

Eleventh Sunday after Pentecost

Dominica Undecima post Pentecosten · II classis · Green

1962 *Missale Romanum*, editio typica, pp. 390–392 · *Credo* · Preface of the Most Holy Trinity

The Propers: Map

Proper	1962 Missal text / reference	Scriptural axis	Connection
Introit (<i>Int.</i>)	<i>Deus in loco sancto suo</i> (Ps. 67:6–7, 36, with v. 2)	Three clauses cut from one psalm	God’s holy place is a housed people, and the strength is given to them.
Collect (<i>Coll.</i>)	<i>méríta súpplicum excédis et vota</i> (composed oration)	Two things God exceeds	Pardon for what conscience dreads, and the gift the prayer does not presume to name.
Epistle (<i>Ep.</i>)	<i>Trádidí . . . quod et accépi</i> (1 Cor. 15:1–10)	Delivered creed, then a witness list	Died, buried, raised, seen — and the list ends on one who calls himself untimely born.
Gradual (<i>Grad.</i>)	<i>In Deo sperávit cor meum</i> (Ps. 27:7, with v. 1)	Thanksgiving first, the cry second	Flesh that has flowered again; the versicle is the earlier plea that God not be silent.
Alleluia (<i>All.</i>)	<i>Exsultáte Deo adiutóri nostro</i> (Ps. 80:2–3)	A festal summons, condensed	Take a pleasant psalm with the harp — sung just before a Gospel in which a mouth is opened.
Gospel (<i>Gosp.</i>)	<i>Ephphetha, quod est adaperíre</i> (Mk. 7:31–37; <i>Credo</i>)	One healing, told in gestures	Taken aside, touched with fingers and spittle, opened by one word said with a sigh.
Offertory (<i>Off.</i>)	<i>Exaltábo te, Dómine</i> (Ps. 29:2–3)	A healed man’s psalm	<i>Clamávi ad te, et sanásti me</i> , sung as the gifts are set out.
Secret (<i>Sec.</i>)	<i>sit tibi munus accéptum</i> (composed oration)	One gift, two effects	Acceptable to God, <i>and</i> a support to the frailty of those offering it.
Communion (<i>Comm.</i>)	<i>Honóra Dóminum de tua substántia</i> (Prov. 3:9–10)	The day’s one wisdom text	Firstfruits given; barns filled and presses overflowing, promised at the moment of receiving.
Postcommunion (<i>Postcomm.</i>)	<i>subsídium mentis et córporis</i> (composed oration)	Both halves of the man	Saved in mind and body alike, that we may glory in the fullness of the heavenly remedy.

The four senses

Sense	Synthesis
Literal	Paul hands on what he was handed: Christ died, was buried, rose, was seen (<i>Ep.</i>). Mark narrates one healing in Gentile country — fingers, spittle, a sigh, one word — and a crowd that will not keep quiet (<i>Gosp.</i>). The Communion quotes Israel’s wisdom on firstfruits (<i>Comm.</i>).
Allegorical	St. Bede reads the fingers as the Holy Spirit and the spittle as divine wisdom on a catechumen’s tongue (<i>Gosp.</i>); St. Augustine glosses <i>reflóruit caro mea</i> as <i>resurréxit caro mea</i> (<i>Grad.</i>); St. Jerome reads the Offertory psalm’s title, the dedication of David’s house, as the Resurrection (<i>Off.</i>).
Moral	Bede reads the firstfruits as those of <i>every</i> good work, honoured to God by crediting it to grace (<i>Comm.</i>) — which is the Epistle’s <i>grátia Dei sum id quod sum</i> in the first person (<i>Ep.</i>). Theophylact draws from the command of silence an ethic of benefaction without applause (<i>Gosp.</i>).
Anagogical	St. Hilary, Augustine and St. Robert Bellarmine read the Introit’s power and strength of the resurrection of the body (<i>Int.</i>); Bede reads the filled barns as heavenly satiety (<i>Comm.</i>); Schuster reads help to mind and body as the pledge of the final resurrection (<i>Postcomm.</i>).

Scriptural Date and Location

Seven passages are directly appointed, in four books; composed orations are not listed, their resemblances to Scripture being echoes rather than quotations. Each dossier is a summary row, an event row where a passage narrates one, then a short explanation. Psalm citations give the missal's Vulgate number with the English-Bible equivalent; the appendix supplies the Masoretic series and the two witnesses' general judgments on the psalm titles.

Proper	Citation	Location	Date
Gradual	Ps. 27:7, 1 Vulg. (Eng. 28:7, 1)	Superscription <i>Psalmus ipsi David</i> . No episode, occasion or place	Traditional: Davidic, c. 1000 BC
A bare attribution: no occasion and no musical direction, so nothing fixes a place or a stage of David's life. Theodoret's reading of the psalm as David in flight from Saul is exegesis, not a dated setting.			
Offertory	Ps. 29:2–3 Vulg. (Eng. 30:1–2)	Superscription <i>Psalmus cantici in dedicatione domus David</i> : an occasion named, no place	Traditional: Davidic, c. 1000 BC
The only title of the four naming a dedication, and it drives the psalm's whole reception. Aquinas notes the historical difficulty — David did not dedicate the Lord's house — and Theodoret argues that the letter cannot be David's own building.			
Introit	Ps. 67:6–7, 36, with v. 2 Vulg. (Eng. 68:5–6, 35, with v. 1)	Superscription <i>In finem, psalmus cantici ipsi David</i> . No occasion or place	Traditional: Davidic, c. 1000 BC
<i>In finem</i> renders a term the <i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i> says is “now generally interpreted ‘of the Director’,” marking a collection rather than a date or an event; Jerome rendered it <i>victori</i> . The psalm is a processional but anchors no episode, and the missal takes three clauses from it.			
Alleluia	Ps. 80:2–3 Vulg. (Eng. 81:1–2)	Superscription <i>In finem, pro torcularibus, psalmus ipsi Asaph</i> . Levitical temple choir	Traditional: Asaph or his family, under the monarchy
The one appointed psalm not ascribed to David. The <i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i> makes Asaph a Levite, one of the three chiefs of the Levitical choir, and judges it probable that his family composed the psalms later gathered into an Asaph psalter; <i>pro torcularibus</i> renders a term that “may mean that these psalms were to be sung to some vintage-melody.”			
Communion	Prov. 3:9–10	A father's wisdom instruction; no place named. Traditionally Solomon at Jerusalem	Traditional: Solomonic, 10th c. BC
The two witnesses disagree. The <i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i> (Gigot, 1911) reports Catholic writers “wellnigh unanimous” in ascribing chapters i–ix to Solomon and dates the arrangement only to “either under Ezechias, or as late as Esdras”; the <i>NABRE</i> makes chapters 1–9 an early postexilic introduction. Neither is preferred here.			
Gospel	Mk. 7:31–37	Writing: Rome, for Roman Christians (<i>Cath. Enc.</i>); the <i>NABRE</i> adds a possible Syrian setting	AD 50–67 (<i>Cath. Enc.</i>); often after AD 70
<i>Event: out of the district of Tyre (Arabic Sour) north through Sidon (Saida), both in present-day Lebanon, then to the Sea of Galilee through the Decapolis — for the Catholic Encyclopedia, which names Mk. 7:31 among its three New Testament loci, a region east and south of that lake whose cities lie east of the Jordan but for Scythopolis. Largely Gentile territory, in the Galilean ministry; no year is settled here.</i>			
The <i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i> takes the evangelist to be Peter's interpreter, holds that “it is certain that the Gospel was written at Rome,” says “the date of the Gospel is uncertain,” and settles for AD 50–67; the <i>NABRE</i> reports the attribution to John Mark, notes that the book is anonymous, and prefers a date shortly after AD 70.			
Epistle	1 Cor. 15:1–10	From Ephesus, near present-day Selçuk, Türkiye, to Corinth in Greece	About Easter AD 57 (<i>Cath. Enc.</i>); about AD 56 (<i>NABRE</i>)
Pauline authorship is both traditional and the mainstream modern judgment, and the letter names its own writing place at 16:8, “But I will tarry at Ephesus, until Pentecost.” The <i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i> reaches Ephesus by Paul's itinerary instead, and has Titus carry the letter to a church founded about the end of AD 51; chapter 15 answers people there saying there is no resurrection of the dead.			

The Propers: Themes and Movement

Four of this formulary's ten texts stop exactly where a human contribution would begin. The Collect asks God to add what prayer does not presume to ask; the Epistle's last words are grace not made void, and the missal cuts before the Apostle's labour; the Communion antiphon drops the imperative *da ei* and keeps the filling of the barns; and in the Gospel the man who is healed says nothing at all until the string of his tongue has been loosed by somebody else. What holds the day together is not a theme but a grammar: God acts first, and the texts decline to describe what we add.

The book prints the ten texts in one order and the argument can be read in four stages:

1. A holy place that turns out to be a people, and a body that flowers again. (*Int.*), (*Grad.*), (*All.*)
2. What exceeds merit, and what exceeds request — with the lesson cut one clause short. (*Coll.*), (*Ep.*)
3. *Ephphetha*: one word, and a mouth that will not close. (*Gosp.*)
4. The healed man's psalm, the accepted gift, the overflowing press. (*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 witnesses are identified at each element in the commentary and in the references.

1. A holy place that is a people, and a body that flowers again

The Introit is built, not quoted. The missal's own reference — *6-7 et 36* — announces that three clauses have been cut from three places in Psalm 67 and welded: God in his holy place; God who makes the like-minded dwell in a house; he will give power and strength to his people. Read in that order the antiphon performs a small argument. It names a place, and then says the place is inhabited, and then says the strength belongs to the inhabitants. St. Augustine put the point sharply on the second clause: God is contained by no place, so we should not look for him outside ourselves, but rather, dwelling in the house of one mind, deserve that he should dwell in us — and that place, he adds, grace builds, not merits.

One word of the Introit is a small marvel of transmission, and the evidence stands at the element in the full edition. The chant sings *unánimes*, “of one mind,” where the Clementine reads *unius moris*, “of one manner,” and so, in one form or another, does every checked Latin psalter lemma but one. Augustine did not have the chant's word; he supplied it as his gloss. Peter Lombard passed the gloss on; Bellarmine read it back into the verse. Cassiodorus alone lemmatises it as text. The Introit sings what began as an explanation.

The Gradual and the Alleluia carry that forward in two different registers. The Gradual is Psalm 27:7 with v. 1 for its versicle — thanksgiving first, the earlier cry second, exactly the inversion the Introit performs on its own psalm — and its central words are *reflóruit caro mea*, my flesh has flowered again. Augustine glosses that in four words: *id est, et resurrexit caro mea*. Cassiodorus gives the prefix a history (the flesh flowered in the virginal conception and re-flowered in the Resurrection); Aquinas gives it a span from Adam to Christ; Bellarmine gives it a face (“restored . . . to the bloom of youth, health, joy, and beauty”). Theodoret declines the whole reading and hears a hunted man's recovered vigour. The day sings the verse without settling the question. The Alleluia then does what a festal chant does: it summons the singing — take a pleasant psalm with the harp — and it does so immediately before the Gospel in which a man is given back the power of speech.

2. What exceeds merit, and what exceeds request

The Collect is two clauses of address and two of petition, and the two halves are exactly matched. God is addressed as exceeding both *méríta* and *vota* — what suppliants deserve and what suppliants ask — out of the abundance of his kindness. Then: pardon what conscience fears, and add what prayer does not presume. Below what we deserve, God does not exact; above what we ask, God supplies. The Latin makes *orátio* itself the thing that does not presume, which is a stranger and better sentence than the 1861 hand missal's “we dare not presume to ask”; the two stand side by side at the element in the full edition. St. Thomas states the principle without commenting on the prayer: *Deus multa nobis praestat ex sua liberalitate etiam non petita*.

The Epistle sets the same asymmetry in the first person. Paul delivers what he received — died, buried, raised, seen — and then puts himself at the end of the witness list as the untimely born, the least of the apostles, not worthy of the name. And then the lesson’s last words: *grátia autem Dei sum id quod sum, et grátia eius in me vácuá non fuit*. That is where the missal stops, and where it stops is the single most consequential fact about this reading. The verse continues, in the Bible, “but I have laboured more abundantly than all they. Yet not I, but the grace of God with me” — and every classical exposition of Pauline grace built on this text turns on those unread words. Augustine’s proof of free will is the labour; Gregory’s prevenient-and-subsequent scheme hangs on the single word *mecum*; Aquinas derives *grátia cooperans* from the same clause. The cut is old: the same mid-verse ending stands in the Missals of 1570 and 1862. Two things follow. The Fathers’ teaching on grace from this verse cannot be credited to this lesson: they expound one clause further. And the truncation cannot be pressed into a denial of cooperation, since the very authors whose key clause is missing are the ones who teach it.

3. *Ephphetha*: one word, and a mouth that will not close

The Gospel is a single healing told almost entirely in gestures. Jesus is in Gentile country throughout — Tyre, Sidon, the Decapolis — and the man is brought to him by others. He is taken out of the crowd; fingers are put in his ears; there is spittle, and a touch on the tongue; there is a look upward and a groan; and then one Aramaic word, which the evangelist translates: *Ephphetha, quod est adaperire*. St. Bede reads the fingers as the Holy Spirit, proving it from Luke and Matthew on the finger of God, and the spittle as divine wisdom instructing the mouths of those being catechised; he reads the sigh not as need but as example. The seventh-century commentary passing under Jerome’s name reads the whole itinerary as salvation crossing from Judaea to the Gentiles and names what the loosed mouth first says: *Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem* — and the missal, at the end of this Gospel and no other in the formulary, prints the rubric *Credo*.

Then the closing paradox: he charged them to tell no one, and the more he charged them the more they published it. St. Augustine, in the works checked, treats only this, and takes it as a rebuke to lazy preachers. And the word itself walked out of the Gospel into the sacraments: St. Ambrose says plainly that the Church’s rite of opening comes from this passage, and the *Rituale Romanum* was still printing *Ephpheta, quod est, Adaperire* over the ears of infants in the century that produced the missal.

4. The healed man’s psalm, the accepted gift, the overflowing press

Immediately after that Gospel the Offertory sings *clamávi ad te, et sanásti me* — I cried to thee, and thou hast healed me. It is the day’s one proper spoken by somebody already healed, and it arrives at the moment the gifts are set out. One fact changes that claim: the entire checked tradition, Latin and Greek alike, reads that healing of the Resurrection, on the strength of the psalm’s title, the dedication of David’s house. Jerome states it in one line; Augustine asks who healed a man who was never sick, and answers that the flesh was healed when it rose. To hear the verse as the deaf-mute’s thanksgiving is to read it against the tradition, not with it.

The Secret then asks one gift to do two things — be acceptable to God, and be a support to the frailty of those offering it — and the Communion, uniquely in this formulary, quotes not a psalm but the wisdom of Israel: honour the Lord with thy substance and with the firstfruits, and thy barns shall be filled and thy presses run over with wine. Bede reads the firstfruits at three levels, and the middle one is the day’s own Epistle in other words: a man honours God with his substance who credits every good he has to grace and not to his own powers. The Postcommunion closes by refusing to divide the beneficiary: help of mind *and* body, and, saved in both, *gloriémur* — may we glory — in the fullness of the heavenly remedy. Schuster draws the consequence that the body’s contact with the Body of Jesus is a pledge of the final resurrection, and with that the day’s last word rejoins the first: power and strength given to his people.

The Propers: Detailed Commentary

The ten elements follow in the order the missal prints them. First comes the complete appointed formulary, against which every later claim can be checked; then what two 1962 editions actually print, and where the appointed text differs from the Bible's; then each element in turn, from the complete canonical context of its passage, through the direct exegesis of witnesses who had it in front of them, to later reception — each witness with what he actually argues, and the witnesses divided where the tradition divides.

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 UNDECIMA post Pentecosten, II classis*, printed pp. 390–392, marginal nos. 1542–1551. 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 Tenth Sunday (no. 1541) and ends immediately before the heading *DOMINICA DUODECIMA post Pentecosten* (no. 1552). 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, and all ten again in the Venice Missal of 1570, both of them tracked public-domain witnesses; 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 collation below.

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 translated for this edition. Where the registered English does not answer the missal's Latin — and it fails to at several points in this formulary — each gap stands at its element, unfilled.

1. Introit (*Int.*)

***Ant. ad Introitum* — Ps. 67, 6-7 et 36 — marginal no. 1542**

Deus in loco sancto suo: Deus qui inhabitare facit unánimes in domo: ipse dabit virtutem et fortitudinem plebi suæ. Ps. ibid., 2 Exsurgat Deus, et dissipéntur inimíci eius: et fúgiant, qui odérunt eum, a fácie eius. V̇. Glória Patri.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 67:6–7 and 36 in full, with the fragments the antiphon takes in bold, and Ps. 67:2

v. 6 Who is the father of orphans, and the judge of widows. **God in his holy place: v. 7 God who maketh men of one manner to dwell in a house:** Who bringeth out them that were bound in strength; in like manner them that provoke, that dwell in sepulchres. **v. 36** God is wonderful in his saints: the God of Israel is **he who will give power and strength to his people.** Blessed be God.

Ps. (v. 2) Let God arise, and let his enemies be scattered: and let them that hate him flee from before his face.

¶. *Glória Patri.*

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. Two facts about this antiphon govern its English. *First*, the antiphon is a centonisation, which is why the missal’s own reference reads *6-7 et 36*: it takes the closing clause of v. 6, the opening clause of v. 7, and the central clause of v. 36, so the three Douay verses are printed whole with the sung fragments marked; stitched together, the fragments would make an English sentence that no registered English witness prints. *Second*, at v. 7 the antiphon sings *unánimes* — “those of one mind” — where the Clementine, and therefore the Douay, reads *unius moris*, “of one manner.” The Douay cannot be quoted for the chant’s word, so the word stands here without English; the older-psalter reading behind *unánimes* is discussed in the element commentary below. 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.*)

***Oratio* — marginal no. 1543**

Omnípotens sempitérne Deus, qui, abundántia pietátis tuæ, et mérita súpplícum excédís et vota: effúnde super nos misericórdiam tuam; ut dimíttas quæ consciéntia méruit, et adícias quod orátio non præsumit. Per Dóminum nostrum.

English: Cummiskey (Philadelphia, 1861), Collect of this formulary, printed p. 418

O Almighty and eternal God, who, in the abundance of thy goodness, exceedest both the merits and requests of thy suppliants; pour forth thy mercy upon us: and both pardon what our consciences dreadeth, and grant such blessings as we dare not presume to ask. Thro’.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The English shifts one subject. The Latin’s last clause makes the *prayer* the thing that does not presume — *quod orátio non præsumit*, “what prayer does not presume” — and asks God to *adícias*, to *add* it. The 1861 English makes the petitioners the ones who dare not ask. The rendering is the registered public-domain witness; the Latin carries the argument built on the prayer’s grammar, in the element commentary below. The 1861 “dreadeth” after “consciences” is as printed.

3. Epistle (*Ep.*)

***Léctio Epístolæ beáti Pauli Apóstoli ad Corínthios* — 1 Cor. 15, 1-10 — marginal no. 1544**

Fratres: Notum vobis fácio Evangélium, quod prædicávi vobis, quod et accepístis, in quo et statis, per quod et salvámini: qua ratióne prædicáverim vobis, si tenétis, nisi frustra credidístis. Trádidí enim vobis in primis, quod et accépi: quóniam Christus mórtuus est pro peccátis nostris secúndum Scriptúras: et quia sepúltus est, et quia resurréxit tértia die secúndum Scriptúras: et quia visus est Cephæ, et post hoc úndecim. Deínde visus est plus quam quíngentis frátribus símul, ex quibus multi manent usque adhuc, quídam autem dormiérunt. Deínde visus est Iacóbo, deínde Apóstolis ómnibus: novíssime autem ómnium tamquam abortívo, visus est et mihí. Ego enim sum mínimus Apostolórum, qui non sum dignus vocári Apóstolus, quóniam persecútus sum Ecclésiám Dei. Grátia autem Dei sum id quod sum, et grátia eius in me vácuá non fuit.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), 1 Cor. 15:1–10, to the point at which the lesson ends

Now I make known unto you, brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, which also you have received and wherein you stand. By which also you are saved, if you hold fast after what manner I preached unto you, unless you have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all, which I also received: how that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures: And that he was buried: and that he rose again the third day, according to the scriptures: And that he was seen by Cephas, and after that by the eleven. Then was he seen by more than five hundred brethren at once: of whom many remain until this present, and some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen by James: then by all the apostles. And last of all, he was seen also by me, as by one born out of due time. For I am the least of the apostles, who am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. But by the grace of God, I am what I am. And his grace in me hath not been void . . .

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. Two boundaries, both the missal’s. The lesson opens on the missal’s own address: where it prints *Fratres*:, the Clementine reads *Notum autem vobis fácio, fratres* — Paul’s “brethren” stands mid-clause, and the Douay accordingly begins “Now I make known unto you, brethren.” And the lesson ends mid-verse: the Douay’s v. 10 continues “but I have laboured more abundantly than all they. Yet not I, but the grace of God with me,” and the missal cuts before it, so the reading’s last word is grace not made void, not the Apostle’s labour. The same ending stands in the 1570 and 1862 Missals; it is the received lectionary boundary. Neither clause is supplied here.

4. Gradual (*Grad.*)

Graduale — Ps. 27, 7 et 1 — marginal no. 1545

In Deo sperávit cor meum, et adiútus sum: et reflóruit caro mea, et ex voluntáte mea confitébor illi. V. Ad te, Dómine, clamávi: Deus meus, ne síleas, ne discédas a me.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 27:7 and 27:1 in full, with the sung words in bold

v. 7 The Lord is my helper and my protector: **in him hath my heart confided, and I have been helped. And my flesh hath flourished again, and with my will I will give praise to him.** **v. 1** A psalm for David himself. **Unto thee will I cry, O Lord: O my God, be not thou silent to me:** lest if thou be silent to me, I become like them that go down into the pit.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. Three differences. *First*, the chant opens *In Deo sperávit* where the Clementine reads *in ipso sperávit* — “in him,” resuming the verse’s own opening *Dóminus adiútor meus* which the chant does not sing — so the Douay’s “in him” renders a pronoun the chant replaces with the divine name. *Second*, the versicle sings *clamávi*, “I have cried,” where the Clementine has the future *clamábo* and the Douay accordingly “will I cry.” *Third*, the versicle’s closing *ne discédas a me*, “depart not from me,” has no counterpart in the Clementine verse and therefore none in the Douay, and it stands here in Latin alone. One American-edition difference falls inside the unsung clause printed above: the 1899 printing reads “lest thou be silent” where this e-text reads “lest if thou be silent.”

5. Alleluia (*All.*)

Alleluia, no separate heading — Ps. 80, 2-3 — marginal no. 1546

Allelúia, allelúia. V. Ps. 80, 2-3 Exsultáte Deo adiútóri nostro, iubiláte Deo Iacob: súmíte psalmum iucúndum cum cíthara. Allelúia.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 80:2–3 in full, with the sung words in bold

v. 2 Rejoice to God our helper: sing aloud to the God of Jacob. **v. 3** Take a psalm, and bring hither the timbrel: the pleasant psaltery **with the harp.**

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The verse condenses Ps. 80:3: the Clementine reads *Súmíte psalmum, et date tympanum; psaltérium iucúndum, cum cíthara*, and the chant drops the timbrel and the psaltery, attaching *iucúndum* — “pleasant” — to the psalm where the Bible attaches it to the psaltery. The Douay verse is therefore printed whole with the sung fragments marked; read in the chant’s own order they say: take a pleasant psalm with the harp. No registered English joins them into one sentence.

6. Gospel (*Gosp.*)

+ <i>Sequéntia sancti Evangélíi secúndum Marcum</i> — Marc. 7, 31-37 — marginal no. 1547
<i>In illo témpore: Exiens Iesus de fínibus Tyri, venit per Sidónem ad mare Galilææ, inter médios fines Decapóleos. Et addúcunt ei surdum et mutum, et deprecabántur eum, ut impónat illi manum. Et apprehéndens eum de turba seórsum, misit dígitos suos in aurículas eius: et éxspuens, tétigit linguam eius: et suspiciens in cælum, ingémuit, et ait illi: Ephphetha, quod est adaperíre. Et statim apértæ sunt aures eius, et solútum est vínculum linguæ eius, et loquebátur recte. Et præcépit illis, ne cui dicerent. Quanto autem eis præcipiebat, tanto magis plus prædicábant: et eo ámplius admirábantur, dicéntes: Bene ómnia fecit: et surdos fecit audíre, et mutos loquí.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Mk. 7:31–37 And again going out of the coasts of Tyre, he came by Sidon to the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis. And they bring to him one deaf and dumb: and they besought him that he would lay his hand upon him. And taking him from the multitude apart, he put his fingers into his ears: and spitting, he touched his tongue. And looking up to heaven, he groaned and said to him: Ephpheta, which is, Be thou opened. And immediately his ears were opened and the string of his tongue was loosed and he spoke right. And he charged them that they should tell no man. But the more he charged them, so much the more a great deal did they publish it. And so much the more did they wonder, saying: He hath done all things well. He hath made both the deaf to hear and the dumb to speak.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The missal’s *In illo témpore: Exiens Iesus de fínibus Tyri* names a subject Mark does not name at v. 31 and drops the evangelist’s *íterum* — the “again” that ties this journey back to the earlier Tyre episode — which the Douay’s opening “And again going out” renders. The liturgical incipit is the missal’s own and is not translated here. Missal and Douay also differ in one transliteration: the missal prints *Ephphetha*, with the second aspirate, and the Douay prints “Ephpheta.”

Rubric as printed: *Credo.* · Printed run-on, right-aligned at the end of the Gospel’s last line. A direction, not a text: the Creed itself is in the Ordinary.

7. Offertory (*Off.*)

<i>Ant. ad Offertorium</i> — Ps. 29, 2-3 — marginal no. 1548
<i>Exaltábo te, Dómine, quóniam suscepísti me, nec delectásti inimícos meos super me: Dómine, clamávi ad te, et sanásti me.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 29:2–3 in full, with the sung words in bold
v. 2 I will extol thee, O Lord, for thou hast upheld me: and hast not made my enemies to rejoice over me. v. 3 O Lord my God, I have cried to thee, and thou hast healed me.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The antiphon sings v. 2 whole and drops *Deus meus* from v. 3’s opening vocative: the Clementine reads *Dómine Deus meus, clamávi ad te*, and the Douay’s “O Lord my God” renders the words the chant does not carry. The verses are printed whole with the sung words marked, so the unsung words stay visible beside the sung ones.

8. Secret (*Sec.*)

***Secreta* — marginal no. 1549**

Réspice, Dómine, quæsumus, nostram propítius servitútem: ut, quod offérimus, sit tibi munus accéptum, et sit nostræ fragilitátis subsidium. Per Dóminum.

English: Cummiskey (Philadelphia, 1861), Secret of this formulary, printed p. 420

Look down, O Lord, we beseech thee, on our homage: that the offerings we make may be acceptable to thee, and a help to our weakness. Thro’.

The 1861 book prints no incipit for this Secret; its lines answer the appointed Latin clause for clause — “our homage” answering *nostram . . . servitútem*, “a help to our weakness” answering *nostræ fragilitátis subsidium* — and the neighbouring Sundays’ orations confirm that the filing does not slip by one.

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.*)

***Ant. ad Communionem* — Prov. 3, 9-10 — marginal no. 1550**

Honóra Dóminum de tua substántia, et de primítiis frugum tuárum: et implebúntur hórrea tua saturitáte, et vino torculária redundábunt.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Prov. 3:9–10 in full, with the sung words in bold

v. 9 Honour the Lord with thy substance, and give him of the first of all thy fruits; v. 10 And thy barns shall be filled with abundance, and thy presses shall run over with wine.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The antiphon compresses the Clementine at three points: v. 9 loses *ómnium* (“all”) and the closing imperative *da ei* (“give him”), and v. 10 loses the second *tua*. The Douay verses are printed whole with the sung words marked; the antiphon’s own reading is the Latin above, and no registered English joins it.

10. Postcommunion (*Postcomm.*)

***Postcommunio* — marginal no. 1551**

Sentiámus, quæsumus, Dómine, tui perceptióne sacraménti, subsidium mentis et córporis: ut, in utróque salváti, cæléstis remédii plenitúdine gloriémur. Per Dóminum.

English: Cummiskey (Philadelphia, 1861), Postcommunion of this formulary, printed p. 420

May we receive, by the participation of these thy mysteries, we beseech thee, O Lord, help in body and mind: that in the salvation of both we may enjoy the full effect of this heavenly remedy. Thro’.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. Two things shift in the English. The Latin’s pair is *mentis et córporis* — mind first, body second — and the 1861 English inverts it to “body and mind.” And the Latin’s last verb is *gloriémur*, “may we glory” in the fullness of the heavenly remedy; the 1861 “enjoy the full effect” keeps the petition and loses the boast. The prayer’s grammar is discussed on the Latin in the element commentary below.

The text: what two 1962 books actually print

The Latin above was collated at 300 and 600 dpi — 1200 dpi for the Gospel’s unaccented opening line — against the CMAA facsimile of the Vatican *editio typica* (printed pp. 390–392), and independently against page images of the Benziger *editio iuxta typicam* of the same year (printed pp. 385–386). The two books are not two photographs of one page. They are two editions of one revision, and they differ in nine places; every form printed follows the typical edition, and none mixes the two.

Place	Vatican <i>editio typica</i>	Benziger <i>iuxta typicam</i>
Introit close	<i>Ÿ. Glória Patri.</i> and stop	<i>Ÿ. Glória Patri. Deus.</i> — the printed cue to repeat the antiphon
Introit	<i>ipse dabit virtutem et fortitudinem</i>	<i>ipse dabit virtutem, et fortitudinem</i>
Chant headings	<i>Ant. ad Introitum, Ant. ad Offertorium, Ant. ad Communionem</i>	<i>Antiphona ad . . .</i> in all three places
Collect	<i>Deus, qui, abundántia pietátis tuæ, et mérita</i>	<i>Deus, qui abundántia pietátis tuæ, et mérita</i> — the first comma dropped
Collect	<i>et adícias</i>	<i>et adiicias</i>
Collect conclusion	<i>Per Dóminum nostrum.</i>	<i>Per Dóminum.</i>
Epistle heading	<i>ad Corínthios.</i> with the reference on the same line	reference on its own line
Gradual layout	<i>Graduale</i> heading, text on a new line	heading, reference and text run in
Postcommunion	<i>ut, in utróque salváti,</i>	<i>ut in utróque salváti,</i>

Two of these bear on the commentary rather than on the eye. The typical edition’s comma pair around *abundántia pietátis tuæ* marks that ablative as parenthetical to *qui . . . excédis*, which is exactly the reading the argument below makes of the prayer; Benziger’s single comma leaves it open whether the ablative attaches forward or back. And *adícias* against *adiicias* is the same contracted/uncontracted class that separates the two editions elsewhere; the 1862 Pustet hand missal prints *adjicias*, so three books spell one verb three ways. The Secret’s conclusion is the short *Per Dóminum.* in both witnesses. Every reading in both books is legible without a third witness.

Eleven places where the appointed text is not the Bible’s text

The consequential collation is not between the two 1962 books but between the appointed text and the Clementine Vulgate the Douay–Rheims renders. At eleven places, verified directly, the printed missal and the printed Vulgate read differently. All eleven are gathered once, in the table below, and each recurs 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. 67:6–7, 36	one continuous antiphon	a centonisation of v. 6b, v. 7a and v. 36b, declared by the missal’s own triple reference
2. (<i>Int.</i>) Ps. 67:7	<i>unánimes in domo</i>	<i>unius moris in domo</i> — a different reading, not a spelling; see below
3. (<i>Ep.</i>) 1 Cor. 15:1	<i>Fratres: Notum vobis fácio</i>	<i>Notum autem vobis fácio, fratres</i> — the address moves forward, <i>autem</i> goes
4. (<i>Ep.</i>) 1 Cor. 15:10	ends <i>in me vácuá non fuit.</i>	the verse continues <i>sed abundántius illis ómnibus laborávi: non ego autem, sed grátia Dei mecum</i>
5. (<i>Grad.</i>) Ps. 27:7	<i>In Deo sperávit cor meum</i>	<i>in ipso sperávit cor meum</i> , after an opening <i>Dóminus adjútor meus et protéctor meus</i> the chant does not sing
6. (<i>Grad.</i>) Ps. 27:7	<i>confitébor illi</i>	<i>confitébor ei</i>
7. (<i>Grad.</i>) Ps. 27:1	<i>clamávi . . . ne síleas, ne discédas a me</i>	<i>clamábo . . . ne síleas a me: nequándo táceas a me, et assimilábor descendéntibus in lacum</i>

Proper and locus	Appointed text	Clementine Vulgate
8. (<i>All.</i>) Ps. 80:3	<i>súmíte psalmum iucúndum cum cíthara</i>	<i>Súmíte psalmum, et date tympanum; psaltérium iucúndum, cum cíthara</i>
9. (<i>Gosp.</i>) Mk. 7:31	<i>In illo témpore: Exiens Iesus</i>	<i>Et iterum éxiens</i> — the incipit supplies a subject and drops Mark's <i>iterum</i>
10. (<i>Off.</i>) Ps. 29:3	<i>Dómine, clamávi ad te</i>	<i>Dómine Deus meus, clamávi ad te</i>
11. (<i>Comm.</i>) Prov. 3:9–10	<i>de primítiis frugum tuárum ... torculária redundábunt</i>	<i>de primítiis ómnium frugum tuárum da ei ... torculária tua redundábunt</i>

The matches complete that table, and they weigh as much as the divergences. The Alleluia's first verse (Ps. 80:2) and the Offertory's first verse (Ps. 29:2) match the Clementine word for word; so do the Gospel from v. 32 onward and the Epistle from v. 2 to the cut in v. 10, orthography aside. One further question stays open rather than counted as a divergence: at Mk. 7:34 the missal and the 1862 Pustet print *suspíciens in cælum*, while the two Clementine transcriptions consulted print *suscípiens*. Those two transcriptions may not be independent of each other, and no printed Clementine facsimile was collated for the verse, so the Clementine's reading there remains unsettled.

Three consequences of the collation for reception

First, at Ps. 67:7 the chant's *unánimes* is not a corrupt *unius moris*. It is the reading of an older Latin psalter, and one checked expositor — Cassiodorus — lemmatises exactly that word. The Introit therefore sings a text that Augustine, Hilary, Jerome, Peter Lombard and Bellarmine did not have in front of them; what they have instead is *unius moris* or *unius modi* with *unanimis* supplied as a *gloss*. The Introit sings the gloss, and the evidence stands at the Introit below.

Second, the Gradual's versicle ends *ne discédas a me*, and no checked witness expounds those words, because no checked witness has them: all of them expound *ne síleas* and *nequándo táceas*. Any reception attached to the Gradual's closing plea is reception of a different clause, wherever it appears in what follows.

Third, the Epistle stops mid-verse, at *et grátia eius in me vácuá non fuit*. The words the missal does not read are the words on which the entire classical Latin argument about grace and free will turns. That is not a curiosity; it changes how much of the reception bears on this lesson, and the evidence stands at length at the Epistle.

Introit (*Int.*)

Deus in loco sancto suo · *Ant. ad Introitum* — Ps. 67, 6-7 et 36, with *Ps. ibid.*, 2 · marginal no. 1542

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.

The whole psalm, and what the antiphon takes from it. Psalm 67 is a long processional: God arises, his enemies scatter, he rides through the desert at the head of his people, Sinai trembles, rain falls on an inheritance, kings flee, a train of captives is led up to a mountain God chose for his dwelling, and the psalm ends in a summons to sing to him who mounts above the heaven of heavens. The antiphon takes three clauses out of that and welds them: the last words of v. 6 (*Deus in loco sancto suo*), the first words of v. 7 (*Deus qui inhabitáre facit ... in domo*), and the middle of v. 36 (*ipse dabit virtútem et fortitúdinem plebi suæ*). What is dropped is instructive. Verse 6 begins with God as father of orphans and judge of widows; v. 7 continues with prisoners brought out and rebels left in a waterless place; v. 36 begins *Mirábilis Deus in sanctis suis* and ends *benedíctus Deus*. The centonisation keeps the housing and the strengthening and lets the orphans, the prisoners and the benediction go.

St. Hilary of Poitiers, *Tractatus super Psalmum 67*, §§2, 8, 37 (CSEL 22) The earliest Latin exposition of the psalm, and it reads the whole thing as prophecy of Christ. On the psalm verse the missal sings — *Exsúrgat Deus* — Hilary is explicit that the rising asked for is the Resurrection: *resurrectionis enim nunc in deo tempus optatur*. At vv. 6–7 his lemma is *unimores*, a hyper-literal Latin for the Greek, and he is the first witness to weld the verse to the Jerusalem community of Acts: *ubi unius moris ac uoluntatis pacificus unanimisque conuentus* — *erat enim secundum Actus apostolorum credentium anima et cor unum*. At v. 36 he takes the giving

of *virtus* and *fortitudo* as the resurrection of the body: God is wonderful in his saints *quos in uitae resurrectionem excitabit aeternos*, and gives strength to a people *quae immortalis effecta intra se uitam uirtutemque contineat*.

St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 67, §§2–3 (v. 2), §7 (vv. 6–7), §44 (v. 36; NPNF sec. 40) Augustine’s lemma at v. 7 is *unius modi*, and he glosses it at once with the word the Introit sings: *unius modi habitare facit in domo*, that is, *unanimes, unum sentientes: iste est locus sanctus Domini*. He then makes the philological observation that the Greek admits either *modi* or *mores*, and notices that the Greek carries no prefix answering the *in* of *inhabitare*. The doctrinal point is the one the Introit’s first two clauses now make in sequence: God is contained by no place, so the holy place he is in is the one he makes — *ne quaeramus eum absque nobis; sed potius unius modi habitantes in domo, mereamur ut habitare etiam ipse dignetur in nobis* — and that place is built by grace and not by merits. On v. 2 he regards the petition as already answered: in the public-domain English of the NPNF translation, “Already this has come to pass: Christ has risen up . . . and His enemies have been dispersed through all nations.” On v. 36 the Introit’s last limb becomes resurrection doctrine, and he proves it out of the chapter the day’s own Epistle comes from: *Seminatur enim hoc corpus in infirmitate; surget in virtute* (1 Cor. 15:43), *virtutem resurrectionis eius* (Phil. 3:10), and *fortitudinem autem, qua inimica destruetur mors*. The full Latin shows that Augustine does **not** cite Acts 4:32 here. The Acts link that later readers assume is Augustinian is Hilary’s and Cassiodorus’s.

St. Jerome, *Tractatus de Psalmo* 67 (Morin) A third track. Jerome’s lemma is *unius moris*, and he records what the Hebrew has: *In hebraeo autem habet “Dominus inhabitare facit monachos in domo”: id est, in quibus non cohabitatur peccatum*. The monk hears *monks* in the verse. His exposition is accordingly moral rather than ecclesial — *Qui unius moris sunt, et non mutantur . . . Peccator autem mutatur; ubicumque sanctitas est, ibi habitaculum Dei est*. On v. 2 he states a double key openly: *specialiter* of the Lord, *ut resurgat a mortuis, et dispergat inimicos suos, hoc est diabolum et exercitum eius*, and *generaliter* whenever we are in tribulation. The homily breaks off at v. 31 and never reaches v. 36; the *Commentarioli* on this psalm begin only at v. 10.

Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum* 67, ad vv. 6, 7, 36 The one checked lemma that matches the Introit. Cassiodorus is the one checked expositor whose lemma is the Introit’s own text: *Deus, qui habitare facit unanimes in domo*. With that word in front of him he restores the Acts citation Augustine had dropped — *Multitudinis autem credentium erat cor unum et anima una* — adds Ps. 132:1, and identifies the house ecclesially: *In domo vero Ecclesiam significat*. At v. 36, however, he parts from Hilary and Augustine and takes the strength given to God’s people without any resurrection at all: *Dominus dabit fidelibus suis virtutem patientiae, et fidei fortitudinem, ut possint ad aeterna praemia pervenire*. The eschatology survives only as the *praemia*; the gift itself has been moralised into patience and faith.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos* 67, ad vv. 7 and 36 (PG 80, cols. 1380, 1400) — Greek-tradition sample Theodoret reads the Septuagint’s “single-mannered” as those who hold one aim and choose to care for virtue only. There is no Acts citation, no monastic reading, and at v. 36 no resurrection: the saints are lovers of virtue whose lives make God be praised, on the model of Matthew 5:16, and the strengthening is providential. The only English of this commentary is in copyright, so Theodoret is summarised here and nowhere quoted.

Peter Lombard, *Commentarium in Psalmos* 67, ad v. 6 (PL 191); St. Robert Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos* 67, tr. John O’Sullivan (Dublin, 1866), pp. 196–201 The conveyor belt and its terminus. Lombard’s exposition is Augustine with the gloss embedded and tagged — *unius moris . . . id est unanimes, unum sentientes . . . Hunc autem locum gratia aedificat, non meritis* — which is how the schools received both the word and the anti-Pelagian point. By Bellarmine the Acts reading is simply standard: the dwellers are “of one mind, one will,” and he quotes “One soul, one heart.” At vv. 35–36 he follows Augustine rather than Cassiodorus: God “will endow his elect with true and real immortality.”

What the chant did to the tradition. Set those lemmata side by side and the Introit’s second clause turns out to be a patristic gloss that became a liturgical text. Augustine reads *unius modi* and explains it by *unanimes*; Lombard transmits the explanation; Bellarmine reads the explanation back into the verse. Cassiodorus alone has *unanimes* as text. The Roman chant sings it. No line of descent from Cassiodorus’s psalter to the Introit is established here — no

Psalterium Romanum witness was collated for it — but the coincidence is exact and is the reason the Douay cannot be quoted for the sung word.

And a disagreement the formulary does not resolve. The Introit’s last clause is read two ways by witnesses of equal standing. Hilary, Augustine and Bellarmine hear the resurrection of the body in it; Cassiodorus hears patience and faith; Theodoret hears providential strengthening. The day’s Epistle is 1 Corinthians 15, and Augustine reaches his reading by quoting that very chapter — but he is expounding a psalm, not this Mass. The witnesses stay divided.

Aquinas stops short of both psalms. St. Thomas’s psalms commentary stops at Psalm 54; there is no Thomistic exposition of Psalm 67 or Psalm 80, and nothing from elsewhere in his corpus stands in for one here.

Collect (*Coll.*)

Omnípotens sempitérne Deus, qui, abundantia pietátis tuæ · Oratio, composed oration · marginal no. 1543

Where the prayer comes from. All three orations of this Mass travel together as a set, and they are old. The set stands complete in the Old Gelasian sacramentary (Vat. Reg. lat. 316, ed. H. A. Wilson, Oxford 1894), at p. 228, as the seventh of the sixteen unassigned Sunday masses of Book III — *Item alia Missa*, tied to no numbered Sunday at all. Wilson’s own footnote records that the Frankish Gelasians assign the mass to the *thirteenth* Sunday after Pentecost, and that Pamelius’s Gregorian prints it at the twelfth. The Gregorian Hadrianum (ed. Wilson, HBS 49, 1915) does assign it: at p. 172, chapter XXX, *DOMINICA .XII. POST PENTECOSTEN*. Through this whole stretch the Gregorian series runs one Sunday ahead of 1962, so the Hadrianum’s twelfth is the 1962 eleventh.

The Collect is not in the Veronese book. The Secret and the Postcommunion are older still and stand in the Veronese (“Leonine”) collection. The Collect is **not there**. The whole of Feltoe’s text was searched for *abundantia pietátis*, *merita suppli-*, *adicias* and *adjicias*, *excedis*, and all seven occurrences of *praesumit*; none is this prayer, and Wilson’s Gelasian margins cite no Leonine parallel for it either. The Collect’s oldest verified witness is the Gelasian. The result holds for the books actually searched and says nothing about the prayer’s absolute age.

The chant cues, and two cycles realigned. Wilson’s apparatus to the Hadrianum reports the marginal chant cues of the Ottobonianus manuscript (Vat. Ottob. lat. 313). The antiphon set of this 1962 Mass — *Deus in loco sancto suo, Exaltabo te Domine, Honora Dominum* — is cued there against *Dominica X post Pentecosten*, two masses before the orations it now accompanies; Gregorian Dominica XII itself carries the cues *Respice . . . in testamentum* and *Panem de caelo*, which are the 1962 Thirteenth Sunday’s chants. The pairing of the *Honora Dominum* Communion with the *abundantia pietátis* Collect is therefore a product of a later realignment of two independently moving cycles.

The grammar, which is the prayer. *Omnípotens sempitérne Deus, qui, abundantia pietátis tuæ, et mérita supplicum excédís et vota.* The two objects are not a doublet. *Merita* are what a suppliant has; *vota* are what a suppliant asks. God is addressed as exceeding both, and the ablative *abundantia pietátis tuæ* — set off by a comma pair in the typical edition — names the reason. Then the petition, and its two purpose clauses: *ut dimittas quæ consciéntia méruit, et adicias quod orátio non praesúmit.* The first asks remission of what conscience fears; the second asks God to *add* what prayer does not presume. The subject of *praesúmit* is *orátio*: it is the prayer, not the petitioner, that does not presume. The registered 1861 English makes the petitioners the ones who “dare not presume to ask,” which is a fair devotional rendering and a different sentence; the witness stands as quoted, and the Latin carries the argument, as at the element above. The structure is therefore symmetrical and complete: below what we deserve, God does not exact; above what we ask, God supplies.

An echo of Ephesians 3:20. The Vulgate of Ephesians 3:20 addresses God as *qui potens est omnia facere superabundánter quam pétimus aut intellégimus*. The two clauses map onto the Collect’s two — giving beyond what we ask, giving beyond what we understand to ask. There is no quotation and no documented dependence; the likeness is a verbal echo.

Aquinas on what the Collect asks. No patristic or early-medieval commentary on the *wording* of these three orations was found, which is the expected result for composed Roman prayers of this age; the earliest wording-level commentary located is modern. Two Thomistic loci nevertheless illuminate the second petition exactly. *Summa theologiae* II–II q. 83 a. 2 ad 3 states the principle the Collect prays: *Deus multa nobis praestat ex sua liberalitate etiam non pétita* — God grants us much unasked, out of his liberality. And q. 83 a. 16 treats whether the prayer of a sinner is heard, concluding that it is heard *non quasi ex iustitia . . . sed ex pura misericordia*, with a *sed contra* that quotes Augustine on the publican: *si peccatores non exaudiret Deus, frustra publicanus dixisset: Domine, propitius esto mihi peccatori*. Neither article is about this Collect. Both are about what the Collect asks.

The continuation of Dom Prosper Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year ... Time after Pentecost* (Dom Lucien Fromage), vol. II, 2nd ed., tr. Laurence Shepherd (1909), Eleventh Sunday, pp. 272–274 Fromage keys the Collect to the publican — and does so on historical grounds, citing Rupert of Deutz, *De divinis officiis* XII, 11, for an older arrangement that read Luke 18 on this Sunday. On the prayer itself: the Church, “with motherly tenderness, comes and takes up his faltering prayer, and gives it her own eloquence ... granting them what they, poor sinners, are too afraid to presume to ask for.” That is reception of the second petition, and it reads *oratio* the way the 1861 missal does.

Blessed Ildefonso Schuster, *The Sacramentary (Liber Sacramentorum)*, tr. Levelis-Marke, vol. III (1927), pp. 124–125 Schuster calls the Collect “a perfect liturgical gem” and says that “this short petition from the Sunday Liturgy contains a complete treatise on prayer.” The judgment matters because it is a judgment about compression: three clauses that between them state who prays, what prayer cannot reach, and what God does about the shortfall.

Afterlife in the reformed books. The prayer did not stop in 1962. It is used verbatim, with the same contracted *adicias*, as the Collect of *Dominica XXVII per annum* in the postconciliar *Missale Romanum*. That reuse was verified in two independent unofficial Latin transcriptions; no free scan of the official *editio typica tertia* was located, so the official locus remains a lead and the postconciliar book is not quoted here. The reuse stands at that strength and no higher.

Epistle (*Ep.*)

Fratres: Notum vobis fácio Evangélium · Lécitio Epístolæ beáti Pauli Apóstoli ad Corínthios — 1 Cor. 15, 1-10 · marginal no. 1544

The complete literary context. First Corinthians 15 is the last of the letter’s problem chapters and the only one that argues a doctrine rather than settling a practice. Some at Corinth were saying *resurrectio mortuórum non est* (v. 12). Paul answers in three movements: he restates the gospel he delivered and the witnesses who saw the risen Christ (vv. 1–11); he shows what follows if the dead are not raised — empty preaching, empty faith, false witness, the dead perished (vv. 12–19); and he expounds Christ as firstfruits, the order of the resurrection, the manner of the risen body, and the swallowing up of death (vv. 20–58). The appointed lesson is the first movement, minus its last verse and minus the last clause of v. 10. It is therefore the *premiss* of the chapter read without the argument it was laid down to support — which is precisely what makes it usable as a Sunday lesson: the assembly hears the creed and the witness list, not the polemic.

The oldest layer of reception is not about grace. Long before anyone argued about merit from v. 10, this passage was the anti-docetic proof text. St. Irenaeus quotes the formula verbatim inside the argument that Christ truly suffered (*Adversus haereses* 3.18.3). Tertullian presses it further, in the public-domain English of the Ante-Nicene Fathers: “since you are told that He died according to the Scriptures ... no otherwise than in the flesh, you will also allow that it was in the flesh that He was raised from the dead. For the very same body which fell in death, and which lay in the sepulchre, did also rise again” (*De resurrectione carnis* 48). *Adversus Marcionem* 5 engages this chapter only from v. 12, so it is no witness to the appearance list.

St. John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in epistulam I ad Corinthis* 38, §§2–3, 5, 7 (NPNF 1/12, tr. Chambers, 1889) Chrysostom’s first observation is grammatical and it controls everything after it: Paul says *delivered* and *received*, not *taught* — “neither here does he say, I said to you, nor, I taught you, but uses the same expression again, saying, *I delivered unto you that which also I received*.” The gospel is transmission, not invention. The centre of the homily is anti-Manichaean: because Christ was sinless, his dying “for our sins” can only be the body’s death — “if being without sin He died, He died — not the death of sin ... but the death of the body” — and *secundum Scriptúras* pins that sense, with the burial clinching it. The appearance list he reads as a chain ordered by credibility, Cephas “the most credible of all”; and he notices that Paul writes *fallen asleep*, not *dead*, so that even the verb preaches resurrection. On v. 8 the self-abasement is calculated: “This is rather an expression of modesty than anything else.” On v. 10 — the lesson’s last words — he catches the reserve exactly: “he said not, I have displayed a diligence worthy of His grace, but, *it was not found vain*.” Chrysostom’s instinct throughout is **moral**. Augustine’s, on the same words, will be **dogmatic**.

Ambrosiaster, *Commentaria in epistolam ad Corinthios primam*, ad 15:1–11 (PL 17) The earliest Latin commentary on the lesson, and the one with a text-critical surprise in it. On vv. 1–2 the stakes are total: those who desert the tradition *perdiderunt quod crediderunt; omnis enim spes credentium in hoc sensu est, quia mortui resurgent. Secundum Scripturas* he refers to the Old Testament, chiefly Isaiah 53, with an excursus on prophetic past tenses; the third day he takes from Hosea 6:3 read *sub persona populi*, adding *In Christo enim omnes resurrexisse, sicut in Adam omnes mortuos esse, nemo fidelium denegat*. James is singled out *ut multifaria apparentia fidem resurrectionis firmaret*. *Abortivus* he explains as *extra tempus natus* — Paul received the apostolate when Christ had already been received into heaven with his flesh. On v. 9, *tempore enim minor est, non dignitate*; on v. 10, *Ne se extulisse jactanter putaretur, statim se humiliat*. **And his lemma for the lesson's last clause is not the Vulgate's.** He reads *Et gratia ejus pauper in me non fuit* — “his grace was not poor in me” — an Old Latin variant that Cornelius a Lapide still knew, a millennium later, as “St. Ambrose's” reading. The missal's *vácu*a is not the word the first Latin commentator had.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in xiv epistulas S. Pauli*, in 1 Cor. 15 (PG 82, cols. 347–352; Migne's Latin column quoted) Theodoret states the chapter's occasion first: impostors were denying the bodily resurrection, and cross, passion and resurrection all happened *propter resurrectionem communem*; hence *si enim non creditur resurrectio corporum, supervacanea est praedicatio Evangelii*. He builds the witness list as an ascending argument from testimony — the five hundred are *a suspicione alienum* and checkable, since *multi manent usque adhuc*. His reading of *abortivus* is his own and is the harshest in the tradition: Paul *abortivo fetui seipsum comparat, qui in hominum catalogo non recensetur* — the aborted foetus is not entered in the register of men. On v. 10 he catches Paul's double bind: *Divitias occultare conatur, et aperire cogitur . . . Occultat enim miracula, et solum laborem ostendit, atque hunc quoque dicit esse divinae gratiae*. The only modern English of this commentary is in copyright, so the Latin column is quoted instead.

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Super I ad Corinthios*, cap. 15, lectio 1, nn. 888–911 This corpus has a seam in it. The *lectura* on 1 Corinthians survives with a gap filled from Peter of Tarantaise; that supplement covers 7:15–10:33, and the authentic *reportatio vulgata* resumes at chapter 11. Chapter 15 is therefore Thomas's own. *Lectio 1* covers vv. 1–11 entire and *lectio 2* begins at v. 12, so the whole 1962 pericope sits inside one lecture. Thomas divides the four things delivered — death, burial, resurrection, appearance — gives three reasons the burial is named at all, and explains the omission of the women's appearances with a principle of forensic economy: *noluit ponere testimonia nisi authentica*. He preserves Augustine's judgment that the true reading at v. 5 is *duodecim* and that *undecim* is *corruptum . . . vitio scriptorum* — the missal prints *undecim*, the appointed text above follows the missal, and the tradition mostly defends the harder number. On *abortivus* he does what a scholastic does and distinguishes three senses at once: *vel quia nascitur extra tempus debitum, vel cum violentia educitur, vel quia non perducitur ad debitam quantitatem* — and applies all three to Paul, including, remarkably, the second: converted by coercion, which he turns into an argument *contra haereticos, qui dicunt quod nullus debet cogi ad fidem, quia Paulus coactus fuit*. On the lesson's own last words: *ex me nihil sum, sed id quod sum, gratia Dei sum . . . Et dicit “id quod sum,” quia homo sine gratia nihil est*. Larcher's English is modern and in copyright, so the Latin is quoted instead.

The lesson stops one clause short of the argument the tradition built on it

Of everything about this Epistle, where the printed missal stops most changes how it may be preached from. The missal reads to *et grátia eius in me vácu*a non fuit and stops. The Clementine verse continues: *sed abundántius illis ómnibus laborávi: non ego autem, sed grátia Dei mecum*. Now consider what hangs on the words that are not read.

Witness	The argument	Which words it needs
St. Augustine, <i>De gratia et libero arbitrio</i> 5.12	Paul's merit was real but <i>evil</i> — <i>Meritum enim fuit quidem in apostolo Paulo, sed malum</i> ; then the balance: <i>nec gratia Dei sola, nec ipse solus, sed gratia Dei cum illo</i>	the proof of free will is <i>plus omnibus illis laboravi</i> ; the correction is <i>non ego autem, sed gratia Dei mecum</i>

Witness	The argument	Which words it needs
St. Gregory the Great, <i>Moralia in Iob</i> 16.25	prevenient and subsequent grace: <i>Superna ergo pietas prius agit in nobis aliquid sine nobis, ut, subsequente quoque nostro libero arbitrio, bonum quod iam appetimus agat nobiscum</i>	the whole schema hangs on one word: <i>Non enim diceret mecum si . . . subsequens liberum arbitrium non haberet</i>
St. Thomas Aquinas, <i>Super I Cor.</i> c. 15 lect. 1 n. 909	<i>gratia cooperans</i> is derived here: God <i>non solum infundit gratiam . . . sed etiam movet ad bene utendum gratia infusa</i>	<i>non autem ego, sed gratia Dei mecum</i>
St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 38 §7	the humility “with reserve” turns on a seesaw of boast and retraction	“laboured more abundantly . . . yet not I”
Ambrosiaster; Cornelius a Lapide	separate lemmata and comments; a Lapide’s anti-Reformation argument rests on <i>with</i> me, not <i>in</i> me	both omitted clauses

Two conclusions follow, and the second is the one worth having. *First*, the Fathers’ teaching on grace from this verse cannot be credited to this lesson: their classic expositions quote past its last word. What they expound is verse 10 entire. *Second*, the truncation is not a 1962 decision. The same mid-verse ending stands in the Venice Missal of 1570 and in the Pustet Missal of 1862, so it is the received lectionary boundary of the Roman rite, and of considerable age. What the Church actually reads on this Sunday ends on *grátia . . . vácuá non fuit*: grace not made void, with the labour and the *mecum* left unread. The very tradition whose key clause is cut — Augustine, Gregory, Thomas — affirms human cooperation; a lection boundary is not a doctrinal statement, and this one cannot be made into a denial of what those authors teach.

One word, three readings, and a sixfold catalogue

Tamquam abortívo is where this pericope’s reception genuinely disagrees with itself, and the disagreement is substantive rather than verbal. Ambrosiaster and Chrysostom read it temporally: born out of time, that is, brought to apostolic birth after the ascension and Pentecost. Theodoret reads it juridically: a thing not entered in the register of men, the language of worthlessness rather than of chronology. Aquinas adds the violent sense — *cum violentia educitur* — and makes Paul’s conversion on the Damascus road a case of it. Cornelius a Lapide, writing in the seventeenth century and read here in the public-domain English of Cobb (1908), catalogues six readings and rejects at least one of them (Baronius’s theory that Paul was a supernumerary member of the Sanhedrin). The Douay’s “as by one born out of due time” takes the first sense only; the Latin will bear all three, and the three stand side by side.

The *Summa* and Augustine on the verse. The *Summa theologiae*’s treatise on grace, I–II qq. 106–114, never cites 1 Cor. 15:10 verbatim: the files were searched for *gratia Dei sum id quod sum, gratia Dei mecum, vacua*, and *abundantius*, and q. 111 a. 2’s *sed contra* rests on Augustine’s treatise instead. The verse enters Thomas’s doctrine of grace through the *lectura*, not through the *Summa*. And no Augustinian exegesis of *abortivus* said of Paul was found in site-scoped searches of his Latin corpus; what Augustine does with the adjacent verses is homiletic — *Sermo* 279, 5–6 calls Paul *modicus*, “least and last, like the hem of the Lord’s garment” that healed the woman with the issue of blood, and *Enarratio in Ps.* 70, sermo 1, shows him preaching on an Apostle-reading that contained v. 9 in his own day’s liturgy.

Where the *Summa* does use the lesson. *Summa theologiae* III q. 55 a. 3 cites vv. 6–7 as appearances of which the Gospels make no mention, and III q. 57 a. 6 ad 3 presses v. 8 dogmatically: the Damascus vision *veritatem resurrectionis non probaret nisi ipsum verum corpus visum fuisset ab eo*. The appearance-list is doing evidentiary work about the risen body, which is what Paul laid it down to do.

Gradual (*Grad.*)

In Deo sperávit cor meum · Graduale — Ps. 27, 7 et 1 · marginal no. 1545

The chant inverts the psalm. Psalm 27 opens with a cry of a man afraid of being ignored — *Ad te, Dómine, clamábo: Deus meus, ne sileas a me: nequándo táceas a me, et assimilábor descendéntibus in lacum* — and reaches its thanksgiving only at v. 7, after the imprecation of vv. 3–5. The Gradual prints *7 et 1*: the body of the chant is the thanksgiving and the versicle is the cry that historically came first. As at the Introit, the liturgy sings the arrival and then the approach.

And it alters the words at four points. *In Deo* for the psalm's *in ipso* (the pronoun looks back to an opening *Dóminus adjutor meus* that the chant does not sing, so the chant must supply a name); *confitébor illi* for *confitébor ei*; *clamávi*, past, for *clamábo*, future; and, at the very end, *ne discédas a me*, which has no counterpart anywhere in the Clementine verse. Of these the last is decisive for reception, and negatively: **no checked witness expounds *ne discédas a me*, because no checked witness has it.** Every one of them — Augustine, Cassiodorus, Jerome, Aquinas, Lombard, Bellarmine — expounds *ne sileas* and *nequándo táceas*. What the tradition supplies for the chant's closing plea is therefore a sense, not a lemma, wherever that sense is drawn on.

St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 27, §§1, 7 Augustine assigns the whole psalm to Christ: *Ipsius mediatoris vox est, manu fortis in conflictu passionis*. On the versicle's "be not silent from me" he reads a Christological danger — that the Word be separated from the assumed manhood. And at v. 7 he supplies the flattest and most consequential gloss in the whole tradition of this chant: *Et refluoruit caro mea: id est, et resurrexit caro mea*. The flourishing is the Resurrection. He then notices the psalm's own *ex voluntate mea*: those freed from the fear of death confess him by free will.

Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum* 27, ad vv. 1, 7 Cassiodorus's lemma at v. 7 is the chant's *confitébor illi*. He follows Augustine on the speaker — *Christus Dominus clamat ad Patrem tempore passionis* — and then develops the flower-figure into a two-stage history that Augustine had left implicit: *Refluoruit . . . quia et primo floruit: quippe quae ex Virgine sine peccato tanquam pulcherrimi floris singulare decus emicuit*, with Isaias 11:1 behind it. The flesh flowered in the virginal conception and re-flowered in the Resurrection. *Refluoruit ergo significat resurrexit*: the prefix carries the doctrine.

St. Jerome, *Commentarioli in Psalmos* 27 (Morin) Two short notes, both useful. On v. 1, *Lacus significat infernum* — and his lemma is the Gallican one, without *ne discédas*. On v. 7 he records a variant and then a second reading: *Pro carne, Theodotion "cor" interpretatus est. Aliter: quippe consurreximus Christo*. Theodotion read "heart" where the Church's psalter reads "flesh"; and the flourishing may be read not of Christ's flesh but of ours, risen with him. There is no Jerome homily on Psalm 27; the *Tractatus* series jumps from Psalm 14 to Psalm 66.

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Super Psalmo* 27, nn. 1, 7 Thomas divides the psalm scholastically and then, following the Gloss, gives the versicle to the man Christ praying not to be abandoned by the Godhead: *ne sileas subtrahendo mihi in beneficium resurrectionis, et ne taceas, idest ne deseras in passione*. He also records Jerome's rendering of the Hebrew, *ne te tacente assimiler*. On v. 7 he gives the flower a salvation-historical span: *In primo homine floruit caro eius per innocentiae puritatem, sed peccando inquinata est. Sed in Christo refluoruit in resurrectione*. His lemma for the last clause is *confitébor tibi*, not the chant's *illi*, and he reads it of the converted will praising freely; he adds that if the verse is said of Christ, *refertur ad membra sua*.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos* 27, ad v. 7 (PG 80, col. 1060) — the dissent Theodoret keeps the psalm where the Antiochene school keeps it: with David in flight from Saul, the Ziphites and Doeg. On v. 7 he understands a man released from the hardships of flight, sprouting and blooming again — bodily vigour recovered because his spirits have recovered. **No resurrection.** He is the one major witness who declines the Christological reading of *refloruit caro mea*, and the chant is therefore sung under a real disagreement, not a consensus. The only English is in copyright, so he is summarised, not quoted.

Peter Lombard, *Commentarium in Psalmos* 27, ad v. 7 (PL 191); St. Robert Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos* 27, tr. O’Sullivan (1866), pp. 68–69 Lombard transmits both readings with their tags: the flesh *quae in Adam defloruit per peccatum* from the interlinear Gloss, and *Vel, caro mea refluoruit, id est iterum in resurrectione floruit* correctly attributed to Cassiodorus. Bellarmine popularises the result — “He now passes to foretell the glory of the Lord’s resurrection” — and gives the flower its most concrete form: “My flesh, that had withered up in death, is not only restored to life, but to the bloom of youth, health, joy, and beauty.”

How the reading developed. Augustine’s equation (*refloruit = resurrexit*) is taken up by Cassiodorus, who adds the conception-flower; Lombard transmits both with attributions intact; Aquinas recasts them as Adam and Christ, flesh and soul; Bellarmine turns them into devotional description. Jerome supports from the side with Theodotus’s variant and the co-resurrection reading. Theodoret dissents. Hilary is simply absent: the extant *Tractatus super Psalmos* covers Psalms 1, 2, 9, 13, 14, 51–69 and 118–150 with fragments, and Psalm 27 is not among them.

Alleluia (*All.*)

Exsultate Deo adiutori nostro · Alleluia, no separate heading — Ps. 80, 2-3 · marginal no. 1546

The psalm and the compression. Psalm 80 is a feast-day psalm: a summons to shout, a recital of the exodus from the burden of Egypt, and then a divine oracle of complaint — my people did not hear me, so I let them go after the desires of their heart. The chant takes only the summons, and condenses even that. The Clementine v. 3 reads *Súmíte psalmum, et date tympanum; psalterium iucúndum, cum cíthara*; the Alleluia sings *súmíte psalmum iucúndum cum cíthara*. Two instruments vanish and one adjective moves: *iucúndum* belongs to the psalter in the Bible and to the psalm in the chant. The result is a line that says, in effect, take a pleasant psalm with the harp — which is a description of what the schola is at that moment doing.

The reception problem this creates. Every checked expositor of this verse builds part of his exposition on the timbrel that the chant removes. That is not an objection to the chant; it is a limit on the reception. The witnesses below illuminate Psalm 80:2-3; none comments on the Alleluia’s line, which no checked witness has as a lemma.

St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 80, §§3–5 Augustine takes Asaph as *congregatio* and the title’s winepresses as the Church’s press, separating oil from dregs. On v. 2 he is anti-spectacle: *Exsultate alii circo, vos Deo* — let others shout in the circus; you, to God our helper. On v. 3 he builds an exchange out of the two instruments: *Psalmus spiritalis est, tympanum carnale . . . accipite spiritalia, et date carnalia*. Receive the spiritual word, give back carnal things — support and mercy to the poor. The psalter, which sounds from above, is heavenly preaching; the cithara, played below, is earthly works; word and deed have to sound together.

Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum* 80, ad vv. 2–3 Cassiodorus first presses *adiutori*: an idol *fictitius deus non est adiutor, sed elisor; non sanans, sed vulnerans* — not healing but wounding. The true God heals, and the verb is the one this day’s Offertory sings four elements later. He then etymologises the shout — *Iubilate dictum est a iuvando, id est delectando* — and re-tools Augustine’s exchange ascetically: the drum is a stretched hide, therefore the mortified body, *sic hominum corpus, dum pro Domino tribulatione quatitur, ad superna mandata dulcius temperatur; tunc Deo bene damus tympanum dum eleemosynas facimus, cum ieiuniis corpus affligimus*. Psalter and cithara — God’s words and human acts — *in unam societatem debeant convenire*.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos* 80, ad vv. 2–3 (PG 80, cols. 1520–1521); Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos* 80, tr. O’Sullivan, pp. 246–247 The literal wing. Theodoret notes the hexaplaric alternatives for the two verbs, takes the jubilation as a victory-shout, and keeps the instruments as instruments, appealing to the account of the temple orchestra in Chronicles. Bellarmine sides with him against Augustine on the occasion — a new-moon festival — and adds, with characteristic bluntness, that “he who sings moodily . . . gives to understand that he has very little affection for him whose praises he chants.” Against Augustine’s and Cassiodorus’s allegory this is a genuine and unresolved divergence about what the verse is for.

Jerome and Aquinas on Psalm 80. St. Jerome does treat Psalm 80, but not these verses: his homily is a riff on the title, on the three *pro torcularibus* psalms (8, 80, 83) and on the number eighty — *Octavus dies resurrectionis est . . . in octavo ergo vincimus, et in octogesimo cum Domino congregamur* — and then leaps from the title to v. 5. His famous timbrel allegory (*nos sumus tympanum . . . quod non habet carnes, nisi quod tenditur*) belongs to his

homily on Psalm 149, not to this psalm, so it does not bear on this chant. And Aquinas, again, is absent: his psalms commentary ends at Psalm 54.

Gospel (*Gosp.*)

In illo tempore: Exiens Iesus de finibus Tyri · + Sequéntia sancti Evangélíi secúndum Marcum — Marc. 7, 31-37 · marginal no. 1547

Where the pericope sits in Mark, and what the incipit removes. The healing follows the Syrophoenician woman (7:24–30) and precedes the feeding of the four thousand (8:1–9). The itinerary — Tyre, then Sidon, then the Sea of Galilee by way of the Decapolis — keeps Jesus in largely Gentile territory from beginning to end, and it is a long way round: Sidon lies north of Tyre, so the route to the lake is described as a detour. Mark’s own first words are *Et iterum éxiens: agáin* going out, a backward link to the earlier Tyre episode. The liturgical incipit replaces that with *In illo tempore: Exiens Iesus*, supplying a subject Mark does not name at v. 31 and dropping the *iterum*. The lesson therefore begins as a fresh journey where the evangelist wrote a resumption.

There is no synoptic parallel. Matthew 15:29–31 is a summary notice of many healings on a mountain: no individual deaf-mute, no fingers, no spittle, no sigh, no *Ephphetha*. That is why the scene surfaces in St. Augustine’s *De consensu evangelistarum* at Book IV — his sweep of Mark-only material — and not in the harmonising Books II–III. Any reception of “the healing of the deaf-mute” is reception of Mark alone.

Ps-Jerome, *Commentarius in evangelium secundum Marcum*, cap. VII (PL 30, cols. 611C–612B)

Transmitted under Jerome’s name and not his: the 1842 Oxford editors of the *Catena* already called it spurious, and modern scholarship treats it as an anonymous seventh-century work of the Irish milieu — in any case earlier than Bede. Its reading is corporate from the first line: Tyre is *angustia* and stands for Judaea; *Sidon vero venatio interpretatur, quae fera indomitaque nostra natio est*; the Decapolis is *decalogi mandata*. The itinerary *is* the passage of salvation from Judaea to the Gentiles. The deaf-mute is accordingly not an individual but the race: *Genus humanum per multa membra, ac si unus homo varia peste absumptus enumeratur: in protoplasto caecatur*. The fingers are *verba spiritus*; the spittle is *divina sapientia: quae solvit vinculum labiorum humani generis* — and the author names what the loosed mouth then says: *Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem*. The opened ears open *ad hymnos, cantica, et psalmos*. The sigh teaches: *nos gemere docuit, et in coelum thesaurum cordis nostri erigere*.

St. Bede, *In Marci evangelium expositio* II, on 7:31–37 (PL 92, cols. 203–206; his lemma spells *Effeta*)

The fullest Latin exposition, and the one the later tradition quarries. Six moves. (a) Being taken apart from the crowd is where salvation starts: *Prima salutis janua est infirmum apprehendente Domino de turba seorsum educi*, the sick mind drawn away *a consuetis humanae conversationis moribus*. (b) The fingers are the Holy Spirit, and he proves it from Scripture rather than asserting it: *Mittit digitos suos in auriculas, cum per dona sancti Spiritus aures cordis ... aperit. Namque digitum Dei appellari Spiritum sanctum testatur ipse Dominus*, comparing Luke 11:20 with Matthew 12:28. (c) The spittle is divine wisdom — *Sputum namque Domini saporem designat sapientiae* — and the tongue it touches is a catechumen’s: the Lord acts *cum ad confessionem fidei ora catechizandorum instruit*. (d) The look upward names where hearing and speech must be sought; the sigh is not need but instruction: *Ingemuit autem, non quia ipsi opus esset cum gemitu aliquid petere a Patre ... sed ut nobis gemendi daret exemplum*. (e) Verses 34–35 hold both natures at once: *Suspiciens in caelum quasi homo Deum precaturus ingemuit, sed mox uno sermone quasi divina potens maiestate curavit*. (f) Morally the deaf-mute is anyone *qui nec aures audiendis Dei verbis, nec os aperit proloquendis*, and he is carried by those already taught. Bede’s closing paragraph on v. 36 is Augustine’s *De consensu evangelistarum* 4.4.5 almost verbatim. Here Bede depends on Augustine — not, as is sometimes assumed for Marcan pericopes, on Gregory.

The Victor-of-Antioch tradition, quoted as “Chrysostomus” in the *Catena aurea in Marcum*, cap. 7, lectio 4

Chrysostom wrote no homilies on Mark. The excerpts the *Catena* labels “Chrysostomus” for this pericope belong to the Greek Mark-catena tradition associated with Victor of Antioch; the 1842 Oxford editors say so in the margin and print “Pseudo-Chrys.” The words are the Victor tradition’s, not Chrysostom’s. The move is worth having on its own account: the healing instrument is Christ’s own assumed body, *quod divina virtute ditatum erat corpus divinitati unitum ... veniens Christus in seipso perfectionem demonstravit humanae*

naturae; and the sigh is *nostram causam suscipiens in seipso, et naturae misertus humanae*. Where Bede makes the sigh an example for us, this tradition makes it a taking-on of our case.

Theophylact, *Enarratio in evangelium Marci*, on 7:31–37 (PG 123, cols. 565–568; Migne’s Latin quoted) The Greek witness, read with Migne’s facing Latin because the only English is in copyright. He takes the affliction as demonic in origin, which is why it follows the exorcism of the Syrophoenician’s daughter, and notes that Jesus leaves Gentile territory promptly lest he be called a transgressor of the law. On the taking aside: *non erat arrogantiae sectator, qui se humiliarat usque ad nostram inopiam*. On the spittle he makes the strongest sacramental point in the tradition: it was done *ut ostenderet omnes partes sanctae carnis suae sanctas ac divinas esse . . . tametsi superfluitas sit omne sputum, sed in Domino admirabilia erant ac divina omnia*. On the sigh he is openly undecided — twice *fortassis* — between prayer to the Father and pity for human nature under tyranny. His coda, which both the *Catena* and a Lapide lift, converts the command of silence into an ethic: benefactors must not seek applause, and beneficiaries must praise even the unwilling benefactor.

St. Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum* 4.4.5 (NPNF 1/6, tr. Salmond, 1888) Augustine treats only vv. 36–37, and only one difficulty: if Christ knew they would publish it the more, why forbid it? His answer, in the public-domain English, is that “he desired to give backward ones to understand how much more zealously and fervently they ought to preach on whom He lays the commission to preach, if even men who were interdicted were unable to keep silent.” No allegory of fingers, spittle or sigh anywhere; this is the one place in the works checked where the Latin tradition’s greatest exegete touches the pericope, and it is a note on prescience and preaching.

Cornelius a Lapide, on Mark 7:31–37, *The Great Commentary*, tr. T. W. Mossman, vol. 3 (1887; 1891 printing), pp. 408–410 Philology first. The Greek adjective at v. 32, he says, means “speaking with difficulty . . . stammering,” not born mute; and *Ephphetha* he derives through the Hebrew root with the note that “for which the Syrians use Ephpheta.” He minds decorum at v. 33 (Christ spat on his own finger). Then he absorbs the tradition — Bede twice, including “Where, says Bede, the two natures of the one and the same Mediator between God and man are plainly set forth”; Theophylact on praising benefactors; Augustine on the silence. His own novelty is scholastic and dissenting: the command of v. 36 “was not properly a command, involving a fault if disobeyed, but merely a token of urbanity and modesty . . . Wherefore they did not commit sin who nevertheless divulged them.” On v. 37 he presses the adverb: it means “beautifully, becomingly, harmoniously . . . Christ’s whole life was one continuous beneficence.”

Four disagreements among the witnesses

Question	Positions	Comment
Who is the deaf-mute?	Ps-Jerome: the human race in Adam. Bede: any individual soul that neither hears nor confesses. Theophylact: a man historically afflicted by a demon. Victor: Adamic human nature restored in Christ’s own humanity	The corporate and individual readings are not variants of one idea; they yield different sermons and different sacramental applications
What is the sigh?	Bede: <i>exemplum gemendi</i> , since Christ needs nothing — an anti-subordinationist guard. Victor: Christ taking our cause on himself. Theophylact: prayer <i>or</i> pity, openly hedged. Ps-Jerome: he taught us to groan. A Lapide: sympathy <i>and</i> genuine impetration	Augustine never touches the sigh at all
Why command silence?	Augustine: to shame lazy preachers. Bede: transcribes Augustine. Victor: prudence, not to inflame envy before the time. Theophylact: an ethics of benefaction. A Lapide: it was not a precept	Only a Lapide denies that disobedience was possible

Question	Positions	Comment
Which spelling?	Missal, Benziger, Clementine, <i>Catena</i> and PG 123's Latin: <i>Ephphetha</i> . Bede's lemma: <i>Effeta</i> . The 1872 <i>Rituale</i> and the Douay: <i>Ephpheta</i>	One Aramaic word, three orthographies, each as its own book prints it

The word left the Gospel and became a rite

This pericope did something no other text in the formulary did: it generated a liturgical ceremony that was still being performed in 1962. St. Ambrose is the earliest witness, and he says outright where the ceremony came from — in the public-domain English of the NPNF translation: “celebrating the mystery of the opening, we said, Epphatha, which is, Be opened . . . Christ made use of this mystery in the Gospel, as we read, when He healed him who was deaf and dumb” (*De mysteriis* 1.3–4). *De sacramentis* I.1.2–3 describes the gesture from the other side, as a memory of what was done: the priest touched ears and nostrils, “It is a Hebrew word, which rendered into Latin is *adaperire*, that is, Be opened” — and explains the move from mouth to nostrils on grounds of propriety toward women.

Fifteen centuries later the *Rituale Romanum* still prints it. In the Pustet printing of 1872, at the baptism of infants (pp. 11–12): *Postea Sacerdos digito accipiat de saliva oris sui, et tangat aures et nares infantis: tangendo vero aurem dexteram, et sinistram, dicat: Ephpheta, quod est, Adaperire: deinde tangit nares, dicens: In odorem suavitatis*. The saliva and the ears are the Gospel’s own gestures, carried into the rite; the same ceremony stands in the order for adults at p. 33. Ambrose’s line runs from this pericope into the sacramental books independently of the whole exegetical chain, and it is the reason a reader is more likely to have met the word *Ephphetha* at a font than in Mark.

Gregory, Jerome and Chrysostom on this Gospel

St. Gregory the Great does not expound this Gospel. The complete OCR of PL 75 and PL 76 — the *Moralia* entire, the *Homiliae in Ezechielem*, and the forty *Homiliae in Evangelia* with their indices — was searched case-insensitively and OCR-tolerantly for the word in its three spellings, for *surdum et mutum* and its case-forms, and every “Marc.” citation in both volumes was reviewed (sixty-six of them in PL 76). There is no exposition of Mark 7:31–37 anywhere in them, and no Gospel homily on the pericope; the one near hit is Herod and the Baptist. Two independent corroborations: the *Catena aurea* gathers no Gregory for this lection, and Bede, who elsewhere leans on Gregory heavily, here transcribes Augustine instead. The search was OCR-based, and PL 77 — the *Regula pastoralis*, the *Dialogi*, the *Registrum* — was not searched. Jerome’s Mark tractates and Chrysostom’s Matthew homily are silent too: the authentic Jerome *Tractatus in Marci evangelium* jumps from 5:30–43 to 8:1–9 and has no tractate here; and Chrysostom’s Homily 52 on Matthew, which reaches the mountain summary, has no deaf-mute, no spittle and no reference to Mark.

Offertory (*Off.*)

Exaltábo te, Dómine · *Ant. ad Offertorium* — Ps. 29, 2-3 · marginal no. 1548

The title does the work. Psalm 29 carries the superscription *Psalmus cantici in dedicatione domus David*, and the whole Latin tradition reads the psalm through it. The antiphon takes vv. 2–3: extolling, being upheld, enemies not allowed to gloat, a cry, and a healing. It drops *Deus meus* from the opening vocative of v. 3, which every checked lemma carries. What is left is the shortest possible statement of the day’s Gospel in the first person: *clamávi ad te, et sanásti me*.

St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 29 — two expositions (Enarr. I §§1–3; Enarr. II §§1, 6, 11–12) The first exposition calls the psalm one “of the joy of the Resurrection . . . not only of the Lord, but also of the whole Church,” and reads v. 2 as praise of God’s own height: *Exaltabo . . . suscepisti me: sublimitatem tuam laudabo*. The healing at v. 3 is healing from mortality itself. The second exposition — which exists in Latin only, the NPNF series carrying just the first — solves the title’s puzzle: *Modo enim fabricatur domus, id est Ecclesia, postea dedicabitur. In dedicatione apparebit gloria populi christiani, quae modo latet*. The house is being built now and dedicated later; Christ’s risen body is the pattern. And then, on the antiphon’s own last

words, the question that the whole later tradition repeats: *Quem sanavit, qui nunquam aegrotavit ... ? Non, sed mortem carnis portabat, vulnus tuum portabat, sanaturus te de vulnere tuo. Sanata est autem caro. Quando? Cum resurrexit* — with 1 Cor. 15:54 quoted, which is again the day’s Epistle chapter.

Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum* 29, title and vv. 2–3 Cassiodorus compresses the title into a formula: *Domus significat dominici corporis templum; dedicatio vero resurrectionem*. On v. 2 he makes a rhetorician’s note on the chant’s own verb: *Delectasti vero posuit, pro delectare fecisti. Quae figura dicitur hypallage*. On v. 3 he reruns Augustine’s paradox almost verbatim — *Quemadmodum sanatus est, qui non legitur aegrotasse? Sed occulte ille aegrotabat, quando universum hominem sua incarnatione suscepit ... quia in illo sanati sumus, sanatum se ipse profitetur* — a textbook demonstration of how much of Cassiodorus is Augustine reorganised.

St. Jerome, *Commentarioli in Psalmos* 29, ad titulum; St. Thomas Aquinas, *Super Psalmo* 29, nn. 1–2 Jerome gives the tradition its tersest form in a single sentence: *Dedicatio domus David, resurrectio Salvatoris intellegitur, in qua omnia vitae corpora dedicantur*. Aquinas weighs the letter first — David never dedicated the Lord’s house, and 2 Samuel 5 may supply his own — then decides: *Tamen melius intelligitur quod referatur ad mysterium domus David, idest Christi ... dedicationem, quae fuit in resurrectione, quando corpus Christi indutum est gloria immortalitatis. Super corpus Christi continue construitur; et per conversionem fidelium dedicabitur*. That fuses Cassiodorus’s body and Augustine’s Church into a single two-stage scheme. On v. 3 he distinguishes: God heals the whole man, but *Christum vero sanavit a corporali solum passibilitate*.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos* 29, title and vv. 2–3 (PG 80, cols. 1069–1072); Bellarmine, tr. O’Sullivan, pp. 73–74 Theodoret argues from the letter that the title cannot be David’s temple, since David neither built it nor fits the words, and concludes that the dedication of the house is the re-making of human nature accomplished when Christ accepted and destroyed death. On v. 2 he has the Master take our firstfruits and refuse to let nature become the demons’ prize. On v. 3 Antiochene precision returns: the cry and the healing fit Hezekiah in the obvious sense, while human nature received its resurrection unasked, out of sheer love of humankind. Even the soberest reader of the four, then, reaches death-destroyed-and-nature-renewed; only the mechanics differ. Bellarmine states the consensus flatly: “In a prophetic sense, it applies literally to Christ. ‘Thou hast healed me’ of the wounds I suffered on the cross ... ‘saved me’ by my resurrection,” and adds that all the saints will say it “most completely, in soul and body” on the last day.

Here the traditions converge. On this psalm the Latin and Greek traditions agree, which they did not at the Gradual or the Alleluia: Jerome, Augustine, Cassiodorus, Aquinas, Theodoret and Bellarmine all read the healing of v. 3 as the Resurrection. That convergence governs how the Offertory is read here and again in the interpretive section: to hear the Offertory as the healed deaf-mute’s own thanksgiving is to read it against, not with, the checked tradition, which puts the words in the mouth of the risen Christ or of the Church in him. There is no Hilary on Psalm 29.

Secret (Sec.)

Réspice, Dómine, quæsumus, nostram propítius servitútem · *Secreta*, composed oration · marginal no. 1549

The oldest text in the formulary, and it began somewhere else. This prayer stands in the Veronese (“Leonine”) collection, ed. Feltoe, p. 142 — inside the October mass *DE SICCITATE TEMPORIS*, a mass against drought, whose preface begs for rain. It is not a Sunday prayer there and has nothing to do with the harvest imagery this Sunday’s Communion carries; it became a Sunday Secret only when the Gelasian gathered the three orations into one mass (Wilson, p. 228), and it was fixed to a numbered Sunday only later still. Three verified variants stand in the witnesses:

Witness	Reading	Character
Veronese, Feltoe p. 142	<i>Respice quæsumus Dne nostram propítius servitútem ... sit nostrae fragilitati subsidium</i>	dative; the older word order <i>quæsumus Domine</i>
Old Gelasian, Wilson p. 228	<i>fragilitatis</i> in V, R, S and Gerbert’s text (Wilson’s n. 7); no <i>et</i> before the second <i>sit</i>	the 1962 genitive is already Gelasian; the 1962 <i>et</i> is not

Witness	Reading	Character
Gregorian Hadrianum, Wilson p. 172	<i>fragilitati</i> in the base text, fragilitatis in Ottob. 313	the manuscript that carries the 1962 reading is the same one whose chant cues sit two masses away
Venice Missal, 1570	<i>ad nostram . . . servitatem</i>	that edition's own preposition, not the 1962 text

The grammar. *Servitus* is the object of God's looking, and the prayer asks two things of one gift: *sit tibi munus accéptum, et sit nostræ fragilitátis subsidium*. The first clause is directed at God, the second at the offerers, and the genitive is doing real work — the support is *of our frailty*, that is, support supplied to a weakness that is admitted in the same breath in which the gift is offered. The dative of the older books (*fragilitati subsidium*, “a support for frailty”) says something very slightly different, and both readings stand in the table above with their witnesses.

Blessed Ildefonso Schuster, *The Sacramentary*, vol. III (1927), p. 127 Schuster fixes the register of the first noun. The *servitus* of which the Missal speaks, he says, is precisely what the Greeks called *leitourgia* — in his own words, “the sacerdotal ministry.” On that reading the prayer does not ask God to look at a general attitude of subjection but at the liturgical act being performed as the words are said, and the frailty supported is the frailty of those performing it.

Communion (*Comm.*)

Honóra Dóminum de tua substántia · *Ant. ad Communionem* — Prov. 3, 9-10 · marginal no. 1550

The one wisdom text of the day, and the missal trims it. Proverbs 3 is a father's instruction: trust the Lord and lean not on your own prudence, honour him with your substance, do not despise his correction. Verses 9–10 are the single promise of material increase in the chapter, and they are conditioned on a prior giving away. The antiphon compresses at three points: v. 9 loses *ómnium* and the closing imperative *da ei*, and v. 10 loses the second *tua*. Losing *da ei* is the interesting one, because it removes the verb of donation and leaves the two verbs of filling: *honour . . . and thy barns shall be filled*. Schuster notices that the antiphon “departs from the usual rule of the classical antiphons” at all — it is not a psalm — and connects it to “these summer Masses, during the time of harvest,” and to the old blessing of firstfruits at *Per quem hæc omnia*.

St. Bede, *In Proverbia Salomonis* I, on Prov. 3:9–10 (PL 91, cols. 950–952) Bede reads the two verses on three levels and the second is the one that matters for this Mass. *Literally*, the alms must come from one's own and honestly gotten substance, and be given for God's honour rather than for applause: *Multi multa pauperibus, sed de aliena substantia . . . tribuunt*. *Spiritually*, the firstfruits are the firstfruits of *every* good work and of every grace received; a man honours the Lord *de sua substantia* who credits all the good he has to grace and not to his own powers and merits, *memor illius verbi: sine me nihil potestis facere* (John 15:5). *Eschatologically*, the filled barns are heavenly satiety — he quotes *satiabor . . . dum manifestabitur gloria tua* — and the overflowing presses the *interna suavitas aeternorum*; the giver of earthly help is repaid *caelesti remuneratione*, *ditior dando*, richer for the giving.

Rabanus Maurus, *Expositio in Proverbia Salomonis* I (PL 111, cols. c. 688–690); Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* I (PL 53, cols. 214–216) Rabanus prints the full Vulgate lemma and then reproduces Bede's exposition verbatim, minus a clause: the Carolingian canonisation of Bede's reading and the route by which it reached the schools. Salvian, writing a good three centuries before Bede, is entirely literal and much sharper. Since everything we have is God's gift, God calls his own property “ours” precisely so that our giving can earn something: *Cum totum suum sit quod ab eo accepimus, nostrum esse dicit ut demus . . . Si devotus es, da quasi tuum; si indevotus, redde quasi non tuum*. Give it as yours if you are devout; hand it back as not yours if you are not.

Bede's second level and the day's Epistle say the same thing twice. *Grátia autem Dei sum id quod sum* is the first-person form of “credit all your good to grace, not to your own powers.” The convergence lies in the texts and their reception; the chant-cue evidence at the Collect shows that the Communion and the orations of this Mass reached each other late.

Salonius, Cyprian, and an open Greek question. Salonius of Geneva’s mystical exposition of Proverbs was searched entire for *Honora*, *substantia*, *primiti-*, *horrea* and *torcular-* and treats these verses nowhere. St. Cyprian, the obvious candidate on almsgiving, quotes Proverbs 20:9, 21:13, 10:3 and 20:7, Sirach 29:12 and Tobias 4 in *De opere et eleemosynis*, and Isaias 58, Job, Tobias and Micheas in *Ad Quirinum* III.1 — but not Proverbs 3:9. Tobias 4:7, “give alms of thy substance,” is the near-twin that the Latin tradition tends to quote instead. Greek patristic use of Proverbs 3:9 was not verified: the Septuagint’s wording differs enough from the Vulgate’s that a phrase search cannot reach it, and the question remains an open lead.

Postcommunion (*Postcomm.*)

Sentiámus, quásumus, Dómine, tui perceptióne sacraménti · *Postcommunio*, composed oration · marginal no. 1551

Transmission. Like the Secret, this prayer predates its Sunday. It stands in the Veronese collection at Feltoe p. 80, in a July mass, in a form with one word the later books drop: *ut in utroque salvati de caelestis remedii plenitudine gloriemur*. The Gelasian (Wilson p. 228) has the older word order *Sentiamus, Domine, quaesumus*; the Hadrianum (p. 172) and 1962 read *quásumus, Dómine*. The 1962 form was verified against the facsimile and stands as that book prints it.

The grammar, and the two things it refuses to separate. *Tui . . . sacraménti* is a split genitive governed by *perceptióne*; the subject of *sentiámus* is the assembly, and the verb is pointedly experiential — may we *feel* the help. What is asked for is *subsídium mentis et corporis*, and *in utroque* resumes exactly those two. The prayer will not let the sacrament be a spiritual benefit with bodily side effects, nor the reverse: it names both, saves both, and then asks for something more than benefit. *Gloriémur* is a verb of boasting. The 1861 English renders it “enjoy the full effect,” which keeps the petition and loses the boast; the divergence stands at the element above, and the Latin carries the argument here.

Schuster, *The Sacramentary*, vol. III (1927), pp. 127–128 Schuster draws the consequence the prayer’s second noun invites: the body’s contact with the Body of Jesus confers “the grace of the final resurrection.” That is reception of *corporis* and of *in utroque salvati* together, and it is the point at which this Postcommunion joins the resurrection reading that the Introit’s last clause, the Gradual’s *reflóruit*, the Offertory’s title and the Epistle’s kerygma have each carried in their own way. The convergence lies in the checked reception of five separate texts.

Source-Grounded Synthesis Across the Propers

The appointed wording, the documented historical orientation of the texts, and the reception actually checked at its own loci alone carry the conclusions below, which concern the formulary as the 1962 book prints it. Its transmission is uneven: the Old Gelasian carries the three orations as an unassigned Sunday mass, the Hadrianum files them at its own twelfth Sunday, the Frankish Gelasians at the thirteenth, and the Ottobonianus margins cue this Sunday’s antiphons two masses away. Chants and orations reached each other by a later realignment.

The formulary’s chief coherence is a shared boundary, and it is verifiable. Four of its texts stop where a human contribution would begin, and in three of the four the stopping is a demonstrable editorial act, not the shape of the source. The Epistle ends mid-verse at *vácuá non fuit*, before *sed abundántius illis ómnibus laborávi*. The Communion antiphon drops the imperative *da ei*, so that the two verbs left standing are *honour* and *shall be filled*. The Collect’s second petition asks God to add what *orátio* does not presume — a petition whose grammatical subject is the prayer, not the person praying. And the Gospel’s protagonist contributes nothing whatever until his tongue has been loosed: he is brought, taken aside, touched, and opened, and the first thing recorded of his speech is that it was right. All four boundaries are verified, and no checked witness reads them together.

The reception of five separate elements converges on the Resurrection, and the convergence belongs to the commentators rather than to the Mass. Hilary, Augustine and Bellarmine read the Introit’s *virtútem et fortitúdinem* of the risen body. Augustine glosses the Gradual’s *reflóruit caro mea* as *resurrexit caro mea*, and Cassiodorus, Lombard, Aquinas and Bellarmine develop it. Jerome, Augustine, Cassiodorus, Aquinas, Theodoret and Bellarmine all read the Offertory psalm’s dedication of David’s house as the Resurrection. The Epistle is the Church’s oldest resurrection kerygma. Schuster reads the Postcommunion’s help to mind and body as the pledge of the final resurrection. Five elements, six centuries of witnesses, one direction — and not one of those witnesses is commenting

on this Sunday. A reader who arrives with the tradition in hand will hear a resurrection Mass here, and the texts themselves supply that reading only through their reception.

The tradition genuinely disagrees at four points, and the formulary resolves none of them. At Introit v. 36 the gift of strength is the resurrection of the body (Hilary, Augustine, Bellarmine), or patience and faith (Cassiodorus), or providential support (Theodoret). At Gradual v. 7 *reflóruit* is the Resurrection for the whole Latin line and recovered bodily vigour for Theodoret. At the Alleluia the instruments are allegory for Augustine and Cassiodorus and instruments for Theodoret and Bellarmine. A fourth disagreement runs through the Gospel: the deaf-mute is the race in Adam (ps-Jerome), or any uncatechised soul (Bede), or a particular man with a demonic affliction (Theophylact), or human nature restored in Christ's own humanity (the Victor tradition) — and the sigh is an example, a taking-on of our cause, a prayer, or a pity, depending on which of them is speaking. These are not variants of one reading. They yield different sermons, and they stand as four positions, not one consensus.

Two of the day's texts are the patristic tradition's own language turned into liturgy, which is a different relation from quotation. The Introit sings *unánimes*, which is Augustine's gloss on *unius modi* and Cassiodorus's lemma; the chant therefore carries into the Mass a word the Vulgate does not have and the Douay cannot render. The baptismal *Ephphetha* runs the other way: a word from this Gospel became a rite, attested by Ambrose at Milan around 390 and still printed in the *Rituale Romanum* of 1872 with the same saliva and the same ears. In both cases the traffic between exegesis, chant and ritual is documented.

The Epistle's boundary constrains what may be preached from this Sunday, and the constraint has a positive form. What the Church actually reads is a creed received and handed on, a list of witnesses, a man who calls himself untimely born, and the sentence *grátia Dei sum id quod sum*. What she does not read is the labour and the *mecum*. The lection is thus, as read, a statement about the origin of a person and a ministry rather than about the mechanics of cooperation — and Bede, expounding the day's Communion antiphon three centuries before the scholastics, says the same thing about giving: one honours the Lord from one's substance by crediting all the good one has to grace and not to one's own powers and merits. The Epistle and the Communion make one claim in two idioms, personal and economic. The link rests on two checked expositions.

The orations do the work that the readings leave undone, and they do it in the plural. The Collect asks for pardon and for a gift beyond request; the Secret asks that one offering be at once acceptable to God and support to the frailty of the offerers; the Postcommunion asks that the sacrament be felt as help of mind and body, and that, saved in both, we may glory in the fullness of the remedy. Each is a double request, and in each the second half concerns the petitioners' weakness. The three prayers travelled together from the Old Gelasian onward, as the sacramentaries document. Their shared shape — one act of God, two effects, the second of them ours — is the nearest thing this Mass has to a thesis.

The Propers: Notable and Quotable

Four verified afterlives of wording from the scriptural propers, each a use that moves the phrase into a register its author did not occupy. Two of the four come from one Aramaic word, and the concentration is telling: of everything on these three missal pages, *Ephphetha* is what the world took and put to other work.

Epistle, 1 Cor. 15:8 — William Morris makes an apostle's apology into an aesthete's manifesto, 1868

Appointed phrase. *Novissime autem ómnium tamquam abortívo, visus est et mihi*; Douay–Rheims, “And last of all, he was seen also by me, as by one born out of due time.”

Later use and locus. William Morris, *The Earthly Paradise* (London: F. S. Ellis, 1868), the prefatory “Apology,” stanza 4, on p. 2 of the first edition: “Dreamer of dreams, born out of my due time, | Why should I strive to set the crooked straight?” Read in the archive.org scan of the first edition.

The turn. Paul's phrase is an apology for the violence and lateness of his own apostolic vision, made in the act of claiming apostolic standing. Morris keeps the idiom, inserts one word — *my* — and inverts the claim. Untimeliness now means being a medieval dreamer stranded in the industrial nineteenth century, and where Paul's untimely birth is the ground of a commission, Morris's is the ground of a disclaimer: he explicitly denies any power to set the crooked straight. The Apostle's least of the apostles becomes the idle singer of an empty day.

Rights and limit. The first edition (1868) and Morris (d. 1896) are long out of copyright. The dependence is on the naturalised English idiom “born out of due time,” shared by the Douay and the King James, not on this Mass lection; Morris cites nothing. The “Apology” is absent from the Project Gutenberg Part II e-text, so the first-edition scan is the witness.

Gospel, Mk. 7:34 — “Effeta, The Body Deodorant,” New Jersey, 1912

Appointed phrase. *Ephphetha, quod est adaperire*, and the baptismal formula that quotes it: *Ephphetha, quod est, Adaperire . . . In odorem suavitatis* (*Rituale Romanum*, Pustet 1872, pp. 11–12).

Later use and locus. A newspaper advertisement for the Willis Pike Co. Laboratories, 129 W. 31st St., New York, in the *Perth Amboy Evening News* (N.J.), 19 June 1912, ed. 2, p. 2: “For That Embarrassing Odor of Perspiration Get a Box of Effeta, The Body Deodorant. ‘Be thou opened unto odor of sweetness.’” The campaign runs in the same paper from 29 May to 22 June 1912 and reappears in the *Norwich Bulletin* (Conn.), 22 June 1912, p. 6. Read in the Library of Congress *Chronicling America* page text.

The turn. The product name is the Latin form of the Gospel word — and, at that, the form Bede’s lemma uses — and the slogan splices Christ’s command to the deaf man onto the rite’s own *in odorem suavitatis*, the words said over the nostrils. What is opened in Mark is a pair of ears and a tongue; what is opened in the advertisement, for twenty-five cents a box, is the pores. The copywriter is not being blasphemous so much as commercially literal: he has found a sacramental formula about opening and odour and sold it as a toiletry.

Rights and limit. United States newspapers of 1912 are public domain. The copywriter’s proximate source is the baptismal rite rather than the Mass lection — but the rite is quoting this Sunday’s Gospel, and St. Ambrose says so. The 19 June issue is the one in which the scriptural slogan line is legible in the page text, and the wording was read there in context.

Introit psalm verse, Ps. 67:2 — Cromwell at Dunbar, 3 September 1650

Appointed phrase. *Exsurgat Deus, et dissipentur inimici eius*; Douay–Rheims, “Let God arise, and let his enemies be scattered.” It is the verse the missal appoints as the Introit’s psalm verse.

Later use and locus. At the moment the Scottish line broke, with the sun coming up over the sea, Cromwell was heard to exclaim “Now let God arise, and his enemies shall be scattered.” The eyewitness is Captain John Hodgson, *Original Memoirs . . . Life of Sir Henry Slingsby, and Memoirs of Capt. Hodgson* (Edinburgh, 1806), pp. 147–48, whose editor footnotes the reference as “Psalm lxviii. v. 1” and who adds, a few lines later, “I heard him say, ‘I profess they run!’” Relayed with the psalter version by Thomas Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell’s Letters and Speeches* (Tauchnitz, 1861), vol. 2, pp. 332–33. Three years later, opening Barebone’s Parliament on 4 July 1653, Cromwell read the whole psalm aloud; Carlyle notes “We remember it ever since Dunbar morning” (vol. 3, pp. 171–72).

The turn. In the Mass the verse is sung by a congregation as the priest comes to the altar. At Dunbar it is not a prayer at all but a battlefield exclamation — the shout of a commander who has just watched a cavalry charge succeed, using the psalm to certify the outcome rather than to ask for it. Three years later the same psalm is deployed politically, as scriptural warrant for a revolutionary assembly. The verse travels from petition to victory-cry to constitutional argument.

Rights and limit. Both sources are public domain. Cromwell’s wording is the English psalter and King James tradition, not the Douay. Hodgson’s memoir is remembered speech first printed in 1806, not a contemporary dispatch; Cromwell’s own letter about Dunbar does not contain the phrase. The 1806 page text garbles the word “scattered,” and the reading here is controlled by the editor’s footnote and by Carlyle’s transcription.

Gospel, Mk. 7:34 — a command to the deaf becomes the name deaf institutions gave themselves

Appointed phrase. *Ephphetha*, “Be thou opened.”

Later use and locus. (a) The Ephphatha Guild, a body of “between fifty and sixty” deaf-mutes attached to St. Luke’s, Scranton, with an affiliated secular “Penny Club” and its own fundraising fairs — *The Scranton Tribune*, 14 November 1895, p. 3, under the heading “EPHPHATHA GUILD SERVICES,” which supplies the derivation itself: the guild “takes its name from the Greek word ‘Ephphatha’ ‘Be opened’ used by the Savior in healing a deaf mute.” (b) The Ephphatha Missions for the Deaf and Blind and the Ephphatha Services Board of

the American Lutheran Church, with an annual professional Ephphatha Conference — Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf, *Council Membership Directory 1969* (ERIC ED032704).

The turn. A word spoken once, to one man, becomes a durable institutional surname across denominations and three-quarters of a century: dues, guild fairs, boards, a conference in the calendar. The register shifts from miracle to administration. And there is a sharper edge: in the decades of the oralism-versus-sign controversy, deaf people organised themselves under a word that commands the deaf to hear and the mute to speak, and used it as a name for their own society rather than as a prescription addressed to them.

Rights and limit. The 1895 newspaper is public domain; the 1969 directory is a freely distributed ERIC document, cited without extended reproduction. Both bodies are church-affiliated, and their names are proper names of functioning institutions, not sermon reuse. The Scranton paper miscalls the Aramaic word “Greek,” which is reproduced above as printed.

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 anchors, mechanism, search result and controlling limit of each are recorded in **research/scope.md**. “Not located in the checked corpus” is bounded to that corpus and never means that a connection is unprecedented. 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 has two openings, and the second is a harvest

Classification: Not located in the checked corpus.

Anchors: Gospel (*Gosp.*), *Ephphetha, quod est adaperire*; Communion (*Comm.*), *implebuntur hórrea tua saturitáte, et vino torculária redundábunt*; Collect (*Coll.*), *effúnde super nos misericórdiam tuam*.

Mechanism: Three of the day’s texts describe a container being opened or filled past its own capacity, and they run in one direction. The Collect asks God to *pour out* — a verb of overflow — and then to add what prayer does not presume; the Gospel’s one spoken word is an imperative to open; the Communion ends on presses that run over. Read in sequence, what God opens does not merely function again but produces more than it can hold. The formulary would then have a shape rather than a subject: unstopping, then overflow.

Fruit: Healing stops being restoration to a norm. The measure of an opened ear, on this reading, is not that it hears but that what comes out of the man afterwards exceeds him — which is exactly what the crowd’s disobedient publishing does at the end of the pericope.

What the ordinary reading misses: Element by element the Communion is an antiphon about almsgiving and the Gospel is a healing narrative, and the Collect’s *effúnde* is read as ordinary petitionary idiom. The three verbs are never set side by side.

Strongest limit: The chant-cue evidence at the Collect is decisive against any design claim: the Ottobonianus margins cue this Communion two masses away from these orations, so the pairing is a late accident of two independently drifting cycles. St. Bede’s firstfruits-of-grace reading and Schuster’s harvest reading each control the Communion severally, and neither joins it to the Gospel. And the antiphon’s overflow is conditional on a giving away that the missal’s trimming of *da ei* has removed from view.

Editorial proposal — The loosed tongue is given a psalm to say, four elements later

Classification: Not located in the checked corpus.

Anchors: Gospel (*Gosp.*), *solútum est vínculum linguæ eius, et loquebátur recte*; Offertory (*Off.*), *clamávi ad te, et sanásti me*; Epistle (*Ep.*), *grátia eius in me vácuá non fuit*.

Mechanism: Mark records that the healed man spoke rightly and never records a word of it. The Offertory, sung a few minutes later, is the only proper of the day in the voice of somebody already healed, and it says in the first person precisely what the Gospel has just narrated in the third: I cried to thee and thou hast healed me.

The Epistle supplies the grammar for such speech — a man whose account of himself begins from grace and not from himself. The proposal is that the liturgy supplies the missing sentence, and that the supplied sentence is a confession rather than a report.

Fruit: Right speech is defined by content, not by fluency. The formulary’s answer to “what does a loosed tongue say?” would be: it says where it came from.

What the ordinary reading misses: Taken alone the Offertory is a generic thanksgiving assigned to a Sunday, and *loquebátur recte* is a clinical detail about articulation.

Strongest limit: This is the proposal that most directly contradicts the checked tradition, and the contradiction is not marginal. Jerome, Augustine, Cassiodorus, Aquinas, Theodoret and Bellarmine all read Ps. 29’s healing of the Resurrection, on the strength of the psalm’s title; Augustine asks in so many words who healed a man who was never sick. Assigning the verse to the deaf-mute reads it against every witness checked. The nearest material found is Cassiodorus’s remark that idols do not heal but wound — and that falls in his exposition of this day’s Alleluia psalm, not of the Offertory.

Editorial proposal — Silence asked of God, and silence ended by God

Classification: Near analogue located.

anchors: Gradual (*Grad.*), *Deus meus, ne sileas, ne discédas a me*; Gospel (*Gosp.*), the groan and then *Ephphetha*; Alleluia (*All.*), *Exsultáte . . . iubiláte . . . súmíte psalmum*.

Mechanism: Three consecutive sung and read elements make an anthropology of sound. The Gradual’s versicle asks God not to be silent; the Alleluia commands a shout; between them the Gospel puts a groan before a word, and ends with a crowd that cannot be silenced. The day would then move through four registers of voice in order — petition that God speak, jubilation, inarticulate groan, and finally right speech — and locate the human voice as something that only exists downstream of a divine one.

Fruit: Liturgical song acquires an anthropology: the assembly’s jubilus is not self-expression but the audible form of having been opened, and the groan is given a place inside worship rather than outside it.

What the ordinary reading misses: Element by element these are a Gradual, an Alleluia and a miracle story; the sequence of vocal states across them is invisible unless the three are read as one movement.

Strongest limit: Two hard checks. The Gradual’s *ne discédas a me* has no patristic lemma at all — every checked expositor has *ne sileas* and *nequándo táceas* — so the closing plea cannot be given a documented reception. And Augustine assigns the whole of Psalm 27 to Christ in the Passion, not to a man asking to be spoken to. The near analogue is real but partial: the seventh-century commentary under Jerome’s name says the opened ears open *ad hymnos, cantica, et psalmos*, joining the healing to psalmody, and Bede supplies the groan as *exemplum gemendi*; neither joins either to this Gradual.

Editorial proposal — The shape of the lesson preaches what the lesson does not say

Classification: Not located in the checked corpus.

anchors: Epistle (*Ep.*), cut at *et grátia eius in me vácuá non fuit*; Collect (*Coll.*), *adícias quod orátio non præsúmit*; Communion (*Comm.*), the antiphon’s dropped imperative *da ei*.

Mechanism: Three independent editorial boundaries in one formulary all fall at the same place — immediately before the point at which a human contribution would be named. The lection stops before Paul’s labour; the Collect makes the prayer, not the petitioner, the thing that does not presume; the antiphon removes the verb of donation and leaves the filling. None of the three is a feature of its source text: each is something the liturgy did to it. The proposal is that the formulary preaches prevenient grace by its cuts rather than by its assertions.

Fruit: An account of how a lectionary teaches. What is not read is part of what is heard, and a reader who has noticed the pattern will read the day’s silences as significant rather than arbitrary.

What the ordinary reading misses: Each boundary looks like a separate accident of chant construction or lectionary convenience, and the Epistle’s mid-verse ending in particular is usually noted, if at all, as a curiosity.

Strongest limit: The boundaries are received, not designed here: the same Epistle ending and the same trimmed antiphon stand in the Missals of 1570 and 1862, and no source states a motive for either. More seriously, the tradition whose key clause is cut — Augustine, Gregory, Aquinas — teaches human cooperation with grace on the strength of exactly those unread words. The pattern cannot be pressed into a denial of what they teach, and this guide does not press it.

Editorial proposal — A green Sunday that sings a small Easter

Classification: Near analogue located.

Anchor: Introit (*Int.*), *ipse dabit virtutem et fortitudinem plebi suæ*; Gradual (*Grad.*), *reflóruit caro mea*; Offertory (*Off.*), the title *in dedicatione domus David* and *sanásti me*; Epistle (*Ep.*), the kerygma of 1 Cor. 15.

Mechanism: Four elements of this Mass have, independently, a resurrection reading in the checked tradition — and the four readings were made by different men in different centuries, none of them thinking about this Sunday. Set the received expositions side by side and an arc appears across the formulary: the risen body promised (Introit), the flesh flowering again (Gradual), the house dedicated in the Resurrection (Offertory), and the event itself confessed in the lesson. The proposal is that a green Sunday in late summer carries a compact paschal formulary, and that it does so as a *reception effect*.

Fruit: A way of describing liturgical coherence. Texts can converge because the tradition that reads them converges, and this Mass is a clean specimen of the phenomenon.

What the ordinary reading misses: Element by element these are a processional psalm, a thanksgiving, an offertory chant and an epistle. Only the reception makes them one thing, and the reception is not on the missal page.

Strongest limit: The arc is not a property of the texts, and two checked witnesses break it: Cassiodorus moralises the Introit's last clause into patience and faith with no resurrection at all, and Theodoret reads the Gradual's *reflóruit* of a hunted man's recovered bodily vigour. Against design, the chant-cue drift recorded at the Collect shows these chants and these orations were not paired when either was composed. And the convergence is partly an artefact of which witnesses survive: it is strongest in the Latin line that runs from Augustine through Cassiodorus to Aquinas.

Appendix: Scope and Qualifications

As of 20 August 2026. Everything below states the boundaries of this guide as at that date. Retrieval mechanics, checksums, query detail, discarded leads, and the full reception, notable-and-quotable and interpretive-proposal audits are in `propos/verified.md` and `research/scope.md` beside this document's source; they are not repeated here.

Two editions, one body of research. This guide is published in two mechanically compiled forms from a single source leaf. The *Full PDF*, which is the canonical 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 the full element-by-element commentary. The *Synthesis PDF*, published at the same identity with a `-synthesis` suffix, omits both of those and puts in their place an integrated commentary organised by cross-proper claims. Everything else — the map, the dossier sheet, the two-page thematic movement, the source-grounded synthesis, the notable gallery, the interpretive proposals and this apparatus — is identical in both. Neither is a separate study, and the synthesis companion owns no research, prose or records of its own. Where a paragraph below refers to a table or a collation, the full edition prints it and `propos/verified.md` records it in either case.

Edition and formulary identity. The work is the temporal formulary printed *DOMINICA UNDECIMA post Pentecosten, II classis*, on pp. 390–392 of the 1962 *editio typica* of the *Missale Romanum* (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis), with marginal numbers 1542–1551. 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. Its boundaries are the Postcommunion of the Tenth Sunday (no. 1541) and the heading *DOMINICA DUODECIMA post Pentecosten* (no. 1552).

Text verification. All ten elements, their headings, references, wording, accents, punctuation, rank, rubrics and both formulary boundaries were visually collated on 19 August 2026 against the CMAA facsimile of the Vatican typical edition at 300 and 600 dpi — and at 1200 dpi for the Gospel's unaccented opening line — and independently against page images of the 1962 Benziger *editio iuxta typicam*. The two editions differ at the nine 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 eleven places where it diverges are tabulated in the commentary as verified textual observations. One further question is deliberately not published as a divergence: at Mk. 7:34 the missal prints *suspiciens in cælum* where two consulted Clementine transcriptions print *suscipiens*; those transcriptions may not be independent and no printed Clementine facsimile was collated for the verse, so the point is recorded in `research/scope.md` as an unresolved lead. 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 its abbreviated conclusion. Both are in the public domain in the United States; neither is an official liturgical translation, and neither was composed for the 1962 books. Where a witness consulted for reception exists only in a translation still under copyright — Theodoret in Hill, the Aquinas *lectura* in Larcher, Theophylact in Stade, Cassiodorus in Walsh — that witness is summarised, or quoted in Latin or from Migne’s Latin column, and never rendered by this project.

Seven places where the registered English does not answer the Latin, and is not made to. The Introit sings *unánimes* where the Clementine, and therefore the Douay, reads *unius moris*; the Introit and the Alleluia are centonisations, so their Douay verses are printed whole with the sung fragments marked rather than stitched into project-made joins; the Gradual sings *clamávi* against the Douay’s future and closes with *ne discédas a me*, which has no Clementine counterpart at all; the Offertory drops the *Deus meus* the Douay carries; the Communion drops *ómnium* and *da ei*; the missal prints *Ephphetha* where the Douay prints “Ephpheta”; and the liturgical incipits *Fratres*: and *In illo témpore: Exiens Iesus* are the missal’s own and are not translated. In each case the gap is stated where it falls. The Epistle’s English stops where the lesson stops; the remainder of its verse is described, not printed as appointed text. Two divergences between this e-text and the 1899 American printing of the Douay fall inside verses quoted here — “lest if thou be silent” at Ps. 27:1 and “Then was he seen” at 1 Cor. 15:6 — and are disclosed in the references; every other quoted locus of this Mass agrees word for word with the American edition.

Search bounds. Reception was searched in Latin, in Greek both directly and through Migne’s Latin columns, and in English, across the major reasonably accessible patristic, medieval and later corpora relevant to each appointed passage: Hilary’s *Tractatus super Psalmos* in CSEL 22; Augustine’s *Enarrationes*, *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, *De consensu evangelistarum*, and sermons; Jerome’s *Commentarioli* and *Tractatus* in Morin’s editions and the *Commentarius in Marcum* transmitted under his name; Bede on Mark and on Proverbs; Rabanus Maurus on Proverbs; Salvian and Salonius; Gregory the Great in PL 75–76 and the *Moralia*; Cassiodorus’s *Expositio Psalmorum*; Theodoret on the Psalms and on First Corinthians; Chrysostom on First Corinthians and on Matthew; Theophylact on Mark; Ambrosiaster; Irenaeus and Tertullian; Aquinas’s *Super Psalmos*, *Super I ad Corinthios*, *Catena aurea in Marcum* and the *Summa theologiae*; Peter Lombard on the Psalms; Bellarmine; Cornelius a Lapide; Ambrose’s mystagogical works; the 1872 *Rituale Romanum*; and Guéranger’s continuator Dom Lucien Fromage and Schuster for modern liturgical commentary. Consequential negative results are reported in the commentary rather than concealed — among them that Gregory the Great nowhere expounds this Sunday’s Gospel, that Aquinas’s psalms commentary ends at Psalm 54 and so touches neither the Introit’s nor the Alleluia’s psalm, that Hilary’s extant tractates omit Psalms 27, 29 and 80, that Jerome’s homily on Psalm 67 stops before the verse the Introit sings, that the *Summa*’s treatise on grace never cites 1 Cor. 15:10, that the Collect is absent from the Veronese sacramentary, and that Salonius and Cyprian do not treat the Communion’s passage. No exhaustive search of Syriac originals, chant manuscripts, untranslated homiliaries, subscription databases or current specialist monographs is claimed, and none of these negatives is a claim about literature outside the corpora named.

Bounds carried by particular claims. Modern critical apparatus for the orations — Corpus Orationum, Bruylants, Deshusses’s numbering — was not publicly reachable and was not consulted; every transmission claim rests on the named public-domain editions themselves. The postconciliar reuse of the Collect rests on two secondary Latin transcriptions, the official 2002 locus remaining a lead. Fromage’s continuation of Guéranger was verified in the 1909 Stanbrook second edition, which is the edition cited. Peter Lombard was checked on Psalms 27 and 67 only. Greek patristic use of Proverbs 3:9 was not verified, the Septuagint’s wording defeating a Vulgate-phrase search, and is recorded as a lead rather than closed. For the Benziger witness, individual page images were read from the Internet Archive item; acquisition of the exact registered derivative bytes is deliberately not claimed. The gloss-attributed line about the womb of an abortive birth, which circulates under Gregory’s name, was traced only to Hugh of St-Cher’s postill, was not verified in Gregory, and is not published.

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 a verse behind the Vulgate wherever the psalm carries a title; the dossiers print it beside the Vulgate number. Three of this Mass’s four psalms show that offset; Psalm 27, whose title the Douay counts inside v. 1, shows none. *Heb.* is the Masoretic number of the Nova Vulgata and the New American Bible, which renumbers the psalm but keeps the Vulgate’s verse division: Ps. 67:2, 6–7, 36 *Vulg.* is Heb. 68:2, 6–7, 36; Ps. 27:1, 7 is Heb. 28:1, 7; Ps. 80:2–3 is Heb. 81:2–3; Ps. 29:2–3 is Heb. 30:2–3. The conversions were taken from the concordance registered with the Douay–Rheims edition used here, not computed by this guide; the concordance marks each of the four psalms as carrying its offset uniformly, so each conversion holds from the head of its psalm.

Historical bounds. Dates and places in the page-2 dossiers distinguish traditional attribution from current historical judgment and are orienting rather than probative. On the psalm titles the two witnesses named there differ in emphasis: the 1910 *Catholic Encyclopedia* reports the Biblical Commission’s decree of that year that the titles are older than the Septuagint and that it cannot prudently be denied that David is the Psalter’s chief author, while adding that neither councils nor Fathers make him its sole author; the *NABRE* treats the superscriptions as pre-Christian Jewish tradition whose technical terms are now lost and holds that no psalm can be securely dated. This guide does not settle the authorship or date of any psalm, the date or place of Mark’s composition, the compilation history of Proverbs, or the year of the events Mark narrates. Where the two named witnesses disagree — as they do about Proverbs 1–9 and about Mark’s date — both positions are printed and neither is preferred.

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 printed 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 of its appointed elements — in the same order and at the same scriptural references — are printed in the Pustet printing of Ratisbon, 1862, and all ten again in the Venice Missal of 1570, both of which this repository tracks as public-domain text, so the 1962 edition’s copyright does not reach them; the element-level 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 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 agents that produced it. It has received no independent liturgical, theological, specialist, rights or ecclesiastical review, and carries no imprimatur, nihil obstat or ecclesiastical approval.

References

Only sources actually used above, with loci sufficient to check the claims made from them. Where a witness was read in a named public-domain translation, that translation is identified; where the only translation is in copyright, the original-language edition is given and the witness is summarised rather than quoted.

Liturgical books and sacramentaries

- *Missale Romanum*, editio typica (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1962), *Dominica Undecima post Pentecosten*, printed pp. 390–392, marginal nos. 1542–1551. Facsimile: <https://media.churchmusicassociation.org/pdf/missale62.pdf>, PDF pp. 471–473. *Controlling text for every Latin form printed above.*

- *Missale Romanum*, editio iuxta typicam (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1962), printed pp. 385–386. Page images in Internet Archive item `MissaleRomanum1962RomanMissalColorLatin`, leaves `n461–n462`: <https://archive.org/details/MissaleRomanum1962RomanMissalColorLatin>. *Second 1962 edition, collated for the discrepancy table.*
- *Missale Romanum* (Venice, 1570), *Dominica xj. post Pentecosten*; *Missale Romanum* (Ratisbon: Pustet, 1862), *Dominica XI. post Pentecosten*, printed pp. 332–334. Tracked public-domain text layers, read only for the preexisting-material check recorded in `propers/verified.md`; nothing is quoted from either.
- *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 Eleventh Sunday after Pentecost, printed pp. 418–420. Anonymous translation; 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`.
- H. A. Wilson, ed., *The Gelasian Sacramentary: Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1894), Book III § VII, *Item alia Missa*, p. 228 with the editor’s notes. <https://archive.org/details/gelasiansacrame00gelagoog>
- H. A. Wilson, ed., *The Gregorian Sacramentary under Charles the Great*, Henry Bradshaw Society 49 (London, 1915), ch. XXX, *Dominica .XII. post Pentecosten*, p. 172, with the apparatus and Ottobonianus chant cues at pp. 171–172. <https://archive.org/details/gregoriansacrame00cath>
- C. L. Feltoe, ed., *Sacramentarium Leonianum* (Cambridge, 1896), p. 142 (*Mense Octobri* § XXXII, *De siccitate temporis*) and p. 80 (*Mense Iulio*, *Missa XXXVIII*). Also searched entire for the Collect, with the bounded negative result recorded in `research/scope.md`.
- *Rituale Romanum Pauli V Pontificis Maximi jussu editum* (Ratisbon and New York: Pustet, 1872), *Ordo baptismi parvulorum*, printed pp. 11–12, and *Ordo baptismi adultorum*, printed p. 33.
- *Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia (2002), *Dominica XXVII per annum*, Collect. Reported as a verbatim reuse of this Sunday’s Collect on the strength of two independent unofficial Latin transcriptions; no official scan was located, the postconciliar book is not quoted here, and the official locus remains a lead.
- 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), Eleventh Sunday, pp. 272–274, citing Rupert of Deutz, *De divinis officiis* XII, 11. <https://archive.org/details/V11TheLiturgicalYear>
- Ildefonso Schuster, *The Sacramentary (Liber Sacramentorum)*, tr. Arthur Levelis-Marke, vol. III (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1927), “Eleventh Sunday after Pentecost,” pp. 124–128. <https://archive.org/details/LiberSacramentorum>

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. 67:2, 6–7, 36; 27:1, 7; 80:2–3; 29:2–3; Prov. 3:9–10; Mk. 7:31–37; 1 Cor. 15:1–10, and read at Ps. 67:1, 27:1, 29:1, 80:1, Mk. 7:30, 1 Cor. 15:11 and 16:8 for boundaries and titles. *Source of the English of every scriptural proper.* Public domain by age. Registered 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. Two of the loci quoted above appear in that collation and both are disclosed: at Ps. 27:1 this e-text reads “lest if thou be silent to me” where the American edition reads “lest thou be silent to me,” and at 1 Cor. 15:6 this e-text reads “Then was he seen” where the American reads “Then he was seen.” At every other quoted locus the printed American Douay–Rheims agrees word for word with the text published here.
- Clementine Vulgate, consulted for Pss. 27, 29, 67 and 80; Prov. 3; Mk. 7; 1 Cor. 15; and Eph. 3:20. <http://www.drbo.org/lvb/>

Patristic, medieval and later reception

- Ambrose, *De mysteriis* 1.3–4, tr. H. de Romestin, NPNF second series, vol. 10 (1896); *De sacramentis* I.1.2–3, tr. T. Thompson, ed. J. H. Srawley (London: SPCK, 1919). Both public domain.

- Ambrosiaster, *Commentaria in epistulam ad Corinthios primam*, ad 15:1–11 (PL 17), read in the Latin Wikisource transcription of the Migne text: [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* 27 §§1, 7; 29, Enarratio I §§1–3 and Enarratio II §§1, 6, 11–12; 67 §§2–3, 7, 44; 80 §§3–5. Latin at https://www.augustinus.it/latino/esposizioni_salmi/; English for Pss. 27, 29 (Enarr. I), 67 and 80 in NPNF first series, vol. 8 (1888), <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1801.htm>, where the expositions are headed by the English psalm numbers 28, 30, 68 and 81. Enarratio II on Ps. 29 exists in Latin only.
- Augustine, *De gratia et libero arbitrio* 5.12; *De consensu evangelistarum* 4.4.5, tr. S. D. F. Salmond, NPNF first series, vol. 6 (1888); *Sermo* 279, 5–6; *Enarratio in Ps.* 70, sermo 1, 1–2.
- Bede, *In Marci evangelium expositio* II, on Mk. 7:31–37 (PL 92, cols. 203–206); *In Proverbia Salomonis* I, on Prov. 3:9–10 (PL 91, cols. 950–952).
- Robert Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos*, Pss. 27, 29, 67 and 80, tr. John O’Sullivan (Dublin, 1866), pp. 68–69, 73–74, 196–201, 246–247.
- Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum*, on Pss. 27 (vv. 1, 7), 29 (title and vv. 2–3), 67 (vv. 6, 7, 36) and 80 (vv. 2–3), PL 70 text at <https://www.monumenta.ch/>. Walsh’s modern English was not used.
- John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in epistulam I ad Corinthios* 38, tr. Talbot W. Chambers, NPNF first series, vol. 12 (1889); *Homiliae in Matthaem* 52, NPNF first series, vol. 10, checked and cited for a negative result.
- Cornelius a Lapide, *The Great Commentary*, on Mk. 7:31–37, tr. T. W. Mossman, vol. 3 (1887; printing read 1891), pp. 408–410; on 1 Cor. 15, tr. W. F. Cobb (1908). Both public domain.
- Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 16.25. The complete text of PL 75 and PL 76 — *Moralia* I–XXXV, *Homiliae in Ezechielem*, and the forty *Homiliae in Evangelia* with their indices — was searched for any exposition of Mk. 7:31–37, with the bounded negative result reported in the commentary.
- Hilary of Poitiers, *Tractatus super Psalmum* 67, §§2, 8, 37, ed. A. Zingerle, CSEL 22 (Vienna, 1891). The extant series omits Pss. 27, 29 and 80, a negative reported in the commentary.
- Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 3.18.3, tr. Roberts and Rambaut, ANF vol. 1 (1885); Tertullian, *De resurrectione carnis* 48, tr. Peter Holmes, ANF vol. 3 (1885). *Adversus Marcionem* 5 was checked and found to engage 1 Cor. 15 only from v. 12.
- Jerome, *Tractatus de Psalmo* 67 and *Tractatus de Psalmo* 80; *Commentarioli in Psalmos* 27, 29, 67 and 80 — all in G. Morin’s editions, *Anecdota Maredsolana* III.1 (1895) and III.2 (1897). The *Tractatus in Marci evangelium* in the same volume was checked and has no tractate on Mk. 7:31–37.
- Ps-Jerome, *Commentarius in evangelium secundum Marcum*, cap. VII (PL 30, cols. 611C–612B). Transmitted under Jerome’s name; treated here as the anonymous seventh-century work modern scholarship takes it to be.
- Peter Lombard, *Commentarium in Psalmos*, on Pss. 27 (v. 7) and 67 (v. 6), PL 191, read in the Internet Archive scan of the 1854 Migne volume; cited by psalm and verse because that scan’s column numbers are illegible.
- Rabanus Maurus, *Expositio in Proverbia Salomonis* I, on Prov. 3:9–10 (PL 111, cols. c. 688–690).
- Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam (Adversus avaritiam)* I (PL 53, cols. 214–216); Salonus of Geneva, *Expositio mystica in Parabolas Salomonis* (PL 53, cols. 967–994), searched entire with a negative result; Cyprian, *De opere et eleemosynis* and *Ad Quirinum* III.1, likewise checked and negative for Prov. 3:9.
- Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos* 27 (PG 80, col. 1060), 29 (cols. 1069–1072), 67 (cols. 1380, 1400) and 80 (cols. 1520–1521), read in the Greek; *Interpretatio in xiv epistulas S. Pauli*, in 1 Cor. 15 (PG 82, cols. 347–352), quoted from Migne’s Latin column. Robert Hill’s English translations are in copyright and were not used.
- Theophylact, *Enarratio in evangelium Marci*, on 7:31–37 (PG 123, cols. 565–568), read in Greek with Migne’s facing Latin, which is what is quoted. Stade’s English is in copyright and was not used.
- Thomas Aquinas, *Super Psalmo* 27, nn. 1, 7 and *Super Psalmo* 29, nn. 1–2 (the series ends at Ps. 54, a negative reported in the commentary); *Super I ad Corinthios*, cap. 15, lectio 1, nn. 888–911; *Catena aurea in Marcum*, cap. 7, lectio 4; *Summa theologiae* II–II q. 83 aa. 2 and 16, III q. 55 a. 3 and q. 57 a. 6, and I–II qq. 106–114, checked and cited for a negative result. Latin at <https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/>; Larcher’s English of the *lectura* is in copyright and was not used.

- *Catena Aurea: Commentary on the Four Gospels . . . St. Mark*, tr. J. D. Dalgairns, ed. J. H. Newman (Oxford, 1842; new ed. 1874), pp. 141–145, for the public-domain English of the chain on this pericope and for the editors’ identification of the “Chrysostomus” excerpts as Victor-of-Antioch material and of the v. 37 Gloss excerpt as untraced.

Historical orientation

- *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1907–1913), articles “Psalms” (<https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/12533a.htm>), “Gospel of Saint Mark” (<https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09674b.htm>), “Book of Proverbs” (<https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/12505b.htm>), “Epistles to the Corinthians” (<https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04364a.htm>), “Decapolis” (<https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04664b.htm>), “Tyre” (<https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/15109a.htm>) and “Sidon” (<https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/13776a.htm>).
- *New American Bible, Revised Edition*, introductions to the Psalms, Proverbs, Mark and First Corinthians, at <https://bible.usccb.org/bible/>. Summarised; protected text is not reproduced.

Cultural afterlives

- William Morris, *The Earthly Paradise: A Poem* (London: F. S. Ellis, 1868), prefatory “Apology,” stanza 4, printed p. 2. Read in the Internet Archive scan of the first edition, item [earthlyparadise00morr](#).
- “Effeta, The Body Deodorant” (Willis Pike Co. Laboratories, New York), advertisement, *Perth Amboy Evening News* (N.J.), 19 June 1912, ed. 2, p. 2; campaign corroborated in the same paper 29 May–22 June 1912 and in the *Norwich Bulletin* (Conn.), 22 June 1912, p. 6. Library of Congress, *Chronicling America*: <https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/>
- John Hodgson, *Original Memoirs, Written during the Great Civil War . . . Memoirs of Capt. Hodgson* (Edinburgh, 1806), pp. 147–48; Thomas Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell’s Letters and Speeches* (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1861), vol. 2, pp. 332–33, and vol. 3, pp. 171–72.
- “Ephphatha Guild Services,” *The Scranton Tribune*, 14 November 1895, p. 3, in *Chronicling America*; Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf, *Council Membership Directory 1969*, ERIC document ED032704, <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED032704>.

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.