

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> (<i>Ps.</i> 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 excédís et vota</i> (<i>composed oration</i>)	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 <i>Cor.</i> 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> (<i>Ps.</i> 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> (<i>Ps.</i> 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> (<i>Mk.</i> 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> (<i>Ps.</i> 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> (<i>composed oration</i>)	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> (<i>Prov.</i> 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> (<i>composed oration</i>)	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

Five claims follow that no single proper establishes and that only the whole formulary, read against its checked reception, makes visible. Every appointed element informs them, though none has a heading of its own. The complete appointed Latin and English, the collation against two 1962 editions and against the Clementine Vulgate, and the individual dossiers of every witness cited here stand in the full edition.

1. Two texts of this Mass are the tradition's own language, promoted

The ordinary relation between exegesis and liturgy is that the liturgy quotes Scripture and the commentators explain it. Two elements of this formulary invert or short-circuit that relation, in opposite directions, and both are verifiable.

The Introit sings *Deus qui inhabitare facit unánimes in domo*. Only one checked Latin psalter lemma reads *unánimes* there: the Clementine has *unius moris*, and the Douay accordingly has “of one manner,” which is why no registered English can be quoted for the sung word. What *unánimes* is, in the checked corpus, is a *gloss*. Augustine's lemma is *unius modi* and he explains it on the spot — *unanimes, unum sentientes* — observing besides that the Greek will bear either *modi* or *mores*. Peter Lombard transmits the explanation with the tag attached. Bellarmine reads it back into the verse as though it were the verse. Only Cassiodorus lemmatises *unanimes* as text, and he is the one witness who also restores the Acts citation Augustine had dropped, identifying the house as the Church. The Roman chant sings the gloss. No line of descent is established here — no *Psalterium Romanum* witness was collated — but the effect is that the assembly's first words on this Sunday are a patristic reading that has hardened into a liturgical text.

The Gospel runs the traffic the other way. *Ephphetha* left Mark and became a rite. St. Ambrose is the earliest witness and states the derivation outright: “celebrating the mystery of the opening, we said, Ephphatha, 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 sacramentis* adds the gesture — the priest touching ears and nostrils — and explains the transfer from the mouth on grounds of propriety. Fifteen centuries later the *Rituale Romanum* of 1872 still prints *Ephpheta, quod est, Adaperire* with the same saliva and the same ears, at the baptism of infants and again at the baptism of adults. Between the two lies an exegetical tradition that read the spittle as divine wisdom (Bede) and as proof that every part of Christ's flesh was holy (Theophylact) — but the rite does not depend on that tradition; it is older than most of it and travels beside it. A reader is likelier to have met the word at a font than in Mark, and the missal's own rubric at the end of this Gospel, *Credo*, sits oddly close to the seventh-century commentary that names what the loosed mouth first says: *Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem*.

2. Four texts stop where the human contribution would begin

This is the formulary's most demonstrable coherence, and it is a coherence of boundaries rather than of themes. Four appointed texts break off at the same kind of place, and in three of them the breaking is something the liturgy did to a source that continues.

The Epistle ends at *et grátia eius in me vácuá non fuit*. The verse goes on: *sed abundantius illis ómnibus laborávi: non ego autem, sed grátia Dei mecum*. Those unread words are the foundation of the entire classical Latin argument about grace and freedom. Augustine's proof of free will in *De gratia et libero arbitrio* 5.12 is the labour clause, balanced by *nec gratia Dei sola, nec ipse solus, sed gratia Dei cum illo*. Gregory's prevenient-and-subsequent scheme in *Moralia* 16.25 hangs on one word: *Non enim diceret **mecum** si cum praeveniente gratia subsequens liberum arbitrium non haberet*. Aquinas derives *gratia cooperans* from the same clause. Chrysostom's reading of the whole passage as humility “with reserve” needs the boast in order to have something retracted. The lection ends one clause before all of it.

The Collect's second petition asks God to add *quod orátio non præsúmit* — and the subject of the verb is *orátio*. It is the prayer, not the person praying, that does not presume; the 1861 hand missal's “we dare not presume to ask” is a different and more comfortable sentence, and the two stand side by side in the full edition, where the English is printed. The Communion antiphon trims Proverbs 3:9 of its imperative *da ei*, so that of the four verbs in the appointed text three are God's (*implebúntur, redundábunt*) or the singer's honouring, and the act of donation has gone. And the Gospel's protagonist does nothing at all: he is brought, taken aside, touched with fingers and spittle, sighed over and opened, and the first thing said of his speech is that it was right.

Two conclusions, one negative and one positive. Negatively, the Fathers’ teaching on grace from this verse cannot be credited to this lesson: their expositions quote past its last word, and cited without saying so they become a comment on a text the Church does not read here. Positively, the truncation is old — the same mid-verse ending stands in the Venice Missal of 1570 and the Pustet Missal of 1862 — so it is the received lectionary boundary of the rite and not a 1962 decision. What the Church actually reads on this Sunday is a statement about the origin of a man and a ministry, not about the mechanics of cooperation. That it cannot be turned into a *denial* of cooperation follows from the same evidence: the authors whose clause is missing are the ones who teach it.

3. One reading, and the witnesses who refuse it

Five elements of this Mass have a resurrection reading in the checked corpus, and the convergence is striking. On the Introit’s last clause — power and strength given to his people — Hilary speaks of those whom God will raise as immortal, and Augustine proves the point from 1 Corinthians 15:43 and Philippians 3:10, arriving at strength “by which death the enemy shall be destroyed”; Bellarmine follows him. On the Gradual, Augustine’s gloss is as flat as a gloss can be: *Et refluuit caro mea: id est, et resurrexit caro mea*. Cassiodorus gives the prefix a history, the flesh flowering in the virginal conception and re-flowering in the Resurrection; Lombard transmits both readings correctly tagged; Aquinas extends them across Adam and Christ; Bellarmine turns them into description. On the Offertory the psalm’s title does the work: Jerome in one line (*Dedicatio domus David, resurrectio Salvatoris intellegitur*), Augustine in two expositions, Cassiodorus almost verbatim after him, Aquinas fusing body and Church into a two-stage dedication. The Epistle is the resurrection kerygma itself. And Schuster reads the Postcommunion’s help to mind and body as the pledge of the final resurrection.

Yet not one of those witnesses is commenting on this Sunday; each is expounding a psalm, a letter or a prayer on its own account. And the convergence has real dissenters inside the checked corpus. Cassiodorus, who supplied the Gradual’s most influential development, refuses the resurrection reading at the Introit’s last clause and moralises it into patience and faith, keeping eschatology only as *praemia*. Theodoret refuses it at the Gradual, hearing a hunted man whose spirits and body have recovered together. At the Alleluia the split is sharper still and runs the other way: Augustine makes the psalm’s instruments an exchange of spiritual for carnal goods and Cassiodorus makes the drum a mortified body, while Theodoret keeps the orchestra literal on the authority of Chronicles and Bellarmine sides with Theodoret. Four elements, one direction, and three named refusals. A reader arriving with the Latin tradition in hand will hear a resurrection Mass here; the texts supply that reading only through their reception, and the reception is not unanimous.

4. The body is the instrument in the Gospel and the beneficiary in the orations

Read across the formulary, this Mass is unusually physical, and the physicality is doctrinally load-bearing at both ends.

In the Gospel the healing is done with parts of a body. The Greek Mark-catena tradition that the *Catena aurea* labels “Chrysostomus” — in fact the Victor-of-Antioch material, as the 1842 Oxford editors note — makes the assumed body itself the instrument: it was *divina virtute ditatum . . . corpus divinitati unitum*, and in it Christ “demonstrated the perfection of human nature.” Theophylact presses the same point through the least dignified detail in the story: the spitting was done *ut ostenderet omnes partes sanctae carnis suae sanctas ac divinas esse*. Bede reads the same gestures sacramentally in the other direction — the fingers are the Holy Spirit, on the warrant of Luke 11:20 read with Matthew 12:28, and the spittle is wisdom touching the mouth of a catechumen. And the sigh divides them: for Bede it is *exemplum gemendi*, an example given because Christ needs nothing; for Victor it is Christ taking our cause on himself; Theophylact will not choose, hedging twice; a Lapidus has it both ways. Augustine, in the one place in the works checked where he touches this pericope, ignores the gestures entirely and asks only why silence was commanded of people who could not keep it.

The orations then make the body the beneficiary. The Secret asks that one gift be *tibi munus accéptum* and *nostræ fragilitátis subsidium* — directed to God, and directed at a weakness admitted in the same breath; Schuster fixes *servitútem* as the sacerdotal ministry itself, so what God is asked to look at is the act being performed as the words are said. The Communion promises filled barns and overflowing presses, which is material increase promised at the moment of sacramental reception — and Bede’s three levels keep that from becoming crude, since his middle level makes the firstfruits the firstfruits of every good work, honoured to God by crediting it to grace. The Postcommunion refuses to divide the beneficiary at all: *subsidium mentis et corporis*, and then *in utrôque salváti*, resuming exactly

those two. Its last verb is *gloriémur*, a verb of boasting, which the 1861 English renders “enjoy the full effect” — keeping the petition and losing the boast. Schuster’s conclusion, that the body’s contact with the Body of Jesus confers the grace of the final resurrection, is the point at which this thread rejoins the third: the instrument in the Gospel and the beneficiary in the orations are the same kind of thing.

5. How the orations and the chants were transmitted

The three orations stand together as one mass-set in the Old Gelasian (Wilson, p. 228), among the sixteen unassigned Sunday masses of Book III, tied to no numbered Sunday at all. Wilson’s own footnote records the Frankish Gelasians assigning the set to the thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost and Pamelius’s Gregorian to the twelfth; the Hadrianum (Wilson, p. 172) files it at *DOMINICA .XII. POST PENTECOSTEN*, the Gregorian series running one Sunday ahead of 1962 through this stretch. Two of the three prayers are older than the set: the Secret stands in the Veronese collection inside an October mass against drought, whose preface begs for rain, and the Postcommunion in a July mass, with a *de* that every later book drops. The Collect is absent from the Veronese book altogether — as a search of the whole of Feltoe’s text for five distinctive phrases establishes — so its oldest verified witness is the Gelasian.

The chants tell a different story again, and the two stories do not meet. The Ottobonianus margins reported in Wilson’s apparatus cue this Sunday’s antiphon set — *Deus in loco sancto suo, Exaltabo te Domine, Honora Dominum* — against *Dominica X post Pentecosten*, two masses before the orations they now accompany, while Gregorian Dominica XII carries the chants that 1962 sings on its Thirteenth Sunday. The pairing of the *Honora Dominum* Communion with the *abundantia pietatis* Collect is the product of a later realignment of two cycles that had been moving independently.

Two footnotes to the transmission, both about texts that outlived their Mass. The Collect is used verbatim, contracted *adicias* and all, as the Collect of *Dominica XXVII per annum* in the postconciliar *Missale Romanum*; the reuse was verified in two independent unofficial Latin transcriptions, no free scan of the official *editio typica tertia* was located, and the reuse stands at exactly that strength. And the Secret’s variants differ, each with its witnesses: *fragilitati* in the Veronese and in the Hadrianum’s base text, *fragilitatis* in the Gelasian manuscripts and in Ottobonianus 313, *ad nostram servitutem* in the Venice Missal of 1570. The 1962 reading is one of these; none is new.

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. <https://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.