriptural Date and Location

Seven passages are directly appointed. Each has one dossier: a four-field summary, the narrated event where there is one, then a short explanation. Composed orations are not listed; their biblical echoes are not quotations. Psalm citations give the missal's Vulgate number with the English-Bible equivalent; the appendix adds the Masoretic series.

Proper	Citation	Location	Date
Gradual	Ps. 8:2 Vulg. (Eng. 8:1)	Superscription <i>In finem, pro torcularibus. Psalmus David.</i> No place named	Traditional: Davidic, c. 1000 BC
The title claims David and a musical direction, not an occasion; unlike Pss. 53 and 58 it anchors no episode, and nothing fixes a writing place or a moment in David's life. The 1910 <i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i> defends the titles as ancient and canonical while conceding many are obscure. Hebrews 2:6–8 later quotes vv. 5–7 verbatim; the Gradual quotes only v. 2.			
Offertory	Ps. 18:9–12 Vulg. (Eng. 19:8–11)	Superscription <i>In finem. Psalmus David.</i> No episode, place or life stage named	Traditional: Davidic, c. 1000 BC
The Torah half of a psalm whose first half praises the wordless witness of the heavens. Its title carries no historical notice at all, so even the traditional horizon is a bare attribution; Romans 10:18 quotes v. 5, Paul's warrant for hearing the psalm of apostolic preaching.			
Introit	Ps. 53:3, 6–7 Vulg. (Eng. 54:1, 4–5)	Title names the Ziphites' report to Saul; narratives at 1 Sam. 23:19 and 26:1, in the Judaeen wilderness	Traditional: David's pre-royal flight, c. 1010 BC
The title's <i>absconditus est</i> matches 26:1 rather than 23:19's <i>latitat</i> . A title associating a prayer with an episode is received tradition, not proof it was composed then; modern date and authorship remain open.			
Alleluia	Ps. 58:2 Vulg. (Eng. 59:1)	Title names Saul's watch on David's house; narrative at 1 Sam. 19:11, at David's house	Traditional: David's pre-royal danger, c. 1010 BC
The title reads <i>quando misit Saul, et custodivit domum ejus, ut eum interficeret</i> , and the appointed verse matches the Clementine psalter word for word. The horizon is a night of imminent assassination in a watched house: an inherited setting, not a proved date.			
Gospel	Lk. 19:41–47	Writing: place unknown; traditionally Achaia. Audience largely Gentile and non-Palestinian, through Theophilus	Traditional: before AD 70. Modern: AD 80–90
<i>Event: the descent of the Mount of Olives toward Jerusalem (Lk. 19:29, 37), then the Temple (19:45), both in present-day Jerusalem; the last week before the Passover of Jesus' death. AD 29 on the Catholic Encyclopedia's computation, commonly AD 30–33 later; not settled here.</i>			
The <i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i> identifies Luke the physician and Pauline companion and reports Julius Africanus for Achaia; the NABRE reports the same attribution but places composition after AD 70, many proposing AD 80–90, and leaves the place unstated.			
Communion	Jn. 6:57 Clem. (mod. 6:56)	Writing: traditionally Ephesus; the NABRE reports Ephesus, Syria and others	Traditional: c. AD 96. Modern: final form AD 90–100
<i>Event: the bread-of-life discourse, located by Jn. 6:59 in synagoga . . . in Capharnaum — Capernaum on the Sea of Galilee, in present-day northern Israel; during the Galilean ministry.</i>			
The <i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i> argues for John son of Zebedee at Ephesus about AD 96; the NABRE reports that most modern scholars find that evidence insufficient and describes a gospel edited in stages.			
Epistle	1 Cor. 10:6–13	From Ephesus (1 Cor. 16:8), near present-day Selçuk, Türkiye, to Corinth in Greece	Third missionary journey, mid-AD 50s
Pauline authorship is both traditional and the mainstream modern judgment, and <i>permanebo autem Ephesi</i> supplies the writing place. Paul writes into a church he had founded, mixed Jewish and Gentile, divided over food associated with idols. At 10:1 he calls the wilderness generation <i>patres nostri</i> : writer, recipients and narrated desert are three different places.			

The Appointed Formulary in Full

Everything the 1962 *Missale Romanum* prints for this Mass, in the order it prints it: the Latin of the Vatican *editio typica* exactly as the controlling facsimile has it, each element under its own printed heading, scriptural reference and marginal number, and beneath it the English of an identified public-domain witness. All ten texts stand complete below.

Formulary. *DOMINICA NONA post Pentecosten, II classis*, printed pp. 388–389, marginal nos. 1522–1531. Green follows the general rubrics for Sundays after Pentecost and is not printed on those pages. The formulary begins immediately after the Postcommunion of the Eighth Sunday (no. 1521) and ends immediately before the heading *DOMINICA DECIMA post Pentecosten* (no. 1532). Nothing between those boundaries is omitted here. It appoints no Tract, Sequence, second oration, blessing or ritual text, and no second Collect, Secret or Postcommunion.

The Latin. Received liturgical text of the Roman Rite, older than the edition that prints it. No public-domain conclusion is claimed for the 1962 typical edition itself; what permits the Latin here is 17 U.S.C. §103(b), under which a revised edition's copyright reaches only that edition's own contribution and not the preexisting material it reprints. All ten appointed elements of this formulary are printed in the Pustet Missal of Ratisbon, 1862, a tracked public-domain witness; the basis and its bounds are set out in full in the terminal appendix. No rights are claimed in this text, and none of it has been composed, translated, modernised, conflated or adapted for this edition. Every form below was visually collated at 300 and 600 dpi against the CMAA facsimile of the Vatican typical edition, and independently against page images of the 1962 Benziger *editio iuxta typicam*. Where the two editions differ, the Vatican typical reading is what appears here and the difference is tabulated in the detailed commentary.

The English. Scriptural elements are the Douay–Rheims as revised by Bishop Challoner (1749–1752) — the English of the Clementine Vulgate the missal prints — in the Project Gutenberg e-text of that revision. The three orations are the anonymous English of *The Roman Missal translated into the English language for the use of the laity*, first revised edition (Philadelphia: Eugene Cumiskey, 1861), from the three lines that book supplies for this formulary, reproduced with its own nineteenth-century spelling and its abbreviated conclusion “Thro.” Both are public domain in the United States. Neither is an official liturgical translation, and neither is the text of the 1962 books: this English is printed for study, not as an altar book or a hand missal, and none of it was composed, translated, adapted or paraphrased for this edition. Where the registered English does not answer the missal's Latin — and it fails to at four points in this formulary — each gap stands at its element, unfilled.

1. Introit (*Int.*)

<i>Ant. ad Introitum</i> — Ps. 53, 6-7 — marginal no. 1522
<i>Ecce Deus ádiuvat me, et Dóminus suscéptor est ánimæ meæ: avérte mala inimícis meis, et in veritáte tua dispérde illos, protéctor meus, Dómine. Ps. ibid., 3 Deus, in nómine tuo salvum me fac: et in virtúte tua líbera me. V̇. Glória Patri.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 53:6–7 and 53:3
For behold God is my helper: and the Lord is the protector of my soul. Turn back the evils upon my enemies; and cut them off in thy truth. <i>Ps.</i> Save me, O God, by thy name, and judge me in thy strength. <i>V̇. Glória Patri.</i>

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. Three clauses of the antiphon are not answered by that English, which stands as the Douay prints it. The antiphon's closing vocative *protéctor meus, Dómine* has no counterpart anywhere in Psalm 53, so the Douay has none either. The psalm verse sings *líbera me* where the Clementine, and therefore the Douay, reads *judica me*: the English above says “judge me,” the missal does not. And the Douay's opening “For” renders the *enim* that the antiphon drops at v. 6. The doxology cue *Glória Patri* belongs to the Ordinary rather than to this formulary and is a scriptureless liturgical formula; no English is supplied for it here.

2. Collect (*Coll.*)

<i>Oratio</i> — marginal no. 1523
<i>Páteant aures misericórdiæ tuæ, Dómine, précibus supplicántium: et, ut peténtibus desideráta concédas; fac eos, quæ tibi sunt plácita, postuláre. Per Dóminum nostrum.</i>
English: Cummiskey (Philadelphia, 1861), Collect of this formulary, printed p. 414
May the ears of thy mercy, O Lord, be open to the prayers of thy suppliants: and, that they may succeed in their desires, make them ask those things that are agreeable to thee. Thro’.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. Not a missing clause but a shifted subject, and one that matters. *Ut peténtibus desideráta concédas* makes God the one who grants — that *thou* mayst grant to those who ask the things they desire. The 1861 English makes the petitioners the ones who succeed. The rendering is the registered public-domain witness for this formulary; the Latin carries the argument built on the prayer’s grammar, in the detailed commentary.

3. Epistle (*Ep.*)

<i>Léctio Epístolæ beáti Pauli Apóstoli ad Corínthios</i> — 1 Cor. 10, 6-13 — marginal no. 1524
<i>Fratres: Non simus concupiscéntes malórum, sicut et illi concupiérunt. Neque idolólatræ efficiámini, sicut quidam ex ipsis: quemádmódum scriptum est: Sedit pópulus manducáre et bíbere, et surrexérunt lúdere. Neque fornicémur, sicut quidam ex ipsis fornicáti sunt, et cecidérunt una die vigínti tria mília. Neque tentémus Christum, sicut quidam eórum tentavérunt, et a serpéntibus periérunt. Neque murmuravéritis, sicut quidam eórum murmuravérunt, et periérunt ab exterminatóre. Hæc autem ómnia in figúra contingébant illis: scripta sunt autem ad correptiónem nostram, in quos fines sæculórum devenérunt. Itaque qui se exístimat stare, vídeat ne cadat. Tentátio vos non apprehéndat, nisi humana: fidélis autem Deus est, qui non patietur vos tentári supra id quod potéstis, sed fáciat étiam cum tentatióne provéntum, ut possítis sustinére.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), 1 Cor. 10:6–13, from the point at which the lesson begins
... that we should not covet evil things, as they also coveted. Neither become ye idolaters, as some of them, as it is written: The people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play. Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed fornication: and there fell in one day three and twenty thousand. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them tempted and perished by the serpents. Neither do you murmur, as some of them murmured and were destroyed by the destroyer. Now all these things happened to them in figure: and they are written for our correction, upon whom the ends of the world are come. Wherefore, he that thinketh himself to stand, let him take heed lest he fall. Let no temptation take hold on you, but such as is human. And God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that which you are able: but will make also with temptation issue, that you may be able to bear it.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The lesson opens mid-verse. Where the missal prints its own liturgical address *Fratres*;, the Clementine has *Hæc autem in figúra facta sunt nostri* and the Douay has “Now these things were done in a figure of us” — the words displaced above by the ellipsis. *Fratres*: is the missal’s own and is not translated here.

4. Gradual (*Grad.*)

Graduale — Ps. 8, 2 — marginal no. 1525
<i>Dómine Dóminus noster, quam admirábile est nomen tuum in univérſa terra! V̇. Quóniam eleváta est magnificéntia tua super cælos.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 8:2
O Lord, our Lord, how admirable is thy name in the whole earth! V̇. For thy magnificence is elevated above the heavens.

5. Alleluia (*All.*)

Alleluia, no separate heading — Ps. 58, 2 — marginal no. 1526
<i>Allelúia, allelúia. V̇. Ps. 58, 2 Eripe me de inimícis meis, Deus meus: et ab insurgéntibus in me líbera me. Allelúia.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 58:2, between the chant’s own acclamations
Alleluia, alleluia. V̇. Deliver me from my enemies, O my God; and defend me from them that rise up against me. Alleluia.

6. Gospel (*Gosp.*)

+ <i>Sequéntia sancti Evangélii secúndum Lucam</i> — Luc. 19, 41-47 — marginal no. 1527
<i>In illo témpore: Cum appropinquáret Iesus Ierúsalem, videns civitátem, flevit super illam, dicens: Quia si cognovísſes et tu, et quidem in hac die tua, quæ ad pacem tibi, nunc autem abscondita sunt ab óculis tuis. Quia vénient dies in te: et circúmdabunt te inimíci tui vallo, et circúmdabunt te: et coangustábunt te úndique: et ad terram prostérnent te, et fílios tuos, qui in te sunt, et non relínquent in te lápidem super lápidem: eo quod non cognóveris tempus visitatiónis tuæ. Et ingrèssus in templum, cæpit eícere vendéntes in illo, et eméntes, dicens illis: Scriptum est: Quia domus mea domus oratiónis est. Vos autem fecístis illam spelúncam latrónum. Et erat docens cotídie in templo.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Lk. 19:41–47a
And when he drew near, seeing the city, he wept over it, saying: If thou also hadst known, and that in this thy day, the things that are to thy peace: but now they are hidden from thy eyes. For the days shall come upon thee: and thy enemies shall cast a trench about thee and compass thee round and straiten thee on every side, And beat thee flat to the ground, and thy children who are in thee. And they shall not leave in thee a stone upon a stone: because thou hast not known the time of thy visitation. And entering into the temple, he began to cast out them that sold therein and them that bought. Saying to them: It is written: My house is the house of prayer. But you have made it a den of thieves. And he was teaching daily in the temple.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The missal’s *In illo témpore: Cum appropinquáret Iesus Ierúsalem* names a subject and a city that Luke does not name at v. 41; the Clementine reads *Et ut appropinquávit* and the Douay accordingly begins “And when he drew near.” The liturgical incipit is the missal’s own and is not translated here. The reading stops at v. 47a: the Douay’s v. 47 continues “And the chief priests and the scribes and the rulers of the people sought to destroy him,” and the missal cuts before it.

Rubric as printed: *Credo.* · Printed on its own line immediately after the Gospel. A direction, not a text: the Creed itself is in the Ordinary.

7. Offertory (*Off.*)

<i>Antiphona ad Offertorium</i> — Ps. 18, 9, 10, 11 et 12 — marginal no. 1528
<i>Iustitiæ Dómini rectæ, lætificantes corda, et iudicia eius dulcióra super mel et favum: nam et servus tuus custódit ea.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 18:9–12 in full, with the four fragments the antiphon takes in bold
v. 9 The justices of the Lord are right, rejoicing hearts: the commandment of the Lord is lightsome, enlightening the eyes. v. 10 The fear of the Lord is holy, enduring for ever and ever: the judgments of the Lord are true, justified in themselves. v. 11 More to be desired than gold and many precious stones: and sweeter than honey and the honeycomb. v. 12 For thy servant keepeth them, and in keeping them there is a great reward.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. This antiphon is not a quotation but a centonisation, which is why the missal prints four verse numbers instead of a range: it takes v. 9a, the subject *iudicia* from v. 10c, the honey comparison from v. 11b, and v. 12a. The four Douay verses are therefore printed whole with the fragments marked; stitched together, the fragments would make an English paragraph that no registered English witness prints. Read in the antiphon’s own order the fragments say: the justices of the Lord are right, rejoicing hearts, and the judgments of the Lord sweeter than honey and the honeycomb; for thy servant keepeth them. One further difference is invisible in English: the missal writes *nam et* where the psalm has *Etenim*, and the Douay reads “For” either way.

8. Secret (*Sec.*)

<i>Secreta</i> — marginal no. 1529
<i>Concéde nobis, quæsumus, Dómine, hæc digne frequentáre mystéria: quia, quóties huius hóstiæ commemorátio celebrátur, opus nostræ redemptiónis exercétur. Per Dóminum nostrum Iesum Christum, Fílium tuum: Qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitáte.</i>
English: Cummiskey (Philadelphia, 1861), Secret of this formulary, printed p. 415
Grant us, O Lord, we beseech thee, frequently and worthily to celebrate these mysteries: for as many times as this commemorative sacrifice is celebrated, so often is the work of our redemption performed. Thro’.

The typical edition prints the long conclusion here, breaking off at *in unitáte* for the celebrant to complete from the Ordinary; Benziger prints only *Per Dóminum*, and the 1861 hand missal only “Thro’.” The 1861 rendering splits the single verb *frequentáre* and the adverb *digne* into “frequently and worthily to celebrate.”

Rubric as printed: *Præfatio de Ssma Trinitate.* · Printed immediately after the Secret, with *Ssma* under a tilde abbreviation for *Sanctissima*: the Preface of the Most Holy Trinity, which is in the Ordinary. Expanded here from the same book’s own abbreviation practice.

9. Communion (*Comm.*)

<i>Ant. ad Communionem</i> — Io. 6, 57 — marginal no. 1530
<i>Qui manducat meam carnem, et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet, et ego in eo, dicit Dóminus.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Jn. 6:57
He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me: and I in him.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The antiphon’s closing *dicit Dóminus* is the liturgy’s own attribution formula, not part of John 6:57, and therefore not in the Douay. The antiphon also reads *et ego in eo* where the Clementine has *et ego in illo*; the English is “and I in him” either way. The reference *Io. 6, 57* is the Clementine’s verse number, which the Douay–Rheims shares; most current editions number the same clause 6:56.

10. Postcommunion (*Postcomm.*)

<i>Postcommunio</i> — marginal no. 1531
<i>Tui nobis, quæsumus, Dómine, commúnio sacraménti, et purificatióem cónferat, et tríbuat unitátem. Per Dóminum nostrum.</i>
English: Cummiskey (Philadelphia, 1861), Postcommunion of this formulary, printed p. 415
May the participation of this thy sacrament, O Lord, we beseech thee, both purify us, and unite us. Thro’.

The Propers: Detailed Commentary

Each appointed element stands below under its Latin incipit, its printed heading and reference, and the missal's marginal number, with its text in the English of an identified public-domain witness, and then its evidence. The complete appointed Latin has already been printed above, in liturgical order and beside the same English; below, it recurs only where an argument turns on the wording.

Where the English comes from, and what it is not. Scriptural elements — Introit, Gradual, Alleluia, Epistle, Gospel, Offertory, Communion — are given in the Douay–Rheims as revised by Bishop Challoner (1749–1752), which is the English of the Clementine Vulgate the missal prints, in the Project Gutenberg e-text of that revision. The orations — Collect, Secret, Postcommunion — are given in the anonymous English of *The Roman Missal translated into the English language for the use of the laity*, first revised edition (Philadelphia: Eugene Cumiskey, 1861), quoted from the three lines that book supplies for this formulary. Both are in the public domain in the United States. Neither is an official liturgical translation, and where the registered English does not answer the missal's Latin, each gap stands at its element, unfilled.

The text: what two 1962 books actually print

The Latin of this formulary was collated at 300 and 600 dpi against the CMAA facsimile of the Vatican *editio typica* (printed pp. 388–389), and independently against the page images of the Benziger *editio iuxta typicam* of the same year (printed pp. 382–383). The two books are not two photographs of one page; they are two editions, and they differ. The typical edition governs every form printed here, and no form mixes the two; every divergence between them stands in the table below.

Place	Vatican <i>editio typica</i>	Benziger <i>iuxta typicam</i>
1 Cor. 10:8	<i>viginti tria milia</i>	<i>viginti tria millia</i>
Lk. 19:45	<i>cæpit eícere</i>	<i>cæpit eiícere</i>
Introit close	<i>Ÿ. Glória Patri.</i>	<i>Ÿ. Glória Patri. Ecce Deus.</i>
Secret conclusion	<i>Per Dóminum nostrum Iesum Christum, Fílium tuum: Qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitáte.</i>	<i>Per Dóminum.</i>
Collect, Postcomm. conclusion	<i>Per Dóminum nostrum.</i>	<i>Per Dóminum.</i>
Communion reference	<i>Io. 6, 57</i>	<i>Ioann. 6, 57</i>

Two of these are worth more than a footnote. The Clementine Vulgate reads *millia* at 1 Corinthians 10:8, and so does Benziger; the Vatican typical edition prints *milia*. And at Luke 19:45 the typical edition prints the contracted *eícere* where Benziger and the Clementine Vulgate print the uncontracted form. Neither changes a meaning. Both show that “the 1962 Latin” is not a single artefact, and that a reading cited without its witness does not tell the reader what was checked.

Ten places where the appointed text is not the Bible's text

The more consequential collation is against the Clementine Vulgate itself. At ten places, verified directly, the printed missal and the printed Vulgate read differently. All ten are gathered once, in the table below, and each recurs later at the element where it bears on an argument. Because an argument about wording cannot be conducted in translation, the Latin stands on the page here.

Proper and locus	Appointed text	Clementine Vulgate
1. (<i>Int.</i>) Ps. 53:6	<i>Ecce Deus ádiuvat me</i>	<i>Ecce enim Deus adjuvat me</i> — the antiphon drops <i>enim</i> , and the Douay's “For behold” renders the word the missal does not sing

Proper and locus	Appointed text	Clementine Vulgate
2. (<i>Int.</i>) Ps. 53:3	<i>et in virtute tua libera me</i>	<i>et in virtute tua judica me</i> — a different verb, and the one every checked expositor of the psalm comments on
3. (<i>Int.</i>) Ps. 53:7	closing <i>protector meus, Domine</i>	no counterpart anywhere in Ps. 53:6–9; the vocative is the antiphon’s own
4. (<i>Ep.</i>) 1 Cor. 10:6	<i>Fratres: Non simus concupiscētes malōrum</i>	the lesson opens mid-verse; the missal’s <i>Fratres:</i> stands where the Clementine has <i>Hæc autem in figura facta sunt nostri</i>
5. (<i>Ep.</i>) 1 Cor. 10:8	<i>viginti tria milia</i>	<i>millia</i> — orthographic; see the edition table above
6. (<i>Gosp.</i>) Lk. 19:41	<i>In illo tempore: Cum appropinquāret Iesus Ierúsalem</i>	<i>Et ut appropinquāvit</i> — the liturgical incipit supplies a subject and an object the evangelist does not name here, and the Douay accordingly has neither
7. (<i>Gosp.</i>) Lk. 19:45	<i>cæpit eicere</i>	<i>cæpit ejicere</i> — orthographic
8. (<i>Off.</i>) Ps. 18:9–12	one continuous antiphon	a centonisation of vv. 9a, 10c, 11b and 12a; the missal prints four verse numbers rather than a range because the text is built, not quoted
9. (<i>Off.</i>) Ps. 18:12	<i>nam et servus tuus custodit ea</i>	<i>Etenim servus tuus custodit ea</i> — a different connective, invisible in English, where the Douay reads “For” either way
10. (<i>Comm.</i>) Jn. 6:57	<i>in me manet, et ego in eo, dicit Dominus</i>	<i>in me manet, et ego in illo</i> — a different pronoun, and <i>dicit Dominus</i> is the liturgy’s attribution formula, absent from the verse

Two negative results complete that table. The Gradual (Ps. 8:2) and the Alleluia verse (Ps. 58:2) match the Clementine psalter word for word, and are the only appointed scriptural texts of the day of which that is true without qualification. Nothing in the list is a defect in the missal: the Roman Church used an older Latin psalter before Jerome’s Gallican recension displaced it in the Bible, and the 1910 *Catholic Encyclopedia* records that the Roman recension “remained in use in Rome for a considerable time, and at the present day is still used in the Divine Office chanted at St. Peter’s.” That is the natural explanation of a chant text older than the Bible text beside it. Each divergence is verified on the page; the derivation is not established here, because no *Psalterium Romanum* witness was collated for it.

Four attributions the sources do not bear out

Each of these is a claim the standard delivery of the source invites, and each is wrong. The four stand together in this table, and the evidence for each stands at the proper it belongs to.

The claim as usually made	What the sources actually show	Proper
“Aquinas on 1 Corinthians 10 ...”	The exposition of this chapter circulating inside the Thomistic corpus is Peter of Tarantaise’s. Corpus Thomisticum’s own editorial note says the <i>lectura</i> from chapter 10 is lost and the gap filled from him; Larcher’s English prints a bracket in place of the text	Epistle
“Augustine: to suffer for Christ is a human temptation”	The maxim printed in that exposition under Augustine’s name is verbatim Ambrosiaster, a few columns away in the same tradition. It is a gloss-transmission misattribution	Epistle
“Augustine cites the one bread of 1 Cor. 10:17 in Tractates 26 and 27”	The citation is in Tractate 26 only. Tractate 27 turns the clause into a test of reception and does not quote it	Communion

The claim as usually made	What the sources actually show	Proper
“Bede’s exposition of this pericope . . .”	Bede’s Lucan exposition of Lk. 19:41–47 is substantially Gregory’s Homily 39, close enough that whole clauses recur verbatim. What is Bede’s own is the Exodus 12 typology at the end	Gospel

Introit (*Int.*)

Ecce Deus adiuvat me · *Ant. ad Introitum* — Ps. 53, 6-7, with *Ps. ibid.*, 3 · marginal no. 1522

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 53:6–7 and 53:3

Antiphon (vv. 6–7): For behold God is my helper: and the Lord is the protector of my soul. Turn back the evils upon my enemies; and cut them off in thy truth.

Psalm verse (v. 3): Save me, O God, by thy name, and judge me in thy strength.

That English is the English of the psalm, and at three points it is not the English of the antiphon.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. *First*, the antiphon’s closing vocative *protector meus*, *Dómine* has no counterpart in Psalm 53 and therefore none in the Douay–Rheims. Nothing in the registered public-domain English answers it, so the vocative stands here without English. What it asks is plain enough to describe: after the imprecation, the singer turns and addresses God directly by the title the psalm had used of him in the third person a line earlier. *Second*, at the psalm verse the missal sings *libera me* where the Clementine reads *iudica me*; the Douay renders the Clementine, “and judge me in thy strength,” so it cannot be quoted for the missal’s verb, and no other registered public-domain witness carries this chant’s text. The English printed above therefore has the Clementine’s verb, not the chant’s. *Third*, and least consequentially, the Douay’s opening “For” at v. 6 renders the *enim* the antiphon drops, so the English printed above begins one word longer than the antiphon does.

The consequence for reception. The Fathers and the scholastics who expound this psalm are expounding a different verb. In Augustine’s Latin lemma the second half of v. 7 reads *In virtute tua disperde illos*, and he expounds *virtus*; the Introit sings *in veritate tua*. At v. 3 Augustine, Aquinas and Bellarmine all read and gloss *iudica me*, not the Introit’s *libera me*. Quoted for the Introit’s psalm verse without saying so, their exegesis becomes a comment on words they did not have.

St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 53, §§4, 8–9 The controlling image is the Ziphites as those who *flourish*: their bloom is outward and temporary, while the just man’s flowering is hidden. At §8 — the Introit’s opening clause — Augustine’s point is that the help is *interior and present*, not merely future: the glory of the just is the testimony of conscience and the light of God’s countenance “put into my heart — not into my vineyard, not into my flock, not into my cask, not into my table.” At §9 the imprecation is read eschatologically: the enemies flourish for a time and perish for ever. English quoted from the public-domain NPNF first series, vol. 8, where the exposition is headed “Psalm 54” but cites internally as Psalm 53.

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Super Psalmo* 53, nn. 1, 3–4 Aquinas anchors the title in 1 Kings (1 Samuel) 23 and allegorises the Ziphites in the same direction as Augustine. His structural point is that the psalm’s petition is heard twice over: against the enemies’ assault, *ecce Deus adiuvat me*; against those seeking his life, *Domínus susceptor est animae meae*. He then meets the obvious objection to praying that they be cut off at all — *orate pro persequentibus* — and answers that prophetic imprecations admit three readings: as prediction (he notes that the Hebrew has a present, “thou turnest”), as conformity to divine justice, and as spiritual denunciation, since “when sinners cease to sin, then they die and cease to be sinners.”

St. Robert Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos*, Ps. LIII, vv. 4–5, tr. John O’Sullivan (Dublin, 1866) Bellarmine turns the phrase inside out with one sentence: the enemies “had not God before their eyes, but God had them before his eyes.” He reads *Ecce* as “a sudden light from God” and the present tense as certainty, then supplies the concrete deliverance — the messenger announcing the Philistine raid that recalled Saul — and suggests David may have been speaking the words at that very moment. On the imprecation he agrees with Aquinas: “Such imprecations . . . are to be read as predictions; and so this reads in the Hebrew.”

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos* 53 (PG 80, cols. 1265–1268) — Greek-tradition sample Theodoret sets the psalm historically among the Ziphites who “feigned friendship” and betrayed David’s hiding place, then makes it deliberately general: David offered it as instruction so that anyone under unjust attack might pray it. He reads the opening clause as confidence in help coming before long. Alone among the four witnesses here he reads *in veritate tua* — the Introit’s own text — and takes it, strikingly, as addressed to the Holy Spirit. Theodoret was consulted in Robert Hill’s modern English translation, which is in copyright; he is therefore summarised and not quoted, and the PG column numbers above are those printed inline in that translation, not read off a Migne scan.

Collect (*Coll.*)

Páteant aures misericórdiæ tuæ · Oratio, composed oration · marginal no. 1523

English: Cummiskey, *The Roman Missal ... for the use of the laity* (Philadelphia, 1861), Collect of this formulary, printed p. 414

May the ears of thy mercy, O Lord, be open to the prayers of thy suppliants: and, that they may succeed in their desires, make them ask those things that are agreeable to thee. Thro’.

That English changes the subject. The 1861 rendering “that they may succeed in their desires” has a different grammatical subject from the Latin it translates. The missal’s *ut peténtibus desideráta concédas* makes God the agent — that *thou* mayst grant to those who ask the things they desire — and the petitioners the recipients. The 1861 English is the registered public-domain witness for this formulary, and at this point it will not bear the weight of the argument. The Latin carries the argument, and for that reason it stands here.

The prayer is built on a single inversion. An ordinary collect asks that petitions be heard and granted. This one asks that they be heard, and then — *in order that* they may be granted — asks that they first be changed. The purpose clause *ut peténtibus desideráta concédas* depends on the imperative that follows it, *fac eos, quæ tibi sunt plácita, postuláre*, and the printed semicolon marks the join. God is asked to do something to the petitioners before he does anything about the petition.

Two features of the Latin are worth holding, and neither survives into the 1861 English. *Páteant* is not “open thine ears” but “let thine ears lie open”: a state, not an act, and the metaphor is of a door already ajar. And *desideráta* — the things desired — is left deliberately unqualified, so that the prayer never says the things desired are good. It says only that they are desired, and then asks that what is desired be made to coincide with what pleases God.

That is why this Collect reads so pointedly in front of this Epistle. The wilderness generation of 1 Corinthians 10 did not lack petitions; Numbers 11 is a narrative of granted requests. The Epistle’s “that we should not covet evil things” is its way of saying what the Collect asks God to prevent.

No commentary on the wording located. No patristic or medieval commentary on this oration’s wording was located; composed Roman collects of this type carry no ancient commentary tradition comparable to that on the Scriptures. The printed Latin, its punctuation, and its juxtaposition are therefore the whole basis of the analysis above, and no located commentary stands behind it.

Epistle (*Ep.*)

Fratres: Non simus concupiscéntes malórum · Lécitio Epístolæ beáti Pauli Apóstoli ad Corínthios — 1 Cor. 10, 6-13 ·
marginal no. 1524

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), 1 Cor. 10:6–13

[v. 6, first clause: **Now these things were done in a figure of us — the words the missal replaces with its own address *Fratres*:**] ... that we should not covet evil things, as they also coveted. Neither become ye idolaters, as some of them, as it is written: The people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play. Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed fornication: and there fell in one day three and twenty thousand. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them tempted and perished by the serpents. Neither do you murmur, as some of them murmured and were destroyed by the destroyer. Now all these things happened to them in figure: and they are written for our correction, upon whom the ends of the world are come. Wherefore, he that thinketh himself to stand, let him take heed lest he fall. Let no temptation take hold on you, but such as is human. And God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that which you are able: but will make also with temptation issue, that you may be able to bear it.

Where the lesson begins and where it stops. The liturgical *Fratres*: is the missal's, not Paul's, and the bracket above marks exactly what it displaces. The pericope opens mid-sentence at v. 6 — so the assembly does not hear vv. 1–5, where the sea and the cloud are read as a baptism and the rock is Christ — and it closes at v. 13, so the assembly does not hear v. 14, where Paul's "Wherefore" leads straight from divine faithfulness to "fly from the service of idols" and then, at vv. 16–17, to the cup, the bread, and the many who are one body. The Sunday will get to the one bread; it will get there through the Communion and the Postcommunion rather than through the lesson.

The five ruins and their sources. Each clause of vv. 6–10 points at a specific narrative, and one of them is quoted verbatim.

Clause in the Epistle	Narrative in view	What the Epistle does with it
Coveting evil things (v. 6)	Numbers 11: the craving for meat, and the graves of craving	Names desire itself, not its object, as the first ruin — which is what the Collect has just asked God to re-form
"The people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play" (v. 7)	Exodus 32:6, the golden calf	The one direct citation. In the Clementine Vulgate the two run word for word — <i>sedit populus manducare, et bibere, et surrexerunt ludere</i> — and the agreement is a fact about that text, not about every Latin recension. Note Exodus 32:5: Aaron had proclaimed <i>cras sollemnitatis Domini est</i> , so the meal is a cultic meal offered to the true God under an image
"there fell in one day three and twenty thousand" (v. 8)	Numbers 25: Baal-Peor	Numbers 25:9 reads <i>viginti quattuor milia</i> — four and twenty thousand — and so do the Hebrew and the Greek. No witness to Numbers gives twenty-three thousand: the difference is Paul's own, and it stands in his text
"perished by the serpents" (v. 9)	Numbers 21:5–6	The complaint there is disgust at the manna — <i>anima nostra iam nausiat super cibo isto levissimo</i> — which is why the clause can be chained to a Eucharistic warning at all
"destroyed by the destroyer" (v. 10)	The murmuring cycles	Speech is added to appetite and act. The referent is genuinely unsettled: <i>exterminator</i> has no lexical counterpart in the Vulgate of either chapter, and the two Latin commentators anchor it differently — Ambrosiaster at Numbers 14, Peter of Tarantaise at Numbers 16:41

Twenty-three thousand. The tradition did notice. The commentary printed in the Aquinas corpus at this verse gives two options and refuses to invent a third: *sed maior numerus non excludit minorem, unde non dicitur hic cum praecisione, vel forte vitium scriptorum est* — the greater number does not exclude the lesser, so Paul is not speaking with precision; or perhaps it is a copyist’s fault. Chrysostom and Ambrosiaster, who both comment on the verse, do not raise the question at all. The difference itself stands in Paul’s text, and both explanations remain Peter of Tarantaise’s.

St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians 23 and 24* The pericope straddles two homilies: Homily 23 runs to v. 12 and stops; v. 13 opens Homily 24. In 23 he reads the Exodus material in strict parallel — as the gifts were figures, so are the punishments, and therefore “if the one be type, and the other substance, it must needs be that the punishments should as far exceed as the gifts.” He traces the whole catalogue to one root, luxury: from sensuality they “passed into idolatry.” On v. 12 the sin he identifies is not standing but *thinking* one stands: “this is not even standing as one ought to stand, to rely on yourself . . . For our standing here is not secure standing, no not until we be delivered out of the waves of this present life.” In 24 he reads v. 13 as a deliberate descent after terror, and then makes the decisive move: the ability is not natural. “For the ability lies in God’s gracious influence; a power which we draw down by our own will.” The way through is not primarily removal: “He gives patience and brings on a speedy release; so that in this way also the temptation becomes bearable.” English from the public-domain NPNF first series, vol. 12, tr. Talbot W. Chambers.

Ambrosiaster, *Commentaria in Epistolam ad Corinthios Primam, ad 10:6–13 (PL 17)* Ambrosiaster identifies the target with unusual precision: those *qui in idolio recumbentes putabant non esse peccatum* — who reclined at table in an idol’s temple thinking it no sin. He reads v. 12 socially rather than merely morally: it is said to those presuming on the knowledge that all food is lawful, who scandalised weaker brethren while judging the Apostle. And at v. 13 he gives the pericope’s most distinctive reading: *tentatio humana* is not a concession but an exhortation — *Propter Christum ergo pati, humana tentatio est, per quam proficitur apud Deum*. On the “issue” that God makes with the temptation he is concrete to the point of arithmetic: God will either give strength or cut the trial short, “so that he who is known to be able to endure no more than three days is not allowed to suffer on the fourth.” The passage was read in the Migne text of the 1845 printing, where the embedded column marks put the passage at coll. 144–145; other Migne printings of the same work carry a different column system, and CSEL 81/2 was not consulted.

Correction 1: the commentary on this chapter is Peter of Tarantaise, not Aquinas The exposition of 1 Corinthians 10 that circulates inside the Thomistic corpus is not St. Thomas’s. Corpus Thomisticum’s editorial note states *A capite vero X amissa est lectura, ac lacuna repleta ex commentario Petri de Tarantasia breviato forte a Nicholao de Gorran*, and Fabian Larcher’s English translation prints the bracket “[CHAPTERS 7:15–10:33 (nos. 347–581) supplied by Peter of Tarantaise]” in place of the text. Cited as Aquinas at a Marietti number, this material is a text his editors flag as someone else’s. What the passage actually contains is worth having on its own terms: at v. 12 it draws four things out of the verse — the multitude of those falling, the uncertainty of those standing, the necessity of caution, the ease of ruin — and at v. 13 gives *proventum* a moral condition: those do not burst in the furnace *qui non habent ventum superbiae*. **Correction 2 travels with it:** its maxim *Augustinus: propter Christum pati humana tentatio est* is verbatim Ambrosiaster, quoted just above; it is a gloss-transmission misattribution, not a saying of Augustine.

Augustine on v. 13. Two loci were verified in which Augustine uses v. 13, and both are doctrinal reuse rather than exegesis of the pericope: *De sancta virginitate* 47, where untested strength is made a ground of humility — the virgin cannot know whether a married woman is already able to suffer what she is merely spared, since *infirmetas eius temptatione non interrogatur* — and *De bono viduitatis* 17, where the verse is turned against those who make prayer superfluous by claiming the will suffices. His lemma reads *exitum*, not the Vulgate’s *provéntum*. No Augustinian citation of v. 12 was found in the works searched; the *Enarrationes* and *Sermones* were not exhaustively searched for it, so a citation remains possible.

The verse the twentieth century mislearned. Verse 13 says four things, and popular usage keeps only a garbled third. It says that the testing which has taken hold of the Corinthians is *humána* — on human scale, the common lot. It says the ground of confidence is God’s fidelity, not the hearer’s capacity: *fidélis autem Deus est*. It says God will not permit a testing *supra id quod potéstis* — and *potéstis* is plural throughout, addressed to a community, not to an isolated sufferer, a fact the Douay’s “you” cannot show and the modern reader’s “you” actively hides. And

it says that God *makes* something with the testing, a *provéntum*: an outcome, an issue, a way through, which is supplied rather than found. The Douay renders it “issue.” What the verse does not say is that every affliction has been measured to what one person can privately bear.

Gradual (*Grad.*)

Dómine Dóminus noster · Graduale — Ps. 8, 2 · marginal no. 1525

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 8:2

O Lord, our Lord, how admirable is thy name in the whole earth! For thy magnificence is elevated above the heavens.

Here the chant and the Vulgate agree exactly, and the Douay silently shows how the chant is built: the whole Gradual, respond and verse together, is one verse of the Douay–Rheims, printed as a single sentence. The division into respond and verse falls on the *quóniam* that the Douay renders “For,” so that the responsorial form itself carries a logical relation: the wonder, then its reason.

St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 8, §4 Augustine treats the two halves as question and answer — *how* is the Name wonderful throughout the earth? because the *magnificentia* has been lifted above the heavens — and reads that lifting as the Ascension: the glory was raised “from earthly humiliation” above the heavens, and it was the visible ascent that disclosed who had descended. The preceding sections have already read the psalm’s title *pro torcularibus*, “for the winepresses,” of the Churches and the martyrdoms.

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Super Psalmo* 8, n. 1 Aquinas gives the sharpest account of why the second colon is a reason at all. Wonder, he says, arises when the effect is seen and the cause unknown — *Admiratio est quando aliquis videt effectum, et ignorat causam*. God is not wholly unknown, since the creation shows him; but the effect does not manifest the cause perfectly, and therefore he remains *admirabilis*. The exaltation above the heavens then excludes two errors at once: that God is the form of the heavens, and that he acts by necessity of nature. He also insists on *in universa terra* against any restriction of the Name to one territory.

St. Robert Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos*, Ps. VIII, v. 1 Bellarmine anticipates the obvious objection — that in fact few admire — and answers that the Name is *worthy* of admiration whether or not admirers are found, “in the sense that all beautiful productions are said to praise the producer.” He then develops the second colon through an analogy of princely magnificence: God “created the universe for a palace, having the earth for its pavement, the heavens for its roof.”

Why this psalm answers this Epistle. Psalm 8 is the psalm of human smallness under a sky, and its continuation — “What is man, that thou art mindful of him?” — is quoted verbatim in Hebrews 2:6–8, where the argument turns on the fact that we do not yet see all things subject to him. The Gradual quotes only v. 2, and v. 2 is all of the psalm that this Mass sings. But the appointed verse comes from a poem whose next move is exactly the move the Epistle has just demanded: stop estimating your own standing.

Alleluia (*All.*)

Eripe me de inimícis meis · Alleluia, no separate heading — Ps. 58, 2 · marginal no. 1526

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 58:2, between the chant’s own *Allelúia* acclamations

Alleluia, alleluia. √. Deliver me from my enemies, O my God; and defend me from them that rise up against me. Alleluia.

The appointed verse matches the Clementine psalter word for word — one of only two appointed scriptural texts of which that is true — so the Douay answers it directly and leaves no gap. Augustine, however, was reading an Old Latin text: his lemma runs *Erue me de inimícis meis, Deus meus, et ab insurgentibus super me redime me*, with different verbs in both halves. His exegesis is of that text.

An independent convergence. The psalm’s title refers the prayer to the night when Saul set a watch on David’s house to kill him. Three witnesses, in two languages and across eleven centuries, take that guarded house to prefigure the guarded tomb.

Witness	Locus	The reading
St. Augustine	<i>Enarr. in Ps.</i> 58, Sermo I, §§1–4	The title’s <i>ne disperdas . . . in tituli inscriptionem</i> is read of Pilate’s inscription (<i>Quod scripsi, scripsi</i>); Saul’s watch on the house becomes the guard at the sepulchre, and Augustine presses the forensic absurdity of sleeping witnesses. §4 then applies the verse to the whole Christ: it was done once in his flesh and is done daily in his members
Theodoret of Cyrus	<i>Interpretatio in Psalmos</i> 58	Narrates the title from 1 Sam. 18–19 in detail, then says the psalm refers only slightly to David’s own time and forecasts the Passion: the guard set over the Lord’s tomb found the garments but not the body
St. Robert Bellarmine	<i>Explanatio</i> , Ps. LVIII, argument and v. 2	Gives three applications in one sentence: David hemmed in by Saul’s soldiers “as if he were in a prison”; Christ “as he lay in the sepulchre, with guards on it”; and “any just person in danger of death”

Two things follow. The reading is not one author’s idiosyncrasy: a Greek Antiochene and a Latin African reached it independently, and a sixteenth-century Doctor still had it. And it makes the Alleluia’s placement legible: the assembly sings, immediately before the Gospel of the approach to Jerusalem, a prayer that the tradition hears in the mouth of the one who will shortly be sealed in a watched tomb.

No Thomistic exposition. Aquinas wrote no commentary on this psalm. His *Super Psalmos* breaks off at Psalm 54 with *Deo gratias*, and the appointed Alleluia therefore has no Thomistic exposition to compare. Bellarmine is the later Doctoral witness in its place.

Gospel (*Gosp.*)

Cum appropinquáret Iesus Ierúsalem · + *Sequéntia sancti Evangélii secúndum Lucam* — Luc. 19, 41-47 · marginal no. 1527

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Lk. 19:41–47a

[The missal opens *In illo témpore: Cum appropinquáret Iesus Ierúsalem* — naming a subject and a city the evangelist does not name here, and which the Douay accordingly does not carry.] And when he drew near, seeing the city, he wept over it, saying: If thou also hadst known, and that in this thy day, the things that are to thy peace: but now they are hidden from thy eyes. For the days shall come upon thee: and thy enemies shall cast a trench about thee and compass thee round and straiten thee on every side, And beat thee flat to the ground, and thy children who are in thee. And they shall not leave in thee a stone upon a stone: because thou hast not known the time of thy visitation. And entering into the temple, he began to cast out them that sold therein and them that bought. Saying to them: It is written: My house is the house of prayer. But you have made it a den of thieves. And he was teaching daily in the temple.

The appointed reading ends there. The Douay’s v. 47 continues “And the chief priests and the scribes and the rulers of the people sought to destroy him”; the missal cuts before it, and so does the English above. The break is the missal’s, and it is the single most consequential editorial act in the formulary.

The *Credo* is printed on its own line immediately after this Gospel.

The two prophets fused in one sentence

Christ's Temple saying joins two texts that pull in different directions, and both contexts matter.

Text	Vulgate wording	Its own literary setting
Isaiah 56:7	<i>quia domus mea domus orationis vocabitur cunctis populis</i>	The climax of an oracle of <i>inclusion</i> : the eunuch is promised a name better than sons and daughters, and the foreigner who holds fast to the Lord is promised that his sacrifices will be accepted on the altar. What follows immediately (56:9–12) is a savage indictment of Israel's own leaders — blind watchmen, dumb dogs, each turned to his own gain
Jeremiah 7:11	<i>Numquid ergo spelunca latronum facta est domus ista, in qua invocatum est nomen meum</i>	The Temple Sermon, preached in the gate of the Lord's house against the belief that the sanctuary confers immunity: <i>Nolite confidere in verbis mendacii, dicentes: Templum Domini, templum Domini</i> . The charge sheet is theft, murder, adultery, perjury and Baal; the threat is that God will do to this house as he did to Shiloh

Set together, the two quotations say something precise: the house whose vocation is to gather all peoples has been made into the place where the guilty feel safe. And Luke quotes the first of them *short*. Mark 11:17 keeps *omnibus gentibus*; Luke does not, and the Douay's "My house is the house of prayer" shows the shortened form as plainly as the Latin does. The Roman Office, as the continuation of Guéranger's *The Liturgical Year* (Dom Lucien Fromage) prints it, restores the fuller form in its Magnificat antiphon for this Sunday — *domus orationis est cunctis gentibus* — which is a liturgical conflation of Luke with Mark and Isaiah, not Luke's text.

The tears

Origen, *Homiliae in Lucam* 38, in Jerome's Latin (PL 26, cols. 302B–303D) Origen begins from a principle: Christ fulfils in himself every beatitude he preached, and therefore he wept in order to found the beatitude of those who mourn. He then stages an objector who says the prophecy was plainly fulfilled when the Roman army destroyed the city — concedes it — and refuses to stop there. *Nos enim sumus Jerusalem quae defletur*: the weeping concerns *our* Jerusalem, the baptized who sins after the mysteries. "He does not lament over a Gentile, but over him who was a citizen of Jerusalem and ceased to be so." Consequently the besiegers are demonologised: *circumdant eam inimici, contrariae videlicet fortitudines, spiritus nequam* — especially, he adds, when someone is overcome after years of chastity. The only English translation of this homily is modern and in copyright; the Latin is public domain, so the Latin is quoted and the rest is analysis.

St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on Luke*, Sermon 131, tr. R. Payne Smith (Oxford, 1859) Cyril's interest is what a tear proves. The ruin was not God's good pleasure; Christ pitied them. The weeping is a real human act performed as the disclosure of an otherwise invisible compassion — "that we hereby might learn that He feels grief, if we may so speak of God, Who transcends all" — and "the tear which drops from the eye is a symbol of grief, or rather, a plain demonstration of it." The things that are to thy peace he glosses as "the things, that is, useful and necessary for you to make your peace with God," and he reads the hiding through 2 Corinthians 3 (the veil) and Romans 11:25, where the blindness is *in part*. He treats the siege as fulfilled — without ever naming Titus, Vespasian or the Romans — and immediately softens it: Israel "did not perish from the very roots," the apostles being the firstfruits.

St. Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Evangelia* 39, §§1–2 (PL 76, 1293–1301) Gregory preached this homily to the people in the Lateran basilica on this very pericope, and his opening sentence is the one the later tradition repeats: *Flevit etenim prius Redemptor ruinam perfidae civitatis, quam ipsa sibi civitas non cognoscebat*

esse venturam — “The merciful Redeemer wept over the fall of that city, which the city itself did not know was coming.” He supplies the elided verb of the broken sentence: *si cognovisses . . . subaudi, fleres* — understand, “thou wouldst have wept.” That elision is the one grammatical fact of the Gospel that the Douay cannot show, because its “If thou also hadst known . . . the things that are to thy peace” reads as a completed sentence and the Latin does not: *quæ ad pacem tibi* has no verb at all. He names the agents of the destruction, Vespasian and Titus, and argues that not one stone was left from the city’s own later migration to the ground outside the gate where the Lord was crucified. The cause is the unrecognised visitation, clinched with Jeremiah 8:7, where kite, turtledove, swallow and stork all keep their seasons.

The second pass: Gregory turns the whole pericope inward

At §3 Gregory announces a deliberate change of register — *debemus ex rebus exterioribus introrsus aliquam similitudinem trahere* — and then reruns the entire text of the soul. Christ wept once over the city, but “does not cease to do this daily through his elect” over those who fall from a good life. The soul’s *dies sua* is its transitory time. The besieging enemies are the demons — *Qui unquam sunt humanae animae majores inimici, quam maligni spiritus?* — who encircle the dying soul with a rampart built out of its own remembered iniquities; the children dashed to the ground are its illicit thoughts; stone upon stone is perverse thought heaped on perverse thought. At §5 he says God visits every soul in three ways: *praecepto, flagello, miraculo*.

This second pass is where the homily’s weight falls, and the Roman Breviary’s Matins lessons for this Sunday stop at §§1–2 — the historical reading — and never reach it.

The Temple, and who the tradition thinks the thieves are

The striking fact about the patristic handling of the den of thieves is how consistently it is turned on the clergy.

Witness and locus	The reading of the Temple action	Whom it is aimed at
St. Ambrose, <i>Expositio Ev. sec. Lucam</i> IX.16–22 (PL 15)	<i>Deus templum suum non mercatoris vult esse diversorium, sed domicilium sanctitatis.</i> The money-changers are those who traffic in Scripture — “the Lord’s money is divine Scripture” — and not all changers are expelled, since Mt. 25:27 knows good ones	Preachers who debase the King’s image; and, at §19, those who cannot belong in the Church because they <i>sancti Spiritus gratiam nundinentur</i> — who put the grace of the Holy Spirit up for sale
Origen, <i>Hom. in Lucam</i> 38	Presses the letter: Jesus expels only <i>sellers</i> , not buyers, and the only creature named is the dove	The dove is the Holy Spirit; therefore to sell doves is to teach the revealed mysteries for a fee
St. Gregory, <i>Hom. in Ev.</i> 39, §§2, 6–7	<i>ruina populi maxime ex culpa sacerdotum fuit</i> — the ruin of the people came chiefly from the fault of the priests. The <i>spelunca latronum</i> is bribery in the Temple: those who did not pay were persecuted in the body, those who did were killed in the spirit	Explicitly those “who confer the imposition of hands for a fee”; then, at §6, the <i>vita religiosorum</i> that sells justice, and at §7 the conscience of any believer that plots harm to a neighbour

Three facts qualify that table, and each corrects a claim readily made.

Ambrose is not commenting on Luke here. His lemma at §18 is Matthew 21:12 and at §§20–21 John 2:15; he never expounds Luke’s wording. More important, Ambrose has no exegesis of Luke 19:41–44 anywhere: neither in the *Expositio*, which goes straight from the triumphal entry at §16 to the Temple at §17, nor elsewhere in his corpus. He also never quotes *domus orationis* or *spelunca latronum*. The passage is Book IX, not Book X, where it is sometimes placed.

The same passage of Ambrose also expels the Synagogue. In the same section, at §22, he writes that the Jews are expelled *non praescripto aliquo exilio, sed intermino; ut nusquam Synagogae locus in orbe remaneret*. That

is a supersessionist sentence, it is in this very passage, and an account without it falsifies the reception history of this pericope.

Correction 4: Bede’s exposition of this pericope is largely Gregory’s. Bede, *In Lucae Evangelium Expositio* V (PL 92, 570C–574B), reproduces Gregory’s Homily 39 closely enough that whole clauses recur verbatim — *ruinam perfidae civitatis, ex culpa sacerdotum fuit, Sicut templum Dei in civitate est, quotidie Veritas in templo docet*. Bede told Acca that he marked patristic borrowings with marginal initials; Migne does not preserve them. What is Bede’s own is the closing block at 573C–574B: an Exodus 12 typology in which the lamb taken on the tenth day corresponds to the five days between the reception of the Lord near the Mount of Olives and the Pasch — lamb because he takes away sin, kid because he was charged with it; the crowd singing *Benedictus qui venit* brought in the lamb, and the Pharisees’ *Magister, increpa discipulos tuos* the kid. This is the pericope’s own bridge to the Passion, and it is Bede’s.

Augustine and the *Summa* on this Gospel

St. Augustine has no exegesis of Luke 19:41–44. A search of the sermon corpus, all 150 *Enarrationes*, the 124 *Tractates on John*, all twenty-two books of *De civitate Dei*, *De consensu evangelistarum*, the *Quaestiones Evangeliorum* and the letters produced two loci only: *Epistula* 199 (*De fine saeculi*), cap. IV §12, where he is *replying* to Hesychius’s use of the verse and insists that it concerns the first advent and not the second — *sed hoc ad tempus primi aduentus domini pertinet, non secundi* — and one clause in *De sancta virginitate* 28: “Blessed are they that mourn; imitate Him, Who wept over Jerusalem.” *De consensu evangelistarum* II.66 harmonises the triumphal entry and moves straight to the cleansing at II.67, passing over Luke’s unique pericope in the one work devoted to Lucan singularities; and the *Quaestiones Evangeliorum* II runs qq. XLVI–XLVIII, then an unnumbered question on Luke 19:45–46, then q. XLIX, with no question on 19:41–44 at all. Augustine *does* treat *domus orationis* against *spelunca latronum* at *Enarr. in Ps.* 130 (LXX) §§1–3, and the sentence there, though not written on Luke, is the one that most nearly answers this Gospel: *quantum in ipsis est, domum Dei volunt facere speluncam latronum; nec ideo evertunt templum* — so far as in them lies they want to make God’s house a robbers’ den, and they do not thereby overthrow the temple.

St. Thomas never cites this Gospel in the *Summa*. *Luc. XIX* occurs four times in the whole work, each time a different verse (19:8, 19:23, the pounds, 19:10); *flevit* occurs once, inside a quotation from Hilary at III q.15 a.5 ad 1; *spelunca latronum* and *videns civitatem* occur not at all. Where he might have used the tears — III q.15 a.6, on sorrow in Christ — his *sed contra* is Matthew 26:38. Where he might have used the cleansing — III q.15 a.9, on anger in Christ — his *sed contra* is John 2:17. Where he treats simony, II–II q.100, the temple-cleansing texts do not appear at all. Thomas’s engagement with this pericope is real but indirect, and it runs through the *Catena aurea*, which is a compilation and not his exegesis.

What the *Catena aurea* shows about the shape of the tradition

The *Catena* divides the pericope at v. 44 and assembles thirteen excerpts for vv. 41–44 and fifteen for vv. 45–48. Gregory supplies six of the first thirteen and five of the second fifteen, and in both lections he supplies the closing tropology; the Greeks — Origen, Cyril, Eusebius, Theophylact — carry the literal and historical sense. Ambrose, Bede and Augustine appear only in the Temple half, which independently corroborates what is shown above for each of them. The compilation is a map of reception, not a witness: the 1843 Oxford edition’s preface warns that for St. Luke the Greek citations reached Aquinas through translations made for him which often gave “not always the very words . . . but frequently only the sense.”

The reception’s real danger, and the Church’s own correction

The tradition summarised above contains a strain that has done grave harm, and that strain is part of this pericope’s reception history. The most convenient witness is a hand missal companion long used with these very propers: Dom Laurence Shepherd’s English of Dom Lucien Fromage’s continuation of Guéranger’s *The Liturgical Year*, whose 1909 volume introduces the Mass of this Sunday with “Israel had made himself the enemy of the Church; and God . . . punishes and disperses his children” (p. 224), and on the Gospel writes of “the Jewish deicides” and “the apostate nation” (pp. 227, 230). That book supplies none of the English printed in this guide — the Douay–Rheims and the 1861 Cummiskey missal do — but it shows what the devotional reception of this formulary actually said in living memory.

That reading has since been named and rejected by the Church’s own organs, and the correction bears directly on this pericope.

Document and locus	What it says	Bearing on this Gospel
<i>Nostra aetate</i> 4 (1965)	Writes that “Jerusalem did not recognize the time of her visitation,” attaching note 9, <i>Cf. Lk. 19:44</i> ; then states that “the Jews should not be presented as rejected or accursed by God, as if this followed from the Holy Scriptures,” and decries “hatred, persecutions, displays of anti-Semitism, directed against Jews at any time and by anyone”	The Council cites the appointed verse and blocks the inference inside the same article. That adjacency is the pattern: the verse cited, and the inference blocked in the same place
<i>Notes on the Correct Way to Present the Jews and Judaism</i> (1985), VI.1	“The history of Israel did not end in 70 A.D.” and “We must rid ourselves of the traditional idea of a people <i>punished</i> , preserved as a <i>living argument</i> for Christian apologetic”	Names precisely the reading the older devotional commentary embodies, and rejects it
Pontifical Biblical Commission, <i>The Jewish People and Their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible</i> (2001/2002), §§51, 53, 74	§51: he “tearfully foresees” the ruin. §53: “The divine sanction will be the same as in Jeremiah’s time,” followed at once by “as in Jeremiah’s time — God is not satisfied merely to punish, he also offers pardon.” §74: Luke shows Jesus weeping over Jerusalem (19:41–44) and disregarding his own sufferings for the women and children of that city (23:28–31); “universalism does not mean being anti-Jewish”	Supplies the controlling analogy: Jeremiah. The pattern is intra-covenantal prophetic warning, which is exactly what Jeremiah 7 — the text Christ quotes — already was

The pericope’s own quotations settle the register. Christ indicts the Temple with Jeremiah’s Temple Sermon, and Jeremiah was a prophet of Israel speaking inside Israel about Israel’s own sanctuary. The Epistle read ten minutes earlier has already said whose correction the whole thing is: *ad correptionem nostram* — “for our correction.”

The last clause

Et erat docens cotidie in templo, “And he was teaching daily in the temple.” The imperfect periphrastic is durative: not “he taught” but “he was teaching, daily,” and the Douay’s English happens to preserve it exactly. Gregory reads it as grace following discipline, and glosses it in the moral pass as *quotidie Veritas in templo docet* — when Truth patiently instructs the mind of the faithful to avoid evil, Truth is teaching daily in the temple. The missal’s cut, here rather than four words later where the plot begins, means the assembly’s last impression of the day’s Gospel is of a teacher who did not leave.

Offertory (*Off.*)

Iustitiae Dómini rectæ · Antiphona ad Offertorium — Ps. 18, 9, 10, 11 et 12 · marginal no. 1528

The Offertory is the one appointed element for which the registered English offers no continuous counterpart, because the psalm offers no continuous Latin one either: the antiphon is built out of four separated parts of four verses. Stitched into a seamless paragraph, the Douay would present the seam as a translation; the four verses stand whole below, with the parts the antiphon takes marked.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 18:9–12 in full, with the antiphon’s four fragments in bold

v. 9 The justices of the Lord are right, rejoicing hearts: the commandment of the Lord is lightsome, enlightening the eyes.

v. 10 The fear of the Lord is holy, enduring for ever and ever: **the judgments of the Lord** are true, justified in themselves.

v. 11 More to be desired than gold and many precious stones: and **sweeter than honey and the honeycomb.**

v. 12 For thy servant keepeth them, and in keeping them there is a great reward.

Read in the antiphon’s order the four fragments say: the justices of the Lord are right, rejoicing hearts, and the judgments of the Lord sweeter than honey and the honeycomb; for thy servant keepeth them. The construction is faithful to the psalm’s own grammar — in vv. 10–11 it is the judgments that are more desirable than gold and sweeter than honey — but the appointed text is a made thing, not simply “Psalm 18:9–12.” One Latin detail does not survive into the Douay at all: the missal replaces the psalm’s *Etenim* with *nam et* at the join to v. 12, and the Douay reads “For” either way.

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Super Psalmo 18*, nn. 5–7 Aquinas predicates two things of the *iustitiae*: they are *recta*, containing justice, and *iucunda*, “not severe and disturbing, because they are mixed with equity” — hence *laetificantes corda*, on account of that equity and the hope of reward. At n. 7 he reaches the honey and gives three reasons why spiritual delights are objectively greater than bodily ones: the good enjoyed is higher; the power enjoying (intellect) is greater than sense; and the mode differs, since bodily pleasures consist *in fieri et in motu*, and what is only in becoming is never possessed whole at once. The proof, he says, is twofold — by experience, the servant who keeps them, and by effect. Then he presses the preposition: Scripture does not say *pro custodia* but *in custodiendis illis*, because the keeping of them is itself the great reward. The distinction is exactly the one the Douay’s “and in keeping them there is a great reward” preserves and the antiphon, which stops before it, does not.

St. Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. 18*, Sermo I §§9–12 and Sermo II §§9–12 Sermo I reads the law-section christologically — the spotless law is Christ — and produces the image the Offertory most invites: one may already be honey, freed from this life, or still be honeycomb, wrapped in this life as in wax, needing God’s hand not to crush but to press one out of temporal into eternal life. At §12 he insists the reward for keeping the judgments is not some external benefit but the keeping itself. Sermo II reads the same verses pneumatologically and against the Donatists, punctuating each clause with *Hoc est Spiritus sanctus* and turning *iustificata in idipsum* onto ecclesial unity: *non ad rixas divisionis, sed ad congregationem unitatis*. The second sermon is not in the public-domain NPNF English, which prints only the first; it was read in Latin.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos 18* (PG 80, cols. 996–997) Theodoret expounds the five names the Law gives itself — law, testimony, judgments, command, decrees — and assigns each a distinct function, the judgments gladdening the heart by revealing the basis of judgment. He then qualifies the sweetness in a way no other witness here does: these things are worth more than gold and sweeter than honey not to all human beings, but to those truly human, whose life is not comparable with the beasts. Summarised, not quoted, for the rights reason given above.

A variant that changes the mood. Dom Dominic Johner, comparing the Missal with Dom Pothier’s *Liber Gradualis* of 1883 and 1895, observes that the older chant books close this Offertory in the sixth mode and require *custodiet* — “he *will* keep them,” a resolve — whereas the Missal prints the indicative *custódit*. On the older reading, he says, the melody’s close on the half tone “is far removed from victorious certainty. It sounds like a fervent petition.” Of this Sunday specifically he writes only that, after the threatened destruction of the city in the Gospel, the piece is to be sung “in a somewhat more subdued fashion.” Johner’s book was published in the United States in 1940; a search of the standard renewal record found no renewal, which points to but does not establish public-domain status, so he is paraphrased and quoted only in short compass.

Secret (Sec.)

Concéde nobis, quæsumus, Dómine · Secreta, composed oration · marginal no. 1529

English: Cummiskey, *The Roman Missal . . . for the use of the laity* (Philadelphia, 1861), Secret of this formulary, printed p. 415

Grant us, O Lord, we beseech thee, frequently and worthily to celebrate these mysteries: for as many times as this commemorative sacrifice is celebrated, so often is the work of our redemption performed. Thro’.

The prayer’s whole weight is on a *quia*. It does not ask for worthy celebration and then add a pious reason; the reason is the premise, and the petition follows from it. Three Latin words carry it, and one of them the 1861 English has to split in two. *Frequentáre* does not mean “to frequent” in the modern sense but to do a thing repeatedly and attentively — hence “frequently and worthily to celebrate,” where the missal has a single verb and one adverb, *digne*. *Quóties* makes the relation distributive: not “because this is a great mystery” but “as often as.” And *exercétur* is present passive: the work is being carried on, now, here, in the celebration.

This is the one appointed text of the day that the Church has quoted back. *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 2 writes that in the liturgy, and supremely in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, *opus nostrae Redemptionis exercetur*, and its note 1 reads *Missale romanum, oratio super oblata dominicae IX post Pentecosten. Presbyterorum ordinis* 13 reuses the clause — *In mysterio Sacrificii Eucharistici, in quo munus suum praecipuum sacerdotes adimplent, opus nostrae redemptionis continuo exercetur* — and its note 105 identifies the same prayer. The two conciliar uses are not identical: the Decree inserts *continuo*, so the Decree’s is a documented reuse of the clause and not a verbatim repetition. Here, more than anywhere in the formulary, the Latin is itself the evidence: four particular Latin words were carried into a conciliar constitution.

The typical edition prints the long conclusion here — *Per Dóminum nostrum Iesum Christum, Fílium tuum: Qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitáte* — where Benziger prints only *Per Dóminum* and the 1861 hand missal prints only “Thro’.” Since the Secret is said silently and this conclusion is the point at which the celebrant’s voice returns aloud, the difference is not merely typographical for anyone using the book.

The rubric *Præfatio de Sma Trinitate* — the Preface of the Most Holy Trinity — is printed immediately after this prayer, with *Sma* under a tilde abbreviation for *Sanctissima*.

Communion (Comm.)

Qui mandúcat meam carnem · Ant. ad Communionem — Io. 6, 57 (Clementine; 6:56 in the modern critical numbering) · marginal no. 1530

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Jn. 6:57

He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me: and I in him.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The antiphon closes *dicit Dóminus*, which is not part of the Johannine verse and therefore not in the Douay. It is the liturgy’s own attribution formula, and with it a first-person sentence is sung as the Lord’s, not the singers’.

The antiphon also reads *et ego in eo* where the Clementine Vulgate reads *et ego in illo*. Both were checked directly against the Clementine text of John 6:57, and the difference is invisible in English: “and I in him” either way.

Why the verse number differs between editions. The Clementine chapter has seventy-two verses, and so does the Douay–Rheims that renders it; the critical text has seventy-one. The offset begins at critical v. 51, which the Clementine divides in two: its v. 51 is *Ego sum panis vivus, qui de caelo descendi* and its v. 52 begins *Si quis manducaverit ex hoc pane*. From that point on, Clementine equals critical plus one — which is exactly why the missal prints *Io. 6, 57* for a clause most current editions number 6:56. The missal’s number stands here with the other beside it, and the Douay is quoted at its own v. 57, where the same words stand.

The grammar. The clause is a chiasm of persons. *In me manet* moves the communicant into Christ; *et ego in eo* moves Christ into the communicant; the verb is not repeated, so the second half hangs grammatically on the first, which is why the Douay’s colon does the work an English verb would otherwise have to. One act of eating, two

directions of indwelling. Of the ten propers this is the only one whose motion is reciprocal: every other text of the day runs either from God toward the assembly or from the assembly toward God.

St. Augustine, *Tractates on John* 26, §§11–18, and 27, §§1, 6 Augustine builds the apparatus before he touches the clause. At §12 he separates the visible rite from its power — “the sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the sacrament another” — and gives the formula the whole later tradition uses: “he that eats within, not without; who eats in his heart, not who presses with his teeth.” At §13 he brings in 1 Corinthians 10:17, the verse the day’s own Epistle stops four verses short of: “One bread, says he, we being many are one body. O mystery of piety! O sign of unity! O bond of charity!” At §15 he distinguishes the sacrament of the thing from the thing itself, which is the fellowship of the body and its members. Only then, at §18, does he reach the antiphon’s clause: “This it is, therefore, for a man to eat that meat and to drink that drink, to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling in him.” Tractate 27 §1 turns it into a test: “The proof that a man has eaten and drank is this, if he abides and is abode in.” English from the public-domain NPNF first series, vol. 7, tr. John Gibb. **Correction 3:** 1 Corinthians 10:17 is quoted in Tractate 26 only, not in Tractate 27.

St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on John* 47 Chrysostom’s word for the union is mixture: “He that eats My flesh, dwells in Me. This He said, showing that such an one is blended with Him.” The consequence follows as a syllogism — “for if he dwells in Me, and I live, it is plain that he will live also.” He then guards the following verse against a subordinationist reading and insists that the life promised is not bare life, since unbelievers live too, but “that glorious and ineffable life.” NPNF first series, vol. 14, tr. Charles Marriott.

St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on John* IV.2, tr. P. E. Pusey (Library of the Fathers, 1874) Cyril illustrates the indwelling twice, physically: “as if one should join wax with other wax, he will surely see (I suppose) the one in the other,” and then leaven in the lump, so that “the least portion of the Blessing blendeth our whole body with itself.” He draws a pastoral conclusion that runs *against* abstention: those who plead unworthiness will, if they wait until they have stopped stumbling, never communicate at all, since the Blessing is medicinal.

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Super Ioannem* c. 6, lect. 7, n. 976 — and this one is authentic Thomas casts the passage as a syllogism in which the antiphon’s verse is the major premise: whoever eats is joined to Christ; whoever is joined to Christ has life. Taken *mystice* there is no difficulty — spiritual eating is incorporation *per unionem fidei et caritatis*. Taken of sacramental reception he distinguishes, on Augustine’s authority (*Tract. in Ioh.* 26.18, quoted above), those who eat *non sacramentaliter tantum, sed revera* from those *qui in corde ficto ad illud accedunt*, in whom *nullum enim effectum habet sacramentum in ficto*. And he defines the feigning structurally: *Fictus enim est, cum non respondet interius quod signatur exterius* — and what this sacrament outwardly signifies is precisely the mutual indwelling. So the appointed clause functions in Thomas as the criterion by which fruitful reception is told from bare reception.

Johner hears the same structure in the melody, and his observation carries weight because it is arrived at independently of the exegesis: the descending fourth at *in me manet* is answered by a rising fourth at *ego in eo*, “thus both thoughts are placed in strong relief: Thou in me and I in Thee.”

Postcommunion (*Postcomm.*)

Tui nobis, quæsumus, Dómine · Postcommunio, composed oration · marginal no. 1531

English: Cummiskey, *The Roman Missal . . . for the use of the laity* (Philadelphia, 1861), Post-communion of this formulary, printed p. 415

May the participation of this thy sacrament, O Lord, we beseech thee, both purify us, and unite us. Thro’

The Latin is a single sentence with one subject and two verbs, and the *et . . . et* construction makes them equally weighted: not purification *and then* unity, but both at once from one act. The 1861 English keeps the pairing with “both . . . and,” which is the whole of what the argument needs. What it cannot keep is the word order: the genitive

phrase *Tui . . . sacraménti* is split around the address, which throws *Tui* into first position. The sacrament is *thine* before it is ours, and no English sentence of this shape can put that word first.

Two things about the pairing repay attention. First, the two objects match the two fruits the Sunday has been moving toward: purification answers the Epistle’s warning and the Gospel’s cleared Temple, and unity answers the Communion’s mutual abiding. Second, neither is described as accomplished. The formulary that opened by asking God to re-form our desires closes by asking for a cleansing and a unity that are still being asked for.

The Propers: Themes and Movement

This formulary reads two catastrophes — a wilderness generation that fell, and a city that did not recognize its visitation — onto the people standing in the church now, and then hands those people the one thing that makes such a reading survivable: a memorial in which the work of redemption is carried on, and an eating that makes an abiding. The warning and the remedy are not two Sundays. They are one act.

Read in the order the book prints them, the ten texts make an argument in four stages:

1. Help confessed, then desire re-formed. (*Int.*), (*Coll.*)
2. A past disaster refused permission to stay past. (*Ep.*), (*Grad.*)
3. A visitation not recognized, and a house cleared for prayer. (*All.*), (*Gosp.*)
4. Judgment sung as sweetness, and the memorial that carries the redemption into a body. (*Off.*), (*Sec.*), (*Comm.*), (*Postcomm.*)

English quoted in this section is the Douay–Rheims (Challoner) for scriptural propers and the 1861 Cummiskey hand missal for orations, as throughout; the sources are identified in the detailed commentary and in the references.

1. The formulary opens with help already given

The Introit does something the psalm it quotes does not do. Psalm 53 opens with a cry — “Save me, O God, by thy name” — and reaches “For behold God is my helper” only at v. 6. The missal inverts that: the antiphon takes vv. 6–7 and the psalm verse takes v. 3, so the assembly sings the confession of present help first and the plea for rescue second. What the psalm arrives at, the liturgy assumes.

The Collect then does something equally pointed with the grammar of petition. It asks that God’s ears lie open to those who beg; but before it asks that the things desired be granted, it asks God to *make* the petitioners ask for what pleases him — *fac eos, quæ tibi sunt plácita, postuláre*. The printed semicolon after *concédas* carries that subordination, and only the Latin shows it, since the registered English of this prayer does not reproduce it: the 1861 rendering makes the petitioners, not God, the subject of the granting clause. The Church here prays about her own praying. Nothing in the day has yet said why that should be urgent. The Epistle says why.

2. A disaster that will not stay in the past

The Epistle is a list of ruins: craving; an idol feast quoted verbatim from Exodus 32:6; fornication with three and twenty thousand dead in one day; testing answered by serpents; murmuring answered by the destroyer. Then comes the hinge on which the whole Sunday turns. Paul will not let the list remain history: “Now all these things happened to them in figure: and they are written for our correction, upon whom the ends of the world are come.” These things were written for *our* correction — and therefore “Wherefore, he that thinketh himself to stand, let him take heed lest he fall.”

That hinge is the key to the rest of the formulary. Whatever else the day’s Gospel does, the Church has already declared, in the lesson read immediately before it, that the catastrophes she reads out are aimed at the people hearing them. The lesson then closes on the promise that God is faithful and will not allow a testing beyond capacity but will make with the testing an *provéntum* — the Douay’s “issue,” an outcome, a way through — so that they can bear it.

The Gradual answers the sentence about self-estimate not with a rebuke but with a name: “O Lord, our Lord, how admirable is thy name in the whole earth!” Its verse completes the same biblical verse — “For thy magnificence is elevated above the heavens” — so that the whole chant is one verse divided at its own caesura, and that caesura is a *quóniam*: a reason. The man just told not to trust his own standing is handed something else to stand on.

3. A city that did not know the time

The Alleluia is the prayer of a man whose house is being watched by people sent to kill him. Placed here it goes into the mouth of the assembly immediately before a Gospel in which the one approaching the city is himself days away from arrest.

That Gospel has four movements, and the pericope stops before a fifth. Christ draws near, sees the city, and weeps. He names what is hidden — and the naming breaks off: *quæ ad pacem tibi* is a clause with no verb, snapped exactly where the Vulgate snaps it, which is why St. Gregory had to supply *fleres*, “thou wouldst have wept.” The Douay cannot show the break, because its “the things that are to thy peace” reads as a finished phrase. He foretells the rampart, the encirclement, the levelling, and gives the cause: “because thou hast not known the time of thy visitation.” He enters the Temple, drives out the sellers with two prophetic texts fused into one sentence, and then — this is where the reading ends — “And he was teaching daily in the temple.” The missal cuts before Luke 19:47b, where the chief priests and scribes begin seeking to destroy him. The last thing the assembly hears is not a plot against him. It is a teacher who has not stopped teaching.

Two facts qualify that ending. First, Luke’s form of the Temple saying is the short one, “My house is the house of prayer,” without the “for all nations” that Mark 11:17 keeps from Isaiah 56:7, and the appointed text is read without the missing words. Second, the Second Vatican Council cited this very verse. *Nostra aetate* 4 writes that “Jerusalem did not recognize the time of her visitation” and attaches note 9, *Cf. Lk. 19:44*; the same article states that “the Jews should not be presented as rejected or accursed by God, as if this followed from the Holy Scriptures.” The Council read the verse and refused the inference; the verse does not bear it.

4. Judgment sung as sweetness, and carried into a body

What the Church sings at the Offertory, directly after that Gospel, is a centonisation about judgments: the Lord’s justices are right, they gladden hearts, his judgments are sweeter than honey and the honeycomb, and his servant keeps them. It is the least obvious available response to a prophecy of siege. It is also the response the book prints.

The Secret then states, in a causal clause, what is happening on the altar: *quia, quóties huius hóstiæ commemorátio celebrátur, opus nostræ redemptiónis exercétur* — “for as many times as this commemorative sacrifice is celebrated, so often is the work of our redemption performed.” That clause is not this formulary’s private opinion, and its Latin matters, because the Latin is what the Council quoted. The Second Vatican Council took it into the second article of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and identified its source in note 1 as *Missale romanum, oratio super oblata dominicæ IX post Pentecosten*; *Presbyterorum ordinis* 13 reuses it with *continuo* inserted and names the same prayer in its own note. Of the ten texts on these two pages, this is the one the Church has since quoted back.

The Communion says how that work reaches one person: by eating and drinking, in a clause whose halves run in opposite directions — “abideth in me: and I in him.” The Postcommunion asks that a single act bear two fruits, one personal and one corporate: that it “both purify us, and unite us.” The Sunday that began by asking God to form our desires ends by asking that what has been received make us clean and make us one. Neither is described as finished.

Source-Grounded Synthesis Across the Propers

The full formulary does not merely place danger beside consolation. It distinguishes three forms of security. The Introit confesses help that is already God’s gift; the Epistle attacks the imagined security of one who “thinketh himself to stand”; the Communion names an abiding that is received through Christ’s self-gift. The Collect supplies the conversion between them: mercy opens God’s ears by reforming what the petitioner asks. Confidence is therefore neither self-possession nor passivity. It is dependence made capable of truthful desire.

The Epistle and Gospel make catastrophe present without making catastrophe the last word. Paul says Israel’s failures were written for the correction of the eschatological Church. Luke gives Jerusalem’s nonrecognition a human face in Christ’s tears and then ends the appointed passage with daily teaching. The Gradual and Offertory prevent judgment from becoming fascination with ruin: God’s name exceeds the heavens, and his judgments enlighten, warn, gladden, and are kept. The Christian appropriation is controlled by repentance, not by supersessionist triumph.

The orations carry that public warning into worship without reducing worship to moral illustration. The Secret says that the sacrifice’s memorial enacts redemption’s work; the Communion names mutual abiding; the Postcommunion asks one sacramental participation to purify persons and unite the body. Thomas, Augustine, the Second Vatican Council, and the Sunday commentary converge on a theological grammar: the once-for-all Passion bears sacramental fruit, fruitful reception is ecclesial, and unity cannot be detached from conversion.

Read in sequence, the texts make one movement. Received help reforms desire; remembered failure chastens presumption; visitation comes through lament, correction, and teaching; the memorial gives what warning alone cannot produce—abiding in Christ as a purified and united body. The Trinity Preface directs this entire movement toward doxology.

The Propers: Interpretive Possibilities

What this section is

Everything below is exploratory editorial and AI proposal. None of it is sourced historical intent, attributed teaching, or documented reception, and none of it should be quoted as any of those. Each proposal was tested against the corpus checked for this guide and against a targeted search for its own distinctive conjunction; the results of those searches, and each proposal’s controlling limit, are recorded in **research/scope.md**. Evidence, doctrine, and the literal sense of the appointed texts govern; where a proposal and a checked witness conflict, the witness wins.

Editorial proposal — The day begins with the verb the city could not perform

anchors: Gospel (*Gosp.*), *eo quod non cognóveris tempus visitatiónis tuæ*; Introit (*Int.*), *Ecce Deus ádiuvat me*, together with the missal’s inversion of the psalm’s own order.

Mechanism: The Gospel diagnoses a failure of recognition, not of morals: the city is destroyed *eo quod non cognóveris*. The Introit, as the missal builds it, is an act of recognition performed first — *ecce*, look — because the antiphon takes vv. 6–7 and relegates the psalm’s own opening cry to the verse. The assembly therefore begins the Mass by doing, liturgically, the one thing the Gospel will say was not done.

Fruit: Recognising a visitation stops looking like a private intuition and starts looking like something a rite trains. The Sunday supplies not only the warning but the exercise.

What the ordinary reading misses: Taken element by element, the Introit is generic confidence and the Gospel is a prophecy of siege; the inversion in the Introit’s construction is invisible unless the psalm is set beside the antiphon.

Strongest limit: The inversion may be entirely a chant-repertory or centonising habit with no interpretive intent, and antiphons routinely take non-initial verses. *Ecce* and *cognóveris* share no root, the two texts share no vocabulary, and nothing here is evidence about any compiler.

Editorial proposal — The granted prayer is the danger the Collect is built against

Anchor: Collect (*Coll.*), *fac eos, quæ tibi sunt placita, postulâre*; Epistle (*Ep.*), *Non simus concupiscētes malōrum* and the Numbers 11 craving it points at.

Mechanism: The Epistle's first ruin is not an act but an appetite, and the narrative behind it is not a story of refused prayer but of a granted one: Israel asked for meat and got it. The Collect is the only proper of the day that asks God to operate on the petition rather than on the circumstance, and it subordinates the granting to that operation with a purpose clause. Read together, the two texts name a specific and unfashionable danger — being answered.

Fruit: Petition is understood as something to be converted rather than merely offered, and unanswered prayer stops being the only problem worth discussing.

What the ordinary reading misses: On its own the Collect reads as routine piety about “asking rightly.” It acquires teeth only when the lesson immediately following supplies a case in which the request was granted and the petitioners died.

Strongest limit: The Collect never mentions the wilderness; Numbers 11 reaches it only through the Epistle. *Desiderata* is neutral and the prayer nowhere says the things desired are evil — only that they may not be what pleases God. The proposal is a reading of adjacency, not of dependence.

Editorial proposal — Sweetened judgment is not softened judgment: the Offertory as Jeremiah's answer

Anchor: Gospel (*Gosp.*), the Temple action and *spelūncam latrōnum* with its source in Jeremiah 7; Offertory (*Off.*), *iudicia eius dulciōra super mel et favum: nam et servus tuus custōdit ea*.

Mechanism: Jeremiah 7 is an oracle against people who felt safe in the house because it was the house — *Templum Domini, templum Domini*. The Offertory answers with a servant whose relation to the judgments is not security but keeping, and the sweetness is predicated only within that relation: the *nam et* makes the servant's keeping the evidence for the sweetness, not its reward. Theodore says these things are sweeter than honey “not to all human beings, but to those truly human”; the Angelic Doctor's exposition of the psalm presses *in custodiendis illis* to mean that the keeping is itself the recompense. The Offertory is therefore not a change of mood after the Gospel but the precise inversion of the disposition the Gospel condemned.

Fruit: The day's severity and its sweetness stop competing. A person who has understood the Temple sermon can sing about honey without sentimentality.

What the ordinary reading misses: The Offertory looks like a liturgical non sequitur — honey, four minutes after a levelled city — and is usually explained as chant-cycle happenstance or as consolation.

Strongest limit: No checked witness joins Psalm 18 to Luke 19 in this way. Psalm 18 has nothing to do with a temple; the Offertory is a centonisation whose assembly may be much older than any pairing with this Gospel; and the Gospel's severity is not thereby made comfortable.

Editorial proposal — The Gospel's last clause and the Secret's *quōties* share one grammar

Anchor: Gospel (*Gosp.*), *et erat docens cotidie in templo*; Secret (*Sec.*), *quōties huius hōstiae commemoratio celebratur, opus nostræ redemptionis exercetur*.

Mechanism: Both clauses are about iterated action in a present tense, inside a house. The Gospel's is a durative periphrastic imperfect with *cotidie*; the Secret's is a distributive *quōties* with a present passive, *exercetur*. The missal ends the Gospel exactly at the clause that says the teaching did not stop, and then, at the offering, asserts that something else does not stop either. St. Gregory made the equivalent move allegorically — *quotidie Veritas in templo docet* — but he made it about instruction; the proposal is that the missal has already made it about the sacrifice, and made it grammatically.

Fruit: Repetition emerges as the shape of both revelation and redemption in this formulary, which is why the Secret asks for *frequentare* rather than for a single worthy celebration.

What the ordinary reading misses: Element by element these are a narrative detail and a doctrinal clause, and the pericope's endpoint looks arbitrary.

Strongest limit: *Cotidie* and *quōties* are different words with different force — one temporal, one distributive — and the parallel is structural rather than verbal. The Secret is a Roman oration whose date and origin were not investigated here, and nothing indicates that anyone chose it for this Gospel.

Editorial proposal — The Alleluia is sung from inside the sepulchre, before the tears

Anchors: Alleluia (*All.*), Ps. 58:2, from a psalm whose title refers it to the night Saul set a watch on David's house; the documented reading of that watch as the guard at the tomb, held independently by St. Augustine, Theodoret and St. Robert Bellarmine; and the Gospel's approach to Jerusalem (*Gosp.*).

Mechanism: Three checked witnesses in two traditions put this verse in the mouth of the buried Christ. If the assembly sings it there, then the liturgy's order of texts runs backwards through the Passion: the sealed tomb first, the approach and the tears second. The chant's *Allelúia* frame, which sits oddly around a plea for rescue, becomes legible as the position from which the plea is sung — after the outcome is known.

Fruit: The day's lament is heard from a vantage that already contains the answer, which is a different thing from the lament being tempered.

What the ordinary reading misses: On its own the Alleluia is generic distress and its position looks like ordinary chant assignment; the reception history that gives it a speaker is invisible from the missal page.

Strongest limit: The tomb reading is reception, not the psalm's sense; Augustine was moreover expounding a different Latin text (*Erue me . . . redime me*). Nothing documents the missal's assignment of this verse to this Sunday as motivated by that tradition, and Alleluia verses are commonly assigned on musical and cyclical grounds.

The Propers: Notable and Quotable

Three verified afterlives of wording from the scriptural propers, each one a use that moves the phrase into a register its author did not occupy. Two of the three come from the same four words of the Gospel, and the concentration is telling: of everything the appointed texts contain, *spelúncam latrónum* is what English took, kept, and turned loose.

Epistle, 1 Cor. 10:12 — a wordplay cut into a Norwich floor, 1704

Appointed phrase. *Itaque qui se exístimat stare, vídeat ne cadat*, Douay–Rheims “Wherefore, he that thinketh himself to stand, let him take heed lest he fall.” The epitaph below turns on the English idiom that renders the Latin.

Later use and locus. A flat marble at the west end of the nave of St. George Colegate, Norwich, transcribed by Francis Blomefield, *An Essay towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk*, vol. 4 (*The History of the City and County of Norwich*, part II), printed p. 469. The stone commemorates Mr. Bryant Lewis, “barbarously murder'd upon the Heath near Thetford, Sept. 13, 1698,” and beneath him his elder son Jonathan, “who died by a Fall from an Horse, Apr. 7. A. D. 1704, Æt. Suæ 32.” The verse cut under Jonathan's name reads: “Judge me not Reader, Christ is judge of all, | I fell, stand'st thou, take warning by my Fall” — and directly beneath it the mason set the biblical text: “Let him that thinketh he standeth, take Heed least he fall; 1 Cor. 10. 12.”

The turn. Paul's standing and falling are metaphors for presumption and apostasy; the epitaph makes them literal, and does it deliberately. The son really did fall, off a horse, and the stone puns on it — “I fell, stand'st thou” — so that a warning against spiritual self-confidence is re-cut as a memento mori addressed to a reader who is, at that moment, physically standing on the floor of the church. The pun is the point: the verse becomes funerary wit, and the wit is what makes it stick.

Rights and limit. Blomefield's *Essay* (Norwich, 1806 issue of the continued work) and the inscription itself are long out of copyright; the text was read in the British History Online edition. The witness is Blomefield's transcription of a monument, not the monument; whether the stone survives was not investigated.

Gospel, Lk. 19:46 — Ambrose Bierce turns the accusation back on the accusers, 1911

Appointed phrase. *Vos autem fecístis illam spelúncam latrónum*, Douay–Rheims “But you have made it a den of thieves.”

Later use and locus. Ambrose Bierce, *The Devil's Dictionary* (1911), s.v. WALL STREET: “A symbol of sin for every devil to rebuke. That Wall Street is a den of thieves is a belief that serves every unsuccessful thief in place of a hope in Heaven.” Verified in the Project Gutenberg text of the 1911 edition, ebook 972.

The turn. This is a double reversal, which sets it apart from a hundred sermons on financial greed. Bierce first performs the expected secularisation — Christ's charge against the Temple becomes the standard charge against

the stock exchange, complete with a temple standing in for a market. Then he takes it back: the phrase, he says, is not a moral judgment at all but a consolation, and what it consoles is failed avarice. The accusation that once cleared a sanctuary is redescribed as the liturgy of people who wish they had got in. Bierce then extends the joke by citing Andrew Carnegie’s own denunciation of brokers as parasites.

Rights and limit. *The Devil’s Dictionary* was published in 1911 and is in the public domain in the United States. The verbal link is to the Douay–Rheims and King James wording “den of thieves”; Bierce does not cite Luke, and the dependence is on the naturalised English idiom rather than on this pericope specifically. The money-changers usually invoked alongside this phrase are *not* in the appointed Gospel: Luke names only sellers and buyers, and the tables belong to Mark, Matthew and John.

Gospel, Lk. 19:46 — a translator smuggles the Temple into Molière’s Paris, 1908

Appointed phrase. As above, *spelúncam latrónum*, Douay–Rheims “a den of thieves.”

Later use and locus. Curtis Hidden Page’s English *Misanthrope* (1908), Alceste’s closing speech at the end of Act V: “Betrayed on all sides, overwhelmed with wrong, | I’ll leave this den of thieves vice reigns among, | And find some lonely corner, if I can, | Where one is free to be an honest man.”

The turn. Molière wrote no such phrase. His French reads *Trahi de toutes parts, accablé d’injustices, / Je vais sortir d’un gouffre où triomphent les vices* — an abyss where the vices triumph. The biblical wording is the translator’s, and it shows that by 1908 “den of thieves” had become so natural an English container for institutional corruption that a translator reached for it to render a word that means nothing of the kind. The phrase has migrated from a sanctuary full of traders to the salons of the *ancien régime*, and it arrives there through a translator’s ear rather than through any author’s intention.

Rights and limit. Page’s translation was first published in 1908 and is in the public domain in the United States; Molière’s French is of 1666. The dependence is a translator’s importation, verified by setting the two texts side by side; it is not evidence of any biblical allusion by Molière, and nothing here rests on one.

Appendix: Scope and Qualifications

As of 25 July 2026. Everything below states the boundaries of this guide as at that date. Retrieval mechanics, checksums, query detail, discarded leads, and the full reception and proposal audits are in `proposers/verified.md` and `research/scope.md` beside this document’s source; they are not repeated here.

Which edition this is. This canonical full edition prints the complete appointed formulary — the Latin of the 1962 Vatican *editio typica* with the English of the registered public-domain witnesses — and then carries the map, dossiers, commentary, synthesis, and apparatus from the same source leaf.

Edition and formulary identity. The work is the temporal formulary printed *DOMINICA NONA post Pentecosten, II classis*, on pp. 388–389 of the 1962 *editio typica* of the *Missale Romanum* (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis), with marginal numbers 1522–1531. Green follows the general rubrics for Sundays after Pentecost and is not printed on those pages. The formulary appoints the *Credo* and the Preface of the Most Holy Trinity, and appoints no Tract, Sequence, second oration, blessing or ritual text.

Text verification. All ten elements, their headings, references, wording, accents, punctuation, rank, rubrics and both formulary boundaries were visually collated on 25 July 2026 against the CMAA facsimile of the Vatican typical edition at 300 and 600 dpi, and independently against page images of the 1962 Benziger *editio iuxta typicam*. The two editions differ at the points tabulated in the commentary; those are edition differences, not doubtful readings, and nothing was blended or substituted. The appointed text was separately collated against the Clementine Vulgate, and the ten places where it diverges are tabulated in the commentary as verified textual observations. Not printing the Latin in full changed what reaches the page and changed nothing about that collation. The Internet Archive OCR was used only to locate the formulary and controls no published wording.

What this guide is not. It is a hand-missal companion, not a liturgical book, a critical edition, a homily, an assembly sheet for one civil date, or a substitute for the sources cited. It does not treat occurrence, commemorations, particular calendars, or celebration-mode branches for any year; those belong to the edition-specific assembly workflow and require their own evidence.

Translation and received text. The project has composed, translated, paraphrased, modernised and adapted nothing. English for the scriptural propers — Introit, Gradual, Alleluia, Epistle, Gospel, Offertory, Communion — is the Douay–Rheims as revised by Bishop Challoner (1749–1752), the English of the Clementine Vulgate the missal prints, quoted from the Project Gutenberg e-text of that revision. English for the three orations is the anonymous rendering in *The Roman Missal translated into the English language for the use of the laity*, first revised edition (Philadelphia: Eugene Cumiskey, 1861), taken from the three lines that book supplies for this formulary and reproduced with its own spelling and abbreviated conclusions. Both are in the public domain in the United States; neither is an official liturgical translation, and neither was composed for the 1962 books.

Four places where the English does not answer the Latin, and is not made to. The Introit’s closing vocative *protéctor meus, Dómine* has no counterpart in Psalm 53 and none in the Douay; the Introit’s psalm verse sings *libera me* where the Clementine, and therefore the Douay, reads *judica me*, “judge me”; the Communion’s *dicit Dóminus* is not part of John 6:57; and the Offertory is a centonisation of four separated verse-parts, so its four Douay verses are printed whole with the fragments marked rather than stitched into a seamless paragraph. In each case the gap is stated where it falls. No rendering of the project’s own has been supplied anywhere.

Consulted for reception, not for English. Dom Laurence Shepherd’s translation of Dom Lucien Fromage’s continuation of Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year . . . Time after Pentecost*, vol. II, 2nd ed. (Stanbrook Abbey: Burns & Oates, 1909), supplied the English of the appointed texts in an earlier state of this guide and no longer does. It is retained only as a witness to the devotional reception of this formulary, including the supersessionist reading discussed and rejected in the detailed commentary; citing it there is not endorsement of its exposition.

Search bounds. Reception was searched in Latin, Greek in translation, and English, across the major reasonably accessible patristic, medieval and later corpora relevant to each appointed passage: the *Enarrationes*, Tractates, sermons, letters and principal treatises of Augustine; Ambrose on Luke; Origen’s Lucan homilies in Jerome’s Latin; Gregory’s Gospel homilies; Bede on Luke; Chrysostom on First Corinthians and John; Cyril of Alexandria on Luke and John; Ambrosiaster; Theodoret on the Psalms; Aquinas’s psalm, Johannine and Pauline commentaries, the *Catena aurea* and the complete *Summa theologiae*; and Bellarmine on the Psalms. Consequential negative results — notably that Augustine has no exegesis of Luke 19:41–44, that the *Summa* never cites this Gospel, that Aquinas wrote no commentary on Psalm 58, and that the exposition of 1 Corinthians 10 in the Thomistic corpus is Peter of Tarantaise’s — are reported in the commentary rather than concealed. No exhaustive search of Syriac originals, chant manuscripts, untranslated homiliaries, subscription databases or current specialist monographs is claimed, and none of these negatives is offered as a claim about literature outside the corpora named.

Bounds carried by particular claims. Theodoret was consulted in a modern English translation that is in copyright, so he is summarised and never quoted, and the PG column numbers given for him are those printed inline in that translation rather than read from a Migne scan. Bede’s PL 92 columns come from a transcription’s embedded markers, not from a facsimile. Column numbers for Chrysostom, Cyril and Augustine’s Tractates were not verified beyond the volume level and are therefore not printed. John’s 1940 chant commentary shows no copyright renewal in the standard record, which points to but does not establish public-domain status; it is paraphrased and quoted only in short compass. Origen’s homily has no public-domain English, so only its Latin is quoted. Augustine’s second sermon on Psalm 18 is not in the public-domain English collection and was read in Latin.

Psalm numbering. Three series are in use and two of them are routinely both called “modern,” so the dossier sheet prints the two that differ and this appendix supplies the third. *Vulg.* is the Vulgate/Septuagint number, which the missal cites and which the Douay–Rheims carries throughout. *Eng.* is the convention of the King James and Revised Standard versions, which leave the psalm inscription unnumbered and so run one or two verses behind the Vulgate; the dossiers print it beside the Vulgate number. *Heb.* is the Masoretic number of the Nova Vulgata and the New American Bible, which rennumbers the psalm but keeps the Vulgate’s verse division: Ps. 8:2 *Vulg.* is Heb. 8:2; Ps. 18:9–12 is Heb. 19:9–12; Ps. 53:3, 6–7 is Heb. 54:3, 6–7; Ps. 58:2 is Heb. 59:2. The conversions were taken from the concordance registered with the Douay–Rheims edition used here, not computed by this guide; all four psalms of this formulary have a uniform offset, so it holds from the head of each psalm.

Historical bounds. Dates and places in the page-2 dossiers distinguish traditional attribution from current historical judgment and are orienting rather than probative. This guide does not settle the year of the Passion, the date or place of Luke’s or John’s composition, or the historical authorship of any psalm.

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 the Pustet printing of Ratisbon, 1862, which this repository tracks as public-domain text, and six of the ten in the tracked Venice Missal of 1570 besides, 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 either digitisation 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. The project claims no rights in the received liturgical text. Both digitisations used to verify it are third-party artifacts whose own rights status the repository’s source records list as unresolved; neither is redistributed here. Quotations from sources still in copyright are avoided or kept to short compass with attribution, as noted at each point of use. The common reuse notice on the final page states the outbound boundary and does not relicense any of this material. Nothing here is permission to extract and redistribute the incorporated liturgical text independently.

Review state. This document has had internal production review only: source collation, build, and page-by-page visual inspection by the same agent that produced it. It has received no independent liturgical, theological, specialist, rights or ecclesiastical review, and carries no imprimatur, nihil obstat or ecclesiastical approval. The exact published PDF snapshots have distribution authorization under the release record; that authorization does not relicense the incorporated liturgical text for independent extraction and does not constitute any of the outstanding reviews.

References

Only sources actually used above, with loci sufficient to check the claims made from them.

Liturgical witnesses

- *Missale Romanum*, editio typica (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1962), pp. 388–389, marginal nos. 1522–1531. Facsimile: <https://media.churchmusicassociation.org/pdf/missale62.pdf>, PDF pp. 469–470. *Controlling text for every Latin form printed above.*
- *Missale Romanum*, editio iuxta typicam (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1962), pp. 382–383. Page images in Internet Archive item `MissaleRomanum1962RomanMissalColorLatin`, leaves `n458–n460`: <https://archive.org/details/MissaleRomanum1962RomanMissalColorLatin>. *Second 1962 edition, collated for the discrepancy table.*
- *The Roman Missal translated into the English language for the use of the laity*, first revised edition (Philadelphia: Eugene Cumiskey, 1861), Collect, Secret and Postcommunion of the Ninth Sunday after Pentecost, printed pp. 414–415. Anonymous translation, published with the approbation of the Bishop of Philadelphia; public domain in the United States. *Source of the English of all three orations.* Registered in the repository’s source library as `edition.eugene-cumiskey.roman-missal-english-laity.philadelphia-1861`.
- The continuation of Prosper Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year ... Time after Pentecost* (Dom Lucien Fromage), vol. II, 2nd ed., tr. Laurence Shepherd (Stanbrook Abbey: Burns & Oates, 1909), pp. 224, 227, 230. <https://archive.org/details/V11TheLiturgicalYear>. *Cited only for its own commentary as a witness to the devotional reception of this formulary; it supplies no English printed in this guide.*
- Dominic Johnner, *The Chants of the Vatican Gradual* (Collegeville: St. John’s Abbey Press, 1940), pp. 134–135 and 279–282. <https://archive.org/details/chantsofvaticang00john>.

Scripture

- *The Holy Bible, Douay–Rheims*, the Challoner revision (1749–1752), in the Project Gutenberg e-text of that revision (eBook 1581). Quoted for Ps. 8:2; 18:9–12; 53:3, 6–7; 58:2; Lk. 19:41–47; Jn. 6:57; 1 Cor. 10:6–13. *Source of the English of every scriptural proper.* Public domain by age. Registered in the repository’s source library as

edition.english-college-of-douay.douay-rheims-bible.challoner-gutenberg-1581, with its book index, Vulgate/Hebrew/English psalm-numbering concordance, verse-alias table, and collation against the 1899 American edition. None of the verses quoted above appears in that collation, so the printed American Douay–Rheims agrees with the text quoted here at every one of them. Three psalm inscriptions do differ — Ps. 8:1, 53:2 and 58:1 — but this guide cites them only in Latin, in the page-2 dossiers.

- Clementine Vulgate, consulted for Ps. 8, 18, 53, 58; Ex. 32:6; Num. 21, 25; Is. 56; Jer. 7; Mk. 11:15–18; Lk. 19:41–48; Jn. 6; 1 Cor. 10:6–13; Heb. 2:6–8; Rom. 10:18. <https://www.drbo.org/lvb/>
- Nova Vulgata, Jn. 6, for the verse-numbering demonstration. https://www.vatican.va/archive/bible/nova_vulgata/documents/nova-vulgata_nt_evang-ioannem_lt.html

Patristic, medieval and later reception

- Ambrose, *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* IX.16–22 (PL 15). [https://la.wikisource.org/wiki/Expositio_Evangelii_secundum_Lucam_\(Ambrosius\)/9](https://la.wikisource.org/wiki/Expositio_Evangelii_secundum_Lucam_(Ambrosius)/9)
- Ambrosiaster, *Commentaria in Epistolam ad Corinthios Primam*, ad 10:6–13 (PL 17, 1845 printing, coll. 144–145). [https://la.wikisource.org/wiki/Commentaria_in_Epistolam_ad_Corinthios_Primam_\(Ambrosiaster\)](https://la.wikisource.org/wiki/Commentaria_in_Epistolam_ad_Corinthios_Primam_(Ambrosiaster))
- Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 8 §§4; 18, Sermo I §§9–12 and Sermo II §§9–12; 53 §§4, 8–9; 58, Sermo I §§1–4; 130 (LXX) §§1–3. English (Pss. 8, 53, 58 and Ps. 18 Sermo I) in NPNF first series, vol. 8: <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1801.htm>. Latin, including Ps. 18 Sermo II: https://www.augustinus.it/latino/esposizioni_salmi/
- Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium* 26 §§11–18 and 27 §§1, 6. NPNF first series, vol. 7, tr. John Gibb. <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1701026.htm>, <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1701027.htm>
- Augustine, *De sancta virginitate* 28 and 47; *De bono viduitatis* 17; *Epistula* 199 (*De fine saeculi*) IV.12; *De consensu evangelistarum* II.66–67; *Quaestiones Evangeliorum* II, unnumbered question on Lk. 19:45–46.
- Bede, *In Lucae Evangelium Expositio* V (PL 92, 570C–574B). [https://la.wikisource.org/wiki/In_Evangelium_S._Lucae_\(Beda\)](https://la.wikisource.org/wiki/In_Evangelium_S._Lucae_(Beda))
- Robert Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos*, Pss. VIII, XVIII, LIII, LVIII, tr. John O’Sullivan (Dublin, 1866). <https://archive.org/details/commentaryonpsal0000bell>
- John Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians* 23–24, and *Homilies on John* 47. NPNF first series, vols. 12 and 14. <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/220123.htm>, <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/220124.htm>, <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/240147.htm>
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on Luke*, Sermons 131–132, tr. R. Payne Smith (Oxford, 1859). https://www.tertullian.org/fathers/cyрил_on_luke_12_sermons_124_134.htm; *Commentary on John* IV.2, tr. P. E. Pusey. https://www.tertullian.org/fathers/cyрил_on_john_04_book4.htm
- Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Evangelia* 39 (PL 76, 1293–1301). https://la.wikisource.org/wiki/Homiliarum_in_Evangelia/XXXIX
- Origen, *Homiliae in Lucam* 38, in Jerome’s Latin (PL 26, coll. 302B–303D). https://la.wikisource.org/wiki/Translatio_XXXIX_Homiliarum
- Peter of Tarantaise, exposition of 1 Cor. 10 as transmitted in the Thomistic corpus, cap. 10 lect. 2–3. Editorial note: <https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/c1cn.html>; text: <https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/x1c.html>; English bracket in Larcher’s translation: <https://isidore.co/aquinas/english/SS1Cor.htm>
- Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos* 8, 18, 53, 58 (PG 80). Consulted in Robert C. Hill’s English translation, *Fathers of the Church* 101, which is in copyright; summarised only.
- Thomas Aquinas, *Super Psalmos*, Pss. 8 n. 1, 18 nn. 5–7, 53 nn. 1, 3–4 <https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/cps02.html>, <https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/cps11.html>, <https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/cps52.html>; *Super Ioannem* c. 6 lect. 7, n. 976 <https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/cih06.html>; *Summa theologiae* III q. 15 aa. 6, 9 and II–II q. 100, checked and cited for a negative result; *Catena aurea* on Lk. 19, lect. 5–6, in the Oxford edition of 1843, vol. III pt. I, pp. 645–650.

Magisterial and official texts

- Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 2 and note 1 (official Latin). https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_lt.html
- Second Vatican Council, *Presbyterorum ordinis* 13 and note 105 (official Latin). https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_presbyterorum-ordinis_lt.html
- Second Vatican Council, *Nostra aetate* 4 and note 9 (official English). https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_nostra-aetate_en.html
- Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, *Notes on the Correct Way to Present the Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis* (1985), VI.1. <https://www.christianunity.va/content/unitacristiani/en/commissione-per-i-rapporti-religiosi-con-l-ebraismo/commissione-per-i-rapporti-religiosi-con-l-ebraismo-crre/documenti-della-commissione/en2.html>
- Pontifical Biblical Commission, *The Jewish People and Their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible* (2001/2002), §§51, 53, 71, 74. https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/pcb_documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20020212_popolo-ebraico_en.html

Historical orientation and cultural afterlives

- *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1907–1913), articles “Psalms” (<https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/12533a.htm>), “Gospel of Saint Luke” (<https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09420a.htm>), “Gospel of Saint John” (<https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08438a.htm>), “Chronology of the Life of Jesus Christ” (<https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08377a.htm>), and “Revision of the Vulgate” (<https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/15515b.htm>).
- *New American Bible, Revised Edition*, introductions to Luke and John, at <https://bible.usccb.org/bible/>. Summarised; protected text is not reproduced.
- Ambrose Bierce, *The Devil’s Dictionary* (1911), s.v. WALL STREET. <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/972>
- Francis Blomefield, *An Essay towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk*, vol. 4, printed p. 469 (St. George Colegate, Norwich). <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/topographical-hist-norfolk/vol4/pp466-479>
- Molière, *Le Misanthrope* (1666), Act V, in the French of the Louandre edition (https://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/Le_Misanthrope) and in the English of Curtis Hidden Page (1908), [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Misanthrope_\(Moli%C3%A8re\)](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Misanthrope_(Moli%C3%A8re)).

Last revised (UTC): 2026-09-24T17:05:09Z

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.