

Twelfth Sunday after Pentecost

Dominica Duodecima post Pentecosten · II classis · Green

1962 *Missale Romanum*, editio typica, pp. 392–393 · *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 adiutórium meum inténde</i> (<i>Ps.</i> 69:2–3, v. 4)	The emergency cry	The verse with which the Office opens every hour: help begged before anything else is said.
Collect (<i>Coll.</i>)	<i>Omnípotens et miséricors Deus</i> (<i>composed</i>)	Service as gift	Concedes what the Epistle will argue: worthy service comes <i>de cuius múnere</i> , of God’s own gift.
Epistle (<i>Ep.</i>)	<i>Fidúciám talem habémus</i> (2 <i>Cor.</i> 3:4–9)	Letter and spirit	Not sufficient of ourselves to think anything; the letter kills, the spirit gives life; two ministrations compared.
Gradual (<i>Grad.</i>)	<i>Benedícam Dóminum</i> (<i>Ps.</i> 33:2–3)	Praise without pause	The receiver’s posture: blessing at all times, with the meek — not the strong — bidden hear and rejoice.
Alleluia (<i>All.</i>)	<i>Dómine, Deus salútis meæ</i> (<i>Ps.</i> 87:2)	The dark psalm’s first verse	One cry, day and night, from the psalter’s one lament that never brightens.
Gospel (<i>Gosp.</i>)	<i>Beáti óculi . . . Homo quidam</i> (<i>Lk.</i> 10:23–37; <i>Credo</i>)	Mercy proves the neighbour	Blessed eyes; the lawyer’s test; priest and Levite passing; the Samaritan’s oil, wine and inn; <i>Vade, et tu fac simíliter</i> .
Offertory (<i>Off.</i>)	<i>Precátus est Móyses</i> (<i>Ex.</i> 32:11, 13, 14)	Intercession, sung	A rare story-chant: Moses pleads, recalls God’s own oath, and the Lord is appeased — as the gifts go up.
Secret (<i>Sec.</i>)	<i>Hóstias, quæsumus, Dómine</i> (<i>composed</i>)	Pardon as glory	By lavishing pardon on us, the offerings give honour to God’s name: one transaction, not two.
Communion (<i>Comm.</i>)	<i>De fructu óperum tuórum</i> (<i>Ps.</i> 103:13–15)	Bread, wine, oil	The creation psalm’s three staples, named at the moment the faithful eat.
Postcommunion (<i>Postcomm.</i>)	<i>Vivíficet nos, quæsumus</i> (<i>composed</i>)	Life, cleansing, defence	Asks one participation to give life and bestow, <i>páriter</i> , expiation for the past and a guard for what comes.

The four senses

Sense	Synthesis
Literal	Christ blesses the eyes that see, and answers a self-justifying lawyer with a Samaritan whose mercy proved him neighbour (<i>Gosp.</i>); Paul’s sufficiency as minister is from God (<i>Ep.</i>); Moses pleads and the Lord is appeased (<i>Off.</i>).
Allegorical	From Irenaeus to Bede the Samaritan is Christ — the name received as <i>custos</i> , guardian — binding wounded humanity and carrying it to the inn of the Church (<i>Gosp.</i>); the Communion sets that bread, wine and oil on the communicant’s lips (<i>Comm.</i>).
Moral	<i>Vade, et tu fac simíliter</i> (<i>Gosp.</i>): mercy, not pedigree or office, makes the neighbour; the letter alone kills (<i>Ep.</i>), and the survivor’s posture is unbroken praise among the meek (<i>Grad.</i>).
Anagogical	The Collect asks that we run <i>sine offensióne</i> to promises not yet held (<i>Coll.</i>); the ministration of justice shall abound in glory (<i>Ep.</i>); the oath names a land flowing with milk and honey (<i>Off.</i>).

Scriptural Date and Location

Seven directly appointed passages, the Introit's antiphon and verse counted once; each has a four-field summary, the narrated event where there is one, then a short explanation. Composed orations are not listed. Psalms carry the missal's Vulgate number with the English-Bible equivalent.

Proper	Citation	Location	Date
Offertory	Ex. 32:11, 13, 14	Golden-calf narrative; no superscription	Traditional: Mosaic, 2nd millennium BC
<i>Event: Moses' intercession at the mountain of God (Horeb/Sinai, the calf below, Ex. 32:1–6, 19), traditionally Jebel Musa in the south Sinai Peninsula, present-day Egypt, in the wilderness months after the Exodus — whose own century, fifteenth or thirteenth BC, is disputed and not settled here.</i>			
Traditional Mosaic authorship stands with the qualifications the Biblical Commission allowed in 1906: secretaries, sources, inspired post-Mosaic additions; modern judgment prevailingly reads the Pentateuch as compiled from earlier strands. The chant is in any case an Old-Latin adaptation, older than the Vulgate.			
Gradual	Ps. 33:2–3 Vulg. (Eng. 34:1–2)	Title: madness feigned “before Achimelech”	Traditional: David's pre-royal flight, c. 1010 BC
The narrative behind the title is 1 Sam. 21:10–15, at Geth (Gath) in the Philistine coastal plain — but it names Achis, not Achimelech, a discrepancy the tradition discusses and the commentary answers four ways. Modern judgment reads the alphabetical acrostic as composed wisdom poetry rather than the episode's heat; the attribution is tradition, not a proved date.			
Introit	Ps. 69:2–4 Vulg. (Eng. 70:1–3)	Superscription gives a purpose, not a place or episode	Traditional: Davidic, c. 1000 BC
The title reads <i>In finem . . . in rememorationem, quod salvum fecerit eum Dominus</i> . The psalm is the psalter's own doublet, standing nearly verbatim as the close of Ps. 39 (Vulg.) and transmitted separately, so the question of an original setting is one about the psalter's editing. Date and authorship remain open.			
Alleluia	Ps. 87:2 Vulg. (Eng. 88:1)	Double title; no place named	Traditional: Eman the Ezrahite, 10th c. BC
The title assigns the psalm both to the sons of Core and to <i>Eman Ezrahita</i> , named at 3 Kings 4:31 among the sages Solomon exceeded and at 1 Par. 6 among the Levitical singers. It is the psalter's darkest lament, the only one ending in darkness; the appointed verse is its opening cry. Author and date are unsettled.			
Gospel	Lk. 10:23–37	Writing place unstated by the sources checked; audience largely Gentile, through Theophilus	Traditional: before AD 63. Modern: c. AD 80–90
<i>Event: on the journey to Jerusalem (Lk. 9:51), during the ministry, c. AD 29–33, not settled here. The parable's road is real geography: the descent from Jerusalem to Jericho drops some 3,400 feet through desert past the ascent of Adummim (Jos. 15:7), in the present-day West Bank — a name Jerome records as read “of blood.”</i>			
The <i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i> (1910) argues from unanimous external witness that the author is Luke, Paul's physician-companion, and dates the Gospel before AD 63; the NABRE reports that attribution as traditional while placing composition about AD 80–90, by a non-eyewitness.			
Epistle	2 Cor. 3:4–9	From Macedonia, in present-day northern Greece, to Corinth in Greece	Third missionary journey, mid-to-late AD 50s
Pauline authorship is both traditional and mainstream modern judgment. Paul writes from Macedonia (2 Cor. 7:5; 8:1; 9:2–4) after the painful visit and the severe letter, met there by Titus; whether canonical 2 Corinthians is one letter or several joined is left open here. Its furniture — tables of stone, the glory of Moses' face — narrates Sinai (Ex. 34:29–35): writer, recipients and remembered mountain are three places.			
Communion	Ps. 103:13–15 Vulg. (Eng. 104:13–15)	Title <i>Ipsi David</i> ; no episode or place	Traditional: Davidic per title; date open
A creation hymn following the order of the works of Genesis 1; the appointed verses are its bread, wine and oil. The bare title assigns no occasion, the date is open, and nothing appointed turns on it.			

The Propers: Themes and Movement

This Mass is built on the difference between what the letter can do and what mercy does. The Law’s own ministers see the half-dead man and pass by; the despised outsider binds his wounds and pays. From the first cry — help, and quickly — to the last petition — give us life — nothing decisive in this formulary is self-supplied: worthy service is God’s gift before it is our act, sufficiency is God’s, rescue arrives from outside every expected channel, and what the warning alone could never produce is handed over at the altar.

Read in the order the book prints them, the ten texts fall into four stages:

1. Help begged before anything else is said; service confessed as gift. (*Int.*), (*Coll.*)
2. The doctrine stated: sufficiency from God; the letter kills, the spirit gives life. (*Ep.*)
3. The receiver’s posture sung, and the story told: unbroken praise, the meek invited, a cry day and night — then the road, the passers-by, and the guardian. (*Grad.*), (*All.*), (*Gosp.*)
4. Intercession carried to the altar and answered in kind: Moses’ prayer, pardon as glory, bread and wine and oil, life with cleansing and defence. (*Off.*), (*Sec.*), (*Comm.*), (*Postcomm.*)

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

1. The Mass that begins by shouting for help

The Introit is the sentence the Western Church has used to begin prayer for fourteen centuries: Cassian commended this one verse as fitting “every condition, and all assaults,” Benedict wrote it into the opening of the Hours, and the Office still starts there daily. On this one Sunday the Mass itself begins with it — “O God, come to my assistance; O Lord, make haste to help me” — and the chant’s own psalter sharpens what the Vulgate leaves general: the enemies are named (*inimici mei*), and they no longer merely wish evil but devise it (*cogitant*). The Church walks into this liturgy as the psalter’s poor man, with nothing in hand.

The Collect then blocks the one exit self-sufficiency might still take. It does not ask that the faithful manage to serve God worthily; it states, in its opening clause, that worthy and laudable service *comes of God’s gift* — *de cuius múnere venit* — and only then asks for something: that we may *run* to the promises without stumbling. Even the running is requested, not reported.

2. The letter kills; the spirit gives life

The Epistle supplies the doctrine under the day. Paul disclaims not merely achievement but the interior act itself — not sufficient “to think any thing of ourselves, as of ourselves” — and then names the two economies: ministers of a new testament, “not in the letter but in the spirit. For the letter killeth: but the spirit quickeneth.” The tradition spent its best minds on that sentence. Chrysostom read it forensically: the Law seizes a murderer and executes him; the Gospel seizes a murderer, baptises him, and gives him life. Augustine, against the Pelagians, drove it inward: the killing letter is any command without grace — the Decalogue itself — because the bare precept shows what to do and gives no power to do it; “the law was given that grace might be sought; grace was given that the law might be fulfilled.” Aquinas carried the point to its edge in the *Summa*: even the letter of the *Gospel* would kill, were the inward healing grace of faith not present. The Sunday’s lesson is not an archaeology of Sinai; it is a warning about every text, the reader’s own included.

The two chants between the lessons answer as receivers answer. The Gradual takes the acrostic psalm’s opening — “I will bless the Lord at all times” — the praise of a man whose standing is received, with the meek, not the strong, invited to hear and rejoice. The Alleluia frames in double Alleluias the one bright verse of the psalter’s darkest psalm: a cry “in the day, and in the night” that does not stop, addressed to *Deus salútis meæ*, the God of my salvation — salvation named as his property, not the singer’s.

3. The road, the passers-by, and the guardian

The Gospel then stages the whole doctrine on a real road. The Law's reader answers his own citation exam perfectly — love God, love your neighbour — and, “willing to justify himself,” asks the question the parable will refuse to answer: and who is my neighbour? What follows is the letter's failure enacted in its own personnel: priest and Levite — Augustine reads them as the priesthood and ministry of the Old Testament, “which could not profit unto salvation” — see the half-dead man and pass by. The Samaritan, whose very name the tradition from Origen to Gregory heard as *custos*, guardian, “being on his journey, came near him”: mercy arrives from outside, binds wounds with oil and wine, carries the man on its own beast, pays, and promises to return. The question comes back reversed — not “who is my neighbour?” but “which of these three . . . was neighbour to him?” — and the lawyer's own verdict closes it: “he that shewed mercy to him.” *Vade, et tu fac similiter*.

The reception holds two readings in one hand, and Bede legislated the balance between them: the parable teaches that everyone who shows mercy is a neighbour, *and* it specially designates the Son of God; the allegory must not thin out the moral command. Blessed, the pericope began, are the eyes that see what prophets and kings desired — and what they see, by the end, is the guardian at work on the road.

4. Intercession answered at the altar

What can be done for people who cannot supply their own rescue? The Offertory answers with the Old Testament's boldest scene, sung in a Latin older than the Vulgate: Moses *in conspéctu Dómini*, asking God why his anger burns, reminding God of God's own oath, “and the Lord was appeased.” Augustine heard in God's strange “Let me alone” the whole secret — *dilectio tua in illos intercedit mihi*, your love intercedes with me for them — and Gregory made it a rule: to say “let me alone” to a servant is to give him boldness to plead. Tertullian named the figure: Moses deprecating the Father's wrath prefigures Christ, “the offerer of His own life for the salvation of the people.”

The three prayers around Communion then convert intercession into exchange. The Secret asks God to attend the offerings so that, *by lavishing pardon on us*, they may give honour to his name: pardon not traded against glory but constituting it. The Communion feeds the rescued from the creation psalm's pantry — bread out of the earth, wine that gladdens, oil that brightens, bread that strengthens the heart — verses the tradition's Latin doctors read toward the chalice and the chrism, and that this Mass sets at the moment of reception. And the Postcommunion begins with the Epistle's own verb turned into a petition: *Vivificet nos* — may the holy participation give us *life* — and asks it to bestow, *páriter*, equally, expiation for what is past and a rampart for what comes. The Mass that opened with an unarmed cry for help closes by asking that the help just received keep working: cleansing and defence, neither yet finished.

A ninth-century cue line of the Gregorian Sacramentary tradition already pairs this Sunday's four chants: *Deus in adiutorium*, *Benedicam dominum*, *Precatus est moyses*, *De fructu operum*. The reception is genuinely divided at two of the four stages: Augustine holds two readings of “the letter killeth” and himself ranks the later above the earlier, while Chrysostom and Ambrosiaster read it juridically instead; and the Alleluia's psalm is heard as the voice of Christ in the Passion by Augustine, Cassiodorus and Bellarmine and as exilic Israel's by Theodoret. The witnesses leave both disagreements open. Governing the whole is Bede's rule: the parable specially designates the Son of God *and* teaches that everyone who shows mercy is a neighbour, and the rules of allegory must not thin out or carry off the moral institutes of mutual brotherhood. On the tradition's own terms, that rule forbids any doctrine of grace to displace the imperative the Gospel closes with.

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. Here the texts stand complete, for a reader who came for them.

Formulary. *DOMINICA DUODECIMA post Pentecosten, II classis*, printed pp. 392–393, marginal nos. 1552–1561. 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 Eleventh Sunday (no. 1551) and ends immediately before the heading *DOMINICA DECIMA TERTIA post Pentecosten* (no. 1562). Everything between those boundaries follows below. 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 located in the Venice Missal of 1570, both of them 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. Every form below was visually collated against the CMAA facsimile of the Vatican typical edition, and independently against page images of the 1962 Benziger *editio iuxta typicam*. Where the two editions differ, the Vatican typical reading is what appears here and the difference is tabulated in the detailed commentary.

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

1. Introit (*Int.*)

Ant. ad Introitum — Ps. 69, 2-3 — marginal no. 1552

Deus, in adiutórium meum inténde: Dómine, ad adiuvándum me festína: confundántur et reveréantur inimíci mei, qui quærunť ánimam meam. Ps. ibid., 4 Avertántur retrórsum, et erubéscant: qui cógitant mihi mala. V. Glória Patri.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 69:2–3 and 69:4

O God, come to my assistance; O Lord, make haste to help me. Let them be confounded and ashamed that seek my soul. *Ps.* Let them be turned backward, and blush for shame that desire evils to me. *V. Glória Patri.*

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The antiphon and verse follow the chant psalter, not the Clementine the Douay translates, and the English above therefore misses the missal at two points. The antiphon sings *confundántur et reveréantur inimíci mei*, “my enemies”; Clementine Ps. 69:3 has no *inimíci mei*, so the Douay’s “that seek my soul” hangs from no named enemy. The verse sings *qui cógitant mihi mala*, “who devise evils against me”; the Clementine, and therefore the Douay, reads *qui volunt mihi mala*, “that desire evils to me” — desiring is what the English answers, devising is what the missal prints. The verse also stops at the half-verse; the Clementine’s continuation (*avertántur statim erubescéntes...*) is not appointed. 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. 1553

Omnípotens et miséricors Deus, de cuius múnere venit, ut tibi a fidélibus tuis digne et laudabíliter serviátur: tríbue, quásumus, nobis; ut ad promissiónes tuas sine offensióne currámus. Per Dóminum.

English: Cummiskey 1861, Collect of this formulary, printed p. 420

O Almighty and merciful God, from whose gift it proceedeth that thy people worthily serve thee; grant we beseech thee, that we may run on, without stumbling, to the obtaining the effects of thy promises. Thro’.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The 1861 rendering gives one adverb where the Latin prays two: “worthily serve thee” answers *digne* and leaves *et laudabíliter* — “and laudably,” service that is also praise — without a separate English word. It also renders *a fidélibus tuis*, “by thy faithful,” as “thy people.” The Latin, not the English, therefore carries the prayer’s grammar.

3. Epistle (*Ep.*)

Léctio Epístolæ beáti Pauli Apóstoli ad Corínthios. — 2 Cor. 3, 4-9 — marginal no. 1554

Fratres: Fidúciam talem habémus per Christum ad Deum: non quod sufficiéntes simus cogitáre áliquíd a nobis, quasi ex nobis: sed sufficiéntia nostra ex Deo est: qui et idóneos nos fecit minístros novi testaménti: non líttera, sed spírítu: líttera enim occídít, spírítus autem vivíficat. Quod si ministrátio mortis, lítteris deformáta in lapídibus, fuit in glória; ita ut non possent inténdere fílii Israél in fáciem Móysi, propter glóriam vultus eius, quæ evacuátur: quómodo non magis ministrátio Spírítus erit in glória? Nam si ministrátio damnatiónis glória est: multo magis abúndat ministérium iustítiæ in glória.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), 2 Cor. 3:4–9

And such confidence we have, through Christ, towards God. Not that we are sufficient to think any thing of ourselves, as of ourselves: but our sufficiency is from God. Who also hath made us fit ministers of the new testament, not in the letter but in the spirit. For the letter killeth: but the spirit quickeneth. Now if the ministration of death, engraven with letters upon stones, was glorious (so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses, for the glory of his countenance), which is made void: How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather in glory? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more the ministration of justice aboundeth in glory.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The liturgical incipit *Fratres*: is the missal’s own and is not translated; it displaces the connective of Clementine 2 Cor. 3:4, *Fidúciam autem talem habémus* — the Douay’s opening “And” renders the *autem* that the lesson drops. The pericope ends at v. 9; v. 10 is outside the appointed lesson.

4. Gradual (*Grad.*)

Graduale — Ps. 33, 2-3 — marginal no. 1555

Benedícam Dóminum in omni témpore: semper laus eius in ore meo. V. In Dómino laudábitur ánima mea: áudiant mansuétí, et læténtur.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 33:2–3

I will bless the Lord at all times, his praise shall be always in my mouth. *Ÿ*. In the Lord shall my soul be praised: let the meek hear and rejoice.

5. Alleluia (*All.*)

Allelúia — Ps. 87, 2 — marginal no. 1556

Allelúia, allelúia. Ÿ. Dómine, Deus salútis meæ, in die clamávi et nocte coram te. Allelúia.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 87:2

O Lord, the God of my salvation: I have cried in the day, and in the night before thee. *Allelúia.*

6. Gospel (*Gosp.*)

+ *Sequéntia sancti Evangélíi secúndum Lucam.* — Luc. 10, 23-37 — marginal no. 1557

In illo témpore: Dixit Iesus discíplis suis: Beáti óculi, qui vident quæ vos vidétis. Dico enim vobis, quod multi prophétæ et reges voluérunt vidére quæ vos vidétis, et non vidérunt: et audíre quæ audítis, et non audíerunt. Et ecce quidam legisperítus surréxit, tentans illum, et dicens: Magíster, quid faciéndó vitam ætérmam possidébo? At ille dixit ad eum: In lege quid scriptum est? quómodo legis? Ille respóndens, dixit: Dlíges Dóminum Deum tuum ex toto corde tuo, et ex tota ánima tua, et ex ómnibus víribus tuis, et ex omni mente tua: et próximum tuum sicut teípsum. Dixítque illi: Recte respondísti: hoc fac, et vives. Ille autem volens iustificáre seípsum, dixit ad Iesum: Et quis est meus próximus? Suscípíens autem Iesus, dixit: Homo quidam descendébat ab Ierúsalem in Iéricho, et incidit in latrónes, qui étiam despoliavérunt eum: et plagis impóstitis abiérunt, semivívo relícto. Accidit autem ut sacérdos quidam descénderet eádem via: et viso illo præterívit. Simíliter et levíta, cum esset secus locum, et vidéret eum, pertránsiit. Samaritánus autem quidam iter fáciens, venit secus eum: et videns eum, misericórdia motus est. Et apprópians alligávit vúlnera eius, infúndens óleum et vinum: et impónens illum in iuméntum suum, duxit in stábulum, et curam eius egit. Et áltera die prótulit duos denários, et dedit stabulário, et ait: Curam illíus habe: et quodcúmque supererogáveris, ego cum rediero, reddam tibi. Quis horum trium vidétur tibi próximus fuisse illi, qui incidit in latrónes? At ille dixit: Qui fecit misericórdiam in illum. Et ait illi Iesus: Vade, et tu fac simíliter.

Rubric as printed: *Credo.* · printed at the right-hand end of the Gospel's final line

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Luke 10:23–37

Blessed are the eyes that see the things which you see. For I say to you that many prophets and kings have desired to see the things that you see and have not seen them; and to hear the things that you hear and have not heard them. And behold a certain lawyer stood up, tempting him and saying, Master, what must I do to possess eternal life? But he said to him: What is written in the law? How readest thou? He answering, said: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with all thy strength and with all thy mind: and thy neighbour as thyself. And he said to him: Thou hast answered right. This do: and thou shalt live. But he willing to justify himself, said to Jesus: And who is my neighbour? And Jesus answering, said: A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among robbers, who also stripped him and having wounded him went away, leaving him half dead. And it chanced, that a certain priest went down the same way: and seeing him, passed by. In like manner also a Levite, when he was near the place and saw him, passed by. But a certain Samaritan, being on his journey, came near him: and seeing him, was moved with compassion: And going up to him, bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine: and setting him upon his own beast, brought him to an inn and took care of him. And the next day he took out two pence and gave to the host and said: Take care of him; and whatsoever thou shalt spend over and above, I, at my return, will repay thee. Which of these three, in thy opinion, was neighbour to him that fell among the robbers? But he said: He that shewed mercy to him. And Jesus said to him: Go, and do thou in like manner.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The liturgical incipit *In illo tēpore: Dixit Iesus discipulis suis:* is the missal's own and is not translated. It displaces Luke's narrative frame, Clementine 10:23 *Et convērsus ad discipulos suos, dixit:* — the evangelist's "And turning to his disciples, he said" is outside the appointed text, so the Douay's opening words for v. 23 are not printed above.

7. Offertory (*Off.*)

***Antiphona ad Offertorium* — Exodi 32, 11, 13 et 14 — marginal no. 1558**

Precātus est Mōyses in conspēctu Dómini Dei sui, et dixit: Quare, Dómine, irásceris in pópulo tuo? Parce iræ ánimæ tuæ: meménto Abraham, Isaac, et Iacob, quibus iurásti dare terram fluéntem lac et mel. Et placātus factus est Dóminus de malignitáte, quam dixit fácere pópulo suo.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ex. 32:11, 13 and 14, printed whole

v. 11. But Moses besought the Lord his God, saying: Why, O Lord, is thy indignation enkindled against thy people, whom thou hast brought out of the land of Egypt, with great power, and with a mighty hand?
v. 13. Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou sworest by thy own self, saying: I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven: and this whole land that I have spoken of, I will give to your seed, and you shall possess it for ever:
v. 14. And the Lord was appeased from doing the evil which he had spoken against his people.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. This chant is an Old-Latin adaptation of the narrative, not the Vulgate the Douay translates, so the three verses are printed whole above, and none of those verses matches the chant. Four gaps stand. The chant's *Parce iræ ánimæ tuæ* carries the matter of v. 12 — a verse the missal's own citation does not name — and has no counterpart in any cited verse; the Douay's v. 12, for the record, reads "let thy anger cease, and be appeased upon the wickedness of thy people." The chant sings *Iacob* where v. 13, and therefore the Douay, reads "Israel, thy servants." The chant's oath is *dare terram fluéntem lac et mel*, "to give a land flowing with milk and honey," where v. 13's oath is the stars-and-seed promise printed above — the milk-and-honey formula belongs to Ex. 3:8 and 33:3, not to this verse. And the chant's opening *in conspēctu Dómini Dei sui*, "in the sight of the Lord his God," answers to nothing in v. 11's "besought the Lord his God."

8. Secret (*Sec.*)

<i>Secreta</i> — marginal no. 1559
<i>Hóstias, quæsumus, Dómine, propítius inténde, quas sacris altáribus exhibémus: ut, nobis indulgéntiam largiéndó, tuo nómini dent honórem. Per Dóminum nostrum.</i>
Rubric as printed: <i>Præfatio de Ssma Trinitate.</i> · the Preface of the Most Holy Trinity; <i>Ssma</i> printed under a tilde abbreviation for <i>Sanctissima</i>
English: Cummiskey 1861, Secret of this formulary, printed p. 422
Mercifully look down, O Lord, on the offerings we lay on thy holy altar; that they may be to the honour of thy name, by obtaining pardon for us. Thro’.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The 1861 book prints no incipit for this Secret; its clauses answer the Latin one by one — “the offerings we lay on thy holy altar” to *quas sacris altáribus exhibémus*, “to the honour of thy name, by obtaining pardon for us” to *nobis indulgéntiam largiéndó, tuo nómini dent honórem* — and the orations on either side of it in that book are the eleventh and thirteenth Sundays’, so its filing does not slip by one. The English reverses the Latin’s order of honour and pardon and makes “look down” of *propítius inténde*, “favourably attend”; the order that makes pardon the mode of honour stands only in the Latin.

9. Communion (*Comm.*)

<i>Antiphona ad Communionem</i> — Ps. 103, 13 et 14-15 — marginal no. 1560
<i>De fructu óperum tuórum, Dómine, satiábitur terra: ut edúcas panem de terra, et vinum lætíficet cor hómínis: ut exhílares fáciem in óleo, et panis cor hómínis confírmet.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 103:13–15, printed whole
<i>v. 13.</i> Thou waterest the hills from thy upper rooms: the earth shall be filled with the fruit of thy works: <i>v. 14.</i> Bringing forth grass for cattle, and herb for the service of men. That thou mayst bring bread out of the earth: <i>v. 15.</i> And that wine may cheer the heart of man. That he may make the face cheerful with oil: and that bread may strengthen man’s heart.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The antiphon takes *v. 13*’s second clause with its word order inverted and a vocative added — *De fructu óperum tuórum, Dómine, satiábitur terra* — and the *Dómine* is in no verse of the psalm here, so the Douay has no word for it. The antiphon then skips *v. 14*’s first clause, exactly as the printed citation *13 et 14-15* declares, and runs continuously from *ut edúcas* to the end of *v. 15*. The three verses are printed whole above with the antiphon’s path through them stated, since no registered English follows that path.

10. Postcommunion (*Postcomm.*)

<i>Postcommunio</i> — marginal no. 1561
<i>Vivíficet nos, quæsumus, Dómine, huius participátio sancta mystérii: et páriter nobis expiatiónem tríbuat, et munímen. Per Dóminum.</i>
English: Cummiskey 1861, Postcommunion of this formulary, printed p. 423
May the sacred participation of these thy mysteries, O Lord, we beseech thee, give us life; and be to us both an expiation and protection. Thro’.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The Latin asks one subject to *tribuat* — to *bestow* — two named gifts, *expiationem . . . et munimen*, with *páriter* binding them as equal and simultaneous; the 1861 English flattens the bestowal into “be to us both,” and gives no word for *páriter*. It also pluralises: “these thy mysteries” where the Latin has the singular *huius . . . mystérii*. Only the Latin carries the pair as one bestowal.

The Propers: Detailed Commentary

Each element below stands under its Latin incipit, its printed heading and reference, and the missal’s marginal number, with its English from an identified public-domain witness and then its evidence. The complete appointed Latin stands above, in *The Appointed Formulary in Full*, in liturgical order and beside the same English; below, it returns only where an argument turns on the wording.

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

The text: what two 1962 books actually print

The Latin of this formulary was collated against the CMAA facsimile of the Vatican *editio typica* (printed pp. 392–393), and independently against the page images of the Benziger *editio iuxta typicam* of the same year (printed pp. 386–388). The two books are not two photographs of one page; they are two editions, and they differ. The typical edition governs every form below.

Place	Vatican <i>editio typica</i>	Benziger <i>iuxta typicam</i>
Introit close	<i>Ÿ. Glória Patri.</i>	<i>Ÿ. Glória Patri. Deus.</i>
Introit heading	<i>Ant. ad Introitum</i>	<i>Antiphona ad Introitum</i>
Alleluia	<i>Dómine, Deus salútis meæ</i>	<i>Dómine Deus salútis meæ</i>
Lk. 10:34	<i>in iuméntum suum, duxit</i>	<i>in iuméntum suum duxit</i>
Secret	<i>ut, nobis ... largiéndó,</i>	<i>ut nobis ... largiéndó,</i>
Secret conclusion	<i>Per Dóminum nostrum.</i>	<i>Per Dóminum.</i>

None of these changes a meaning; the first is the only one substantive for the singer, since Benziger prints the antiphon-repetition cue the typical edition leaves to the general rubrics. All of them show that “the 1962 Latin” is not a single artefact, and that a reading cited without its witness does not tell the reader what was checked.

Where the appointed text is not the Bible’s text

The more consequential collation is against the Clementine Vulgate itself. Every divergence below was verified directly against both texts, and each returns at its own element where it bears on an argument. The Latin has to stand on the page for these, since an argument about wording cannot be conducted in translation.

Proper and locus	Appointed text	Clementine Vulgate
1. (<i>Int.</i>) Ps. 69:3	<i>confundántur et revereántur inimíci mei, quí quærunt ánimam meam</i>	<i>Confundantur, et revereantur, qui quærunt animam meam</i> — the chant names the enemies the psalm verse leaves unnamed
2. (<i>Int.</i>) Ps. 69:4	<i>quí cógitant mihi mala</i>	<i>quí volunt mihi mala</i> — a different verb: devising, not desiring, and the one the Douay renders
3. (<i>Ep.</i>) 2 Cor. 3:4	<i>Fratres: Fidúciam talem habémus</i>	<i>Fiduciam autem talem habemus</i> — the liturgical address displaces Paul’s connective
4. (<i>Gosp.</i>) Lk. 10:23	<i>In illo témpore: Dixit Iesus discípuis suis</i>	<i>Et conversus ad discípuos suos, dixit</i> — the incipit removes the evangelist’s turning

Proper and locus	Appointed text	Clementine Vulgate
5. (<i>Gosp.</i>) Lk. 10:27	<i>ex ómnibus víribus tuis</i>	<i>ex omnibus virtutibus tuis</i> — a different noun for “strength”; the Douay’s “with all thy strength” renders either without showing which
6. (<i>Off.</i>) Ex. 32:11	<i>Precátus est Móyses in conspéctu Dómini Dei sui, et dixit</i>	<i>Moyses autem orabat Dominum Deum suum, dicens</i>
7. (<i>Off.</i>) Ex. 32:11	<i>Quare, Dómine, irásceris in pópulo tuo?</i>	<i>Cur, Domine, irascitur furor tuus contra populum tuum, quem eduxisti de terra Ægypti...</i> — the verb becomes second person and the Egypt clause is dropped
8. (<i>Off.</i>) (v. 12)	<i>Parce iræ ánimæ tuæ</i>	carries the matter of a verse the citation does not name: <i>quiescat ira tua, et esto placabilis super nequitia populi tui</i>
9. (<i>Off.</i>) Ex. 32:13	<i>meménto Abraham, Isaac, et Iacob</i>	<i>Recordare Abraham, Isaac, et Israël servorum tuorum</i> — Iacob for Israël
10. (<i>Off.</i>) Ex. 32:13	<i>quibus iurásti dare terram fluéntem lac et mel</i>	the verse’s oath is <i>Multiplicabo semen vestrum sicut stellas cæli...</i> ; the milk-and-honey formula belongs to Ex. 3:8 and 33:3, and there in the ablative, <i>lacte et melle</i>
11. (<i>Off.</i>) Ex. 32:14	<i>Et placátus factus est Dóminus de malignitáte, quam dixit fácere pópulo suo</i>	<i>Placatusque est Dominus ne faceret malum quod locutus fuerat adversus populum suum</i>
12. (<i>Comm.</i>) Ps. 103:13	<i>De fructu óperum tuórum, Dómine, satiábitur terra</i>	<i>de fructu operum tuorum satiabitur terra</i> — inverted order, and the vocative is the antiphon’s own
13. (<i>Comm.</i>) Ps. 103:14	antiphon runs ...terra: <i>ut edúcas panem</i>	v. 14’s first clause, <i>producens fœnum iumentis...</i> , is omitted — exactly what the printed citation 13 et 14-15 declares

Three negative results complete that table. The Gradual (Ps. 33:2–3) and the Alleluia verse (Ps. 87:2) match the Clementine psalter word for word, and the Epistle and Gospel match it throughout apart from rows 3–5 above; the missal’s *i* for the Clementine’s *j* (*Iacob*, *iurásti*, *iustificáre*) and its accents are orthographic policy, not readings. The Introit’s two divergences have the same natural explanation as every chant psalter divergence in this series: the Roman Church sang an older Latin psalter before Jerome’s Gallican recension displaced it in the Bible, and the *Catholic Encyclopedia* records that the Roman recension remained in liturgical use at Rome long after: of the *Psalterium Romanum* its article on the Breviary says that “it is still in use in St. Peter’s at Rome, and many of the texts of our Breviary and Missal still show some variants.” The Offertory’s five rows are of another kind and are treated at the Offertory: that chant is an Old-Latin, Septuagint-shaped adaptation older than the Vulgate beside it. Each of these readings is verified; its derivation is not, since no *Psalterium Romanum* or Old-Latin witness was collated for them.

One cross-edition observation is of another order: in the degraded OCR text layer of the Venice Missal of 1570, this Introit’s psalm verse appears with the Gallican *qui volunt mihi mala*, and the Collect’s word order appears as *tribue nobis, quesumus*, where the 1962 book prints *qui cógitant mihi mala* and *tribue, quæsumus, nobis*. Neither was collated against page images, and both remain leads only.

Attributions the checked sources do not bear out

Each of these is a claim the standard delivery of the source invites, and each is wrong; the evidence for each lies with the proper it concerns.

The claim the standard delivery invites	What the checked sources show	Proper
“Chrysostom allegorises the Good Samaritan. . .”	No genuine Chrysostom treatment of Lk. 10:25–37 was located. The long “Chrysostom” extracts in the <i>Catena aurea</i> on this pericope are flagged in the Oxford edition’s own margins as <i>Hom. in loc. Ed. Lat.</i> — a homily found only in the old Latin editions — and its preface assigns such material to “some very early imitator or epitomist of Chrysostom”	Gospel
“The Samaritan-as-Christ reading is Augustine’s allegorising. . .”	The identification is attested in the second century, before any Latin allegory: Irenaeus has the Lord giving the wounded man’s care and two <i>denaria</i> to the Spirit, and Clement of Alexandria asks “Who else can it be but the Saviour Himself?” Origen then reports the full scheme from “one of the elders” before adding his own	Gospel
“The Fathers read the parable allegorically. . .”	Not all of them. Cyril of Alexandria’s surviving sermon on this pericope reads it morally and never identifies the Samaritan with Christ; the allegory is a mostly Latin inheritance, and Bede legislates the balance both ways	Gospel
“Gregory the Great, in his homily on this Gospel. . .”	There is none. The forty <i>Homiliae in Evangelia</i> contain no homily on Lk. 10:23–37; Gregory’s oil-and-wine reading is in <i>Moralia</i> XX and the <i>Regula pastoralis</i> , on Job and on the duties of rulers	Gospel
“Aquinas’s commentary on 2 Corinthians 3 cites <i>De spiritu et littera</i> . . .”	It does not; Augustine is named in that chapter only on a Trinitarian point. The Augustinian doctrine arrives in <i>Summa theologiae</i> I-II q. 106 a. 2, where it is radicalised	Epistle
“Augustine notes that Psalm 69 repeats the end of Psalm 39. . .”	He does not, in either exposition — verified against the full Latin of both. The doublet is stated by Bellarmine and, at verse level, by Cassiodorus	Introit

Introit (*Int.*)

Deus, in adiutórium meum inténde · *Ant. ad Introitum* — Ps. 69, 2-3, with *Ps. ibid.*, 4 · marginal no. 1552

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 69:2–3 and 69:4

Antiphon (vv. 2–3): O God, come to my assistance; O Lord, make haste to help me. Let them be confounded and ashamed that seek my soul.

Psalm verse (v. 4): Let them be turned backward, and blush for shame that desire evils to me.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. That English is the English of the Clementine psalm, and at two points it is not the English of the chant: the antiphon’s *inimíci mei* has no counterpart in Clementine v. 3, and the verse sings *qui cógitant mihi mala* — who *devise* evils — where the Clementine, and therefore the Douay, has *qui volunt mihi mala*, who *desire* them. The registered English answers neither.

And this time the Fathers sing with the missal. On the Ninth Sunday of this series the chant and the expositors part company over a verb; here the opposite happens. Augustine’s own lemma at this verse reads *Avertantur retrorsum, et erubescant qui cogitant mihi mala*, and Cassiodorus’s psalter carries both of the chant’s readings — *inimíci mei* and *cogitant* — word for word. The Introit is not a deviation from the psalter the tradition expounded; it *is* the old psalter the tradition expounded, standing in the Mass after Jerome’s revision replaced it in the Bible. The expositors therefore comment on exactly the words the assembly sings.

The psalm itself is the psalter’s own doublet — its verses stand nearly verbatim as the close of Ps. 39 — and its speaker is the psalter’s recurring poor man: the plea for speed is grounded, three verses later, in *ego vero egenus et pauper sum*. Bellarmine states the doublet plainly (“The remainder of the Psalm is almost word for word with Ps. 39, which see”), and Cassiodorus cites the twin verse with a theological division of labour: in Ps. 39 the words are Christ’s in his own person, here his members’. Augustine, for all nine sections of his exposition, never mentions the other psalm — a silence verified against the full Latin of both expositions.

St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 69 (New Advent “Psalm 70”), §§1–4, 7 Preached on a martyrs’ feast, and built on the grain of wheat: “Thanks to the Grain of wheat, because He willed to die and to be multiplied . . . Many therefore members of Him, under one Head . . . are one man: and of the same, as of one man, the voice is oftentimes heard in the Psalms.” The cry for help is therefore never off duty — *opus enim habemus sempiterno adiutorio in isto saeculo* — “for need we have of an everlasting aid in this world. But when have we not?” On the antiphon’s second clause he hears Christ whole: “He is speaking that has said, Why do you persecute Me?” And on the verse he draws a precise historical line through the chant’s own verb: open persecution has passed, “now there has remained the malice of them *thinking*” — the enemies who once sought the soul now merely devise, *cogitant*. At §7 the speaker’s ground: “help I seek, always mine infirmity I confess.” English from the public-domain NPNF first series, vol. 8; Latin checked at the same sections.

Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum* 69 (PL 70, coll. 493–494) The whole psalm is *ex persona martyrum*: after the Head narrated his Passion in Ps. 68, “after their Head the members likewise speak.” His gloss on the two opening verbs is the closest reading this verse has received: *inténde* asks God to *look favourably*, “since the Lord knows all things even when he is not asked”; *festína* is prayed “as though divine mercy were delaying, and by the delay of its coming the torments were growing heavier.” And he records what the verse had already become by the sixth century, citing Cassian by name and chapter: the most eloquent Cassian so celebrates this verse in his tenth Conference “that whatever monks undertake, they do not begin without a threefold repetition of this little verse” (*sine huius versiculi trina iteratione non inchoent*). Latin from the public-domain Migne text; the copyrighted ACW translation was not used.

St. John Cassian, *Conferences* X.10 The chapter Cassiodorus meant. Abba Isaac hands over this one verse as the formula of unceasing prayer: “it embraces all the feelings which can be implanted in human nature, and can be fitly and satisfactorily adapted to every condition, and all assaults . . . it contains the thought of one’s own weakness, confidence in the answer, and the assurance of a present and ever ready help”; it is to be prayed “in adversity that we may be delivered, in prosperity that we may be preserved and not puffed up.” English from the public-domain NPNF second series, vol. 11.

The Rule of St. Benedict, cc. 17–18 and 35 Cassian’s counsel became law. The Rule orders the Hours to open with this verse — c. 18: *In primis dicatur versu: Deus, in adiutorium meum inténde; Dómine, ad adiuvándum me festína* — and c. 35 sends even the kitchen rotation through it: the brother entering his week of service says this verse three times before all. From Benedict the verse passed to the whole Latin Office, where it opens every hour except Matins. The Twelfth Sunday’s Introit is thus the one place the 1962 Missal sings at Mass the sentence with which the Western Church has begun her prayer for fourteen centuries. Latin from the public-domain text; English cross-checked in the 1902 Verheyen translation.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos* 69 (PG 80, coll. 1415–1418) — Greek-tradition sample The Antiochene counterweight: David composed the psalm fleeing Absalom, and “the memory of his sin stung him more sharply than his enemies did.” The opening plea he paraphrases without figure: many and various calamities engulf me; therefore I ask that help be given quickly. Migne’s apparatus at this verse carries a text-historical note the Introit’s singers have an interest in: the second clause, *Dómine, ad adiuvándum me festína*, is absent from the Septuagint’s two great codices and stands in the Hebrew, in Apollinaris — and in Augustine. Read in the registered facsimile of PG 80; Migne’s parallel Latin is quoted, and the copyrighted modern English translation was not consulted.

St. Robert Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos*, Ps. LXIX, tr. John O’Sullivan (Dublin, 1866), artifact p. 220 One compressed paragraph, aimed straight at the liturgical fact: “A verse celebrated in the Catholic Church, as all the divine offices commence with it. For though it is peculiarly applicable to Christ hanging on the cross, it may be used by all the faithful in any danger whatever . . . it is not only lawful, but expedient to repeat this verse very frequently.” Read on the registered facsimile of the 1866 edition.

Collect (Coll.)

Omnípotens et miséricors Deus · Oratio, composed oration · marginal no. 1553

English: Cummiskey, *The Roman Missal . . . for the use of the laity* (Philadelphia, 1861), Collect of this formulary, printed p. 420

O Almighty and merciful God, from whose gift it proceedeth that thy people worthily serve thee; grant we beseech thee, that we may run on, without stumbling, to the obtaining the effects of thy promises. Thro’.

That English drops an adverb. The 1861 rendering gives one adverb where the Latin prays two: *digne et laudabiliter serviatur* asks that God be served worthily *and laudably* — service that is right and service that is praise — and “worthily serve thee” carries only the first. It also flattens *a fidelibus tuis*, “by thy faithful,” into “thy people.” The Latin carries the argument below.

The prayer’s whole theology is in its opening subordinate clause. Before it asks anything, it states where the thing it wants comes from: *de cuius munere venit, ut tibi a fidelibus tuis digne et laudabiliter serviatur* — it comes of God’s own gift that God is well served at all. Worthy service is not the price of grace but its product; the Collect concedes, in oration grammar, exactly what the day’s Epistle will argue — *non quod sufficiens simus cogitare aliquid a nobis . . . sed sufficientia nostra ex Deo est*. Schuster’s commentary on this Sunday makes the link explicit, quoting that very verse of 2 Corinthians 3 against any thought that the prayer exaggerates. Then the petition, with the printed semicolon marking the join: *tribue, quæsumus, nobis; ut ad promissiones tuas sine offensione curramus* — grant that we may *run* to thy promises *sine offensione*, without stumbling, the participant’s verb rather than the spectator’s. And the promises the Church asks to run toward are, on this Sunday, the ones her own Offertory will name three chants later: *quibus iurasti*.

Where the prayer has been. The oration is older than every book that now carries it. It stands in the Verona (“Leonine”) collection among the July Masses in a shorter form — *tribue ut*, without *quæsumus nobis* (Feltoe’s edition, p. 74); in the Gelasian Sacramentary it opens the Mass-set that already contains all three of this Sunday’s orations together (Wilson’s edition, Book III, no. VIII, pp. 228–229); and in the Gregorian Sacramentary of the Hadrianum tradition it stands under *Dominica XIII post Pentecosten* with the 1962 wording exact (Wilson’s 1915 edition, p. 173) — the old count running one ahead of the missal’s. It also outlived the 1962 books: the postconciliar *Missale Romanum* appoints the same collect, verbatim, for the Thirty-first Sunday *per annum*. A prayer first attested in a fifth-to-sixth-century Roman collection is still being said over the same petition fifteen centuries later.

No commentary on the wording. No patristic commentary on this oration’s wording was located; composed Roman collects carry no ancient commentary tradition comparable to the Scriptures’. The cited editions document the transmission above; for the grammar, the printed Latin is the only witness.

Epistle (Ep.)

Fiduciam talem habemus · Lectio Epistolæ beati Pauli Apostoli ad Corinthios — 2 Cor. 3, 4-9 · marginal no. 1554

The lesson makes two moves, and the second has had one of the great careers in the history of reading. First, sufficiency: not that we are sufficient to *think* anything of ourselves, as of ourselves — Paul disclaims even the interior act — but our sufficiency is from God, who made us fit ministers of a new testament. Second, the contrast that names the covenants: *non littera, sed spiritu: littera enim occidit, spiritus autem vivificat*, and then the a fortiori of the two ministrations: if the ministration of death, engraved in letters on stones, came with such glory that Israel could not gaze at Moses’ face — a glory *quæ evacuatur*, being done away — how shall the ministration of the Spirit not abound the more in glory? The missal’s text follows the Clementine exactly, down to the shift from *ministratio* to *ministerium* in the last clause; only the incipit differs, as tabulated above.

St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Second Corinthians* 6 (on 3:1–6) and 7 (on 3:7–18) The Antiochene reading is forensic and sacramental at once. On sufficiency: Paul “refers and ascribes the whole to Him.” On the letter that kills: “In the Law, he that has sin is punished; here, he that has sins comes and is baptized and is made righteous . . . The Law, if it lay hold on a murderer, puts him to death; the Gospel, if it lay hold on a murderer, enlightens, and gives him life” — with the Sabbath stick-gatherer executed under the one and forgiven thousands under the other. On the two ministrations (Hom. 7): since the New Covenant’s glory cannot be

shown to bodily eyes as Moses' shining face could, Paul "by this logical inference established its superiority"; and the tables have changed material: "This table is of the flesh, and spirit, and righteousness, and remains; and unto all of us is it vouchsafed, not to one only, as to Moses." English from the public-domain NPNF first series, vol. 12.

Ambrosiaster, *Commentaria in Epistolam ad Corinthios Secundam*, ad 3:6–9 (PL 17) The oldest complete Latin commentary on Paul reads the verse juridically: *Litterae enim ad hoc datae sunt Moysi, ut contemnentes Legem occideret secundum jus naturae. Spiritus autem, id est, lex fidei quae non scribitur, sed animo continetur, vivificat reos mortis* — the letters were given to Moses precisely to execute despisers of the Law; the spirit is the unwritten law of faith, held in the soul, which brings the death-guilty to life. The comparison of vv. 7–9 he sums: *multum ergo interest inter legem et legem* — there is much between law and law — and glory is greater in salvation than in death. Latin verified in the public Migne transcription.

St. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III.5.9 and *De spiritu et littera* 4.6, 14.23–25, 19.34 — one Father, two readings, and his own ruling between them In 396 Augustine read the verse as a rule of exegesis: to take figurative expressions literally is "a miserable slavery of the soul," and "nothing is more fittingly called the death of the soul" than intelligence subjected to the flesh by the letter — Origen's hermeneutic naturalised. In 412, against the Pelagians, he quoted that interpretation back and demoted it without retracting it: the verse is to be understood "not in that way only ... but also, and indeed *especially*" (*eoque vel maxime*) of the law without grace — *doctrina quippe illa, qua mandatum accipimus continenter recteque vivendi, littera est occidens, nisi adsit vivificans spiritus*. The letter that kills is now the Decalogue itself: the command shows what to do and gives no power to do it, and by Romans 7 the bare precept occasions the sin it forbids. The treatise's celebrated formula, verified in the Latin: *Lex ergo data est, ut gratia quaereretur: gratia data est, ut lex impleretur* — the law was given that grace might be sought; grace was given that the law might be fulfilled. English from the public-domain NPNF first series, vols. 2 and 5.

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Super II ad Corinthios*, cap. 3, lect. 1–2; *Summa theologiae* I-II q. 106 aa. 1–2 Aquinas supplies the mechanics and then the astonishing corollary. In the commentary the letter kills *occasionaliter*: *littera legis dat solam cognitionem peccati ... non reprimit concupiscentiam, sed magis occasionaliter auget* — knowledge without healing of the cause. In the *Summa* he formalises Augustine's definition — the letter is *quaelibet Scriptura extra homines existens, etiam moralium praeceptorum qualia continentur in Evangelio* — and draws the conclusion in the body of the article, verified verbatim: *unde etiam littera Evangelii occideret, nisi adesset interius gratia fidei sanans* — even the letter of the Gospel would kill, were the inward healing grace of faith not present. The New Law is *principaliter ... ipsa gratia Spiritus Sancti*, the written Gospel only secondarily; the letter/spirit line no longer separates the Testaments but runs through every written norm whatsoever. Yet in cap. 3 of the commentary Aquinas never cites *De spiritu et littera* by name — the Augustinian doctrine arrives in the *Summa*, not where a reader would first look for it.

Origen, *De principiis* I.1.2; *Contra Celsum* VII.20 — the fountainhead; and St. Bernard, *Super Cantica* 7.5 — the domestication Origen fixed the equation the young Augustine inherited: "by letter are meant bodily things, and by spirit intellectual things" (*De principiis* I.1.2, ANF); in *Contra Celsum* the verse dissolves the alleged contradiction of Moses and Christ at the spiritual level. Yet the great hermeneutical manifesto of *De principiis* IV grounds the spiritual sense on 1 Corinthians 2 and Proverbs 22, and does *not* quote this verse there. Eight centuries later the verse has become monastic table-talk about psalmody: *Mel in cera, devotio in littera est. Alioquin littera occidit, si absque spiritus condimento glutieris* — honey in the wax, devotion in the letter; otherwise the letter kills, if you swallow it without the seasoning of the spirit (Bernard, sermon 7 on the Canticle, Latin verified in the Migne text). The verse that named the covenants now seasons the choir office.

From Origen to Bernard. Origen makes the letter the literal sense; the young Augustine adopts that as exegetical rule; Chrysostom and Ambrosiaster read it juridically — law punishes, Spirit pardons and vivifies; the older Augustine subordinates his own earlier reading and interiorises the juridical one — the ungraced command itself kills; Aquinas systematises both and radicalises Augustine until the Gospel's own text, as external letter, falls under the verse; Bernard turns it to devotional practice. Theodoret and Gregory are absent from that sequence: Theodoret's commentary on the passage stands in PG 82, but none of its sentences was verified in the corpora checked; and no Gregory the Great locus for this verse was located in the corpora checked.

Gradual (*Grad.*)

Benedicam Dóminum in omni témpore · Graduale — Ps. 33, 2-3 · marginal no. 1555

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 33:2–3

I will bless the Lord at all times, his praise shall be always in my mouth. *Y*. In the Lord shall my soul be praised: let the meek hear and rejoice.

The chant matches the Clementine word for word, and the psalm it opens is an alphabetical acrostic — Cassiodorus already knows the Hebrew letters head its verses, and Bellarmine guesses the reason: “that it may be easier committed to memory, and be often chanted by the faithful.” The Gradual takes the acrostic’s first two letters, as it were, and leaves the alphabet to the reader.

The title’s puzzle, and four received solutions. The psalm’s superscription sets it *cum immutávit vultum suum coram Achímelech* — when David changed his countenance before Achimelech — but the narrative (1 Sam. 21:10–15) plays the feigned-madness scene before *Achis*, king of Geth. The tradition saw the discrepancy and answered it four ways, each verified at its locus. Basil: “Abimelech” was the common dynastic title of Philistine kings, as “Pharaoh” in Egypt, and “Anchus” the king’s private name from birth. Theodoret: the Abimelech of the title is the priest of Nob — Abiathar under a second name, as Mark 2:26 also calls him — and the Geth setting does not fit the psalm’s words at all. Augustine: the histories nowhere record the scene under this name, “and yet we find whence it is drawn” — *mutatio nominis sacramentum est*, the changed name is itself the mystery: Abimelech means *regnum patris mei*, and Christ “changed his countenance before the kingdom of his father” — the kingdom of David — when he changed the sacrifice from the order of Aaron to the order of Melchisedech and left that kingdom for the Gentiles. Cassiodorus follows Augustine. The four answers do not reduce to one, and together they are the reception.

The Vetus Latina title carried five more words, and Augustine built on them. His psalter’s title continued *et ferebátur in mánibus suis* — “and he was carried in his own hands” — words in neither the Clementine nor the Douay, verified absent. Augustine’s astonishment is the point: *quomodo posset fieri in homine, quis intellegat? ... manibus suis nemo portatur* — carried in another’s hands a man can be; in his own, never. “How this could be done in David according to the letter, we do not find; in Christ we find it: *ferebatur enim Christus in manibus suis, quando commendans ipsum corpus suum, ait: Hoc est corpus meum*” — Christ was carried in his own hands when, entrusting his own body, he said: This is my body. The eucharistic reading of the psalm the Gradual quotes hangs on an Old-Latin clause the modern page no longer shows — and the psalm’s later invitation, *gustáte et vidéte*, is for Augustine where the riddle opens.

St. Basil the Great, *Homilia in Psalmum 33* (PG 29, coll. 349–356) Basil hears the objection in the chant’s first clause and states it at full strength: the prophet “seems to promise the impossible. How can the praise of God be always in a man’s mouth? When he sleeps, he will surely be silent; and how shall the mouth of one eating or drinking produce praise?” His answer is the inner man’s mouth: *quoddam etiam esse hominis interni spirituale os atque intelligibile, quo nutritur, dum verbum vitae recipit, qui est panis, qui de coelo descendit* — there is a certain spiritual and intelligible mouth of the inner man, by which he is nourished when he receives the word of life, the bread that came down from heaven. And the “always” is fixed to affliction first: it is shameful to bless in prosperity and be silent in adversity; then rather are richer thanks owed. On *áudiant mansuétí*: since salvation came “without battle, by the mere change of countenance,” let the meek hear “that it is possible for the quiet to raise a trophy, and for non-combatants to be declared victors” — and “perhaps, prophetically, the meek are the disciples of Christ.” Latin from Migne’s parallel column, read in the registered scan of PG 29; no public-domain English of this homily exists, and the copyrighted FC translation was not used. Basil’s transmitted psalm homilies cover neither Ps. 69, nor 87, nor 103 — of this Sunday’s four psalms he preached only on the Gradual’s.

St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos 33*, two sermons (New Advent “Psalm 34” carries only the second) On the Gradual’s first verse: “So speaks Christ, so also let a Christian speak . . . both when He gives them, bless; and when He takes them away, bless. For it is He that gives, it is He that takes away: but Himself from him that blesses Him He takes not away” — Job’s grammar made a rule of praise. On the verse’s second clause: those who will not be praised *in the Lord* “are not humble, but fierce, rough, lifted up, proud. Gentle

cattle would the Lord have; be the Lord's *iumentum* . . . He sits upon you, He guides you." English from the public-domain NPNF first series, vol. 8; the first sermon, untranslated there, was read in the Latin.

Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum* 33; and Theodoret, *Interpretatio* 33 (PG 80, coll. 1101–1109)

Cassiodorus answers the *quomodo semper?* morally: praise is always in the mouth of the just man "when whatever he thinks or speaks is such that no reproach can fasten on it . . . whatever we speak or carry in mind out of patience, charity, simplicity and the other virtues is rightly counted among God's praises" — and blessing is owed *quando et adversa patimur, et collata felicitate gaudemus*. On the meek he draws a pointed exclusion: *non dixit, lege docti, non ieiunantes, non psallentes, sed mansueti* — not the law-learned, not the fasters, not the psalm-singers, but the meek are bidden rejoice. His conclusion to the whole psalm belongs beside this Mass: the psalm's order is so complete — hymns first, then the people bidden approach Communion at *gustate et videte* — *ut eum conscriptum putes temporibus Christianis*, "that you would think it written in Christian times." Theodoret, for his part, glosses the Gradual's first verse from David's whole career — "fleeing or pursuing, in good fortune or ill, I hymn my Master" — and makes the meek the singer's chorus: he will not weave the hymn alone, but shares the singing with those who share his meekness.

St. Robert Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos*, Ps. XXXIII, tr. O'Sullivan (1866), artifact pp. 100–105

"The word *always* does not mean every moment . . . but it means that he will do so in the proper time and place, to the end of his life; nay, more, as those Psalms will be sung to the end of time, David will thus, through others, 'bless the Lord at all times.'" Bellarmine has, without knowing it, described the Gradual: the Church singing David's *semper* for him is what the chant is. Read on the registered facsimile.

Alleluia (*All.*)

Dómine, Deus salútis meæ · Allelúia — Ps. 87, 2 · marginal no. 1556

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 87:2

O Lord, the God of my salvation: I have cried in the day, and in the night before thee.

The verse is the opening of the psalter's darkest psalm — the one lament that never turns, whose last word in the Hebrew is "darkness" — and the chant frames it in a double *Allelúia*. The liturgy has taken from the psalm exactly what the psalm has of confession: the name *Deus salútis meæ* and the cry that does not stop, day or night. Nothing else of Ps. 87 is appointed, and the rest of the psalm stays in the psalter.

The reception of the verse splits cleanly, and the split is instructive. Augustine reads the whole psalm as the Passion prophesied — "the Passion of our Lord is here prophesied" — decoding the title's *pro Maheleth* as "for the chorus" that answers Christ by imitation, the sons of Core as sons of Calvary, and *Eman* as "his brother"; on this verse: "He prayed both in prosperous times, that is, by day, and in calamity, which I imagine is meant by night." Cassiodorus takes the same line almost verbatim — through the whole psalm "the Lord Saviour speaks from the dispensation in which he suffered"; day signifies joy and night adversity, "and since these two times embrace the whole of human life, he declares that he cried to the Lord continually" — and his conclusion turns the dark psalm into the martyr-making chorus: hence the confessors' prisons, hence blood more precious than purple and fine linen. Bellarmine concretises the pair into two datable hours: "He did so on the day of his passion, when he cried on the cross, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' and on the night before, when he thrice cried out in the garden" (read on the registered 1866 facsimile). Against all three, Theodoret keeps the psalm in history: the prophecy foretells Israel's calamities and the Babylonian servitude, "and at the same time teaches the pains of all human nature after sin"; the title's *Eman* is a choirmaster of 1 Paralipomenon 6, not a figure; and this verse is simply the knowledge that grounds petition: "Thee, Lord, I know as the God of my salvation; therefore night and day I beg that my supplication be received." The two readings do not exclude each other here: the chant sings only the bright first verse, under Alleluia, and both readings expound that verse.

None of the checked Fathers remarks that this psalm is formally the darkest of the psalter; that observation is modern, and it belongs to the moderns.

Gospel (*Gosp.*)

Beāti óculi . . . Homo quidam descendébat · + Sequéntia sancti Evangélii secúndum Lucam — Luc. 10, 23-37, with *Credo* · marginal no. 1557

The pericope has three movements, and the first is usually skipped. Christ turns to the disciples — the turning is Luke's, outside the appointed text — and blesses their eyes; a lawyer stands up to test him and is sent back to the Law he knows; and the lawyer's counter-question, asked *volens iustificáre seípsum*, is answered with the story English has never stopped retelling. The missal appoints all three movements as one lesson, so the famous parable arrives already framed: what the blessed eyes see, and what the prophets and kings desired to see, is the one who is about to name himself — in the tradition's reading — by what he does on the Jericho road.

The blessed eyes (vv. 23–24)

This is the thinner half of the reception: Ambrose's Lucan commentary passes from v. 22 to v. 25 without a word for these verses, and no Augustine treatment of them was located in the corpora checked. The substantive witnesses are three.

St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on Luke*, Sermon 67, tr. R. Payne Smith (Oxford, 1859)

Cyril begins from the question a lector would ask: why does Christ bless the disciples *alone*, when a crowd stood there watching the same miracles? Because the blessing is not of eyewitness: “all the Jews saw Christ working with divine majesty, yet it would not be right to account them all as blessed.” What the blessed eyes see is what faith sees: “They saw that God the Word, Who was in the form of God the Father, had become flesh for our sakes.” The spectators had the spectacle; the disciples had the recognition.

St. John Chrysostom, *Homily 45 on Matthew* — on the parallel saying, Mt. 13:16–17

Chrysostom has no surviving Luke commentary, so his reading of the saying comes from the Matthean parallel. Two points. The disciples' blessedness lies partly in their own act — “neither would they have been blessed, unless the well-doing had been their own” — and what the prophets desired was not information but presence: his coming, his miracles, his voice, his teaching. The ancients “beheld by faith only: but these by sight too.” English from the public-domain NPNF first series, vol. 10.

St. Bede, *In Lucae Evangelium Expositio* III, on Lk. 10:23–24 (PL 92, col. 467)

Bede supplies what Ambrose omitted, and sharpens it socially: not the eyes of the scribes and Pharisees, “who saw only the Lord's body,” but *beāti óculi parvulórum* — the eyes of the little ones to whom the Son deigns to reveal himself and the Father. The “many kings” are for him the saints who ruled their own temptations — *reges magni, quia tentationum suarum motibus . . . regendo praeesse noverunt* — and the prophets saw indeed, but *per speculum et in aenigmate*. Latin verified in the Migne text.

The lawyer, and the answer he was owed (vv. 25–29)

Luke says the *legisperítus* rose *tentans illum* — Douay “tempting him” — and asked what one must *do* to possess eternal life. Christ's reply is a citation exam: *In lege quid scriptum est? quómodo legis?* The lawyer answers with the two commandments, and is told *Recte respondísti: hoc fac, et vives*. Only then, *volens iustificáre seípsum* — “willing to justify himself” — does he ask the question the parable will refuse to answer: *Et quis est meus próximus?*

St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on Luke*, Sermon 68

Cyril reads the lawyer inside a documented campaign: talebearers had gone about Judaea saying Christ taught that Moses' commandment was of no use, so the question is a trap laid for exactly that slander, and Christ springs it by making the lawyer answer from the Law himself. Praised, the man “breaks forth into pride, thinking that he had no neighbour” — and the parable is built to break precisely that: “a crown of love is being twined for him who loves his neighbour: and he proves to be a Samaritan. Nor is he rejected on this account.” Priesthood and Law-learning, Cyril concludes, are vain unless confirmed by works.

Origen, *Homily 34 on Luke*, in St. Jerome's Latin Before any allegory, Origen answers the lawyer's question morally: the neighbour is whoever "keeps the precepts and prepares himself to be neighbour to every man who needs help" (*praeparare se, ut sit proximus omni homini qui auxilio indiget*), and the closing command is spoken *non tam doctori legis quam nobis quoque omnibus* — not so much to the doctor of the Law as to all of us. The literal sense stands on its own feet in the very homily that transmits the great allegory.

The parable, and what the tradition built on it (vv. 30–37)

The road is real before it is a figure. Jericho lies some three and a half thousand feet below Jerusalem, a day's descent through desert; St. Basil, excerpted in the *Catena aurea* at v. 30, makes the geography the point — "the man then came from the high parts to the low, to fall into the hands of the robbers who infested the desert" — and St. Jerome, riding the same road with Paula, noted the place "called Adomim or the Place of Blood . . . because much blood was shed there in the frequent incursions of marauders," and says she thought there of "the wounded man in the gospel . . . and of the kindness of the Samaritan, that is, the guardian" (*Epistle* 108.12, NPNF second series, vol. 6). The danger is not a preacher's invention; it is in Joshua's border lists as the ascent of Adummim.

The allegorical reading is older than most summaries allow, and it did not begin as fancy. Three stages, each verified at its locus:

Second century: St. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III.17.3; Clement of Alexandria, *Quis dives salvetur* 28–29 Irenaeus, arguing about the Holy Spirit, already has the Lord as the one who compassionated the man fallen among thieves, bound his wounds, and gave "two royal denaria" bearing the image of the Father and the Son — entrusting the man to the Spirit. Clement asks of the neighbour who showed mercy: "Who else can it be but the Saviour Himself?" — who poured on our wounded souls the wine, "the blood of David's vine," and the oil of the Father's compassion. Both English texts from the public-domain Ante-Nicene Fathers, vols. 1–2. The Samaritan-as-Christ reading is thus attested a full generation before Origen wrote.

Origen, *Homily 34 on Luke*, in St. Jerome's Latin (PL 26) Origen reports the whole scheme as received: "One of the elders, wishing to interpret the parable, said. . ." — *hominem qui descendit esse Adam; Jerusalem, paradisum; Jericho, mundum; latrones contrarias Fortitudines; sacerdotem, Legem; Levitem, prophetas; Samaritem, Christum . . . duos denarios, Patrem et Filium . . . stabularium, Ecclesiae praesidem*, and the promised return, the Saviour's second coming. Origen corrects it even as he transmits it — not every man descends from Jerusalem to Jericho, so the scheme must not be forced on all — and adds two signatures of his own: the etymology (the Samaritan is the one *qui interpretatur custos*, the guardian, keyed to Jn. 8:48, where the Lord denies the demon and pointedly does not deny being a Samaritan — *sciebat enim se custodem*); and the two denarii as the knowledge of the Father and the Son, *quomodo Pater in Filio, et Filius in Patre sit*. Latin verified in the wikisource transcription of Jerome's translation; the modern English translation (FC 94) is in copyright and is not quoted.

St. Ambrose, *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* VII, §§71–84 (PL 15, coll. 1717–1720) Ambrose grounds the figure in history first — *haec simplicis historia veritatis est: quae si altius consideretur, admiranda signat mysteria* — and then re-mints the inherited scheme. Jericho is *figura istius mundi*, into which Adam descended from the heavenly Jerusalem, exiled not by a change of place but of conduct: *cui non loci, sed morum mutatio naturae suae fecit exsilium*. The robbers are *angeli noctis atque tenebrarum*, who can wound only after stripping the garments of spiritual grace. The Samaritan is read through the same etymology — *Samaritani etenim vocabulo custos significatur* — and identified by his descent: *Qui descendit de coelo*. Ambrose's own coinage is the neighbouring: the guardian "became our neighbour by taking up our compassion" — *factus est compassionis nostrae susceptione finitimus, et misericordiae collatione vicinus*. The two denarii he re-reads as the two Testaments, *quae imaginem in se habent aeterni regis expressam, quorum pretio vulnera nostra curantur*; the innkeeper becomes St. Paul (*Stabularius itaque ille est qui dixit: Misit me Christus evangelizare*); the return is judgment day — *Beati quibus es debitor!* — and the conclusion is the sentence the whole tradition kept: *Non enim cognatio facit proximum, sed misericordia: quia misericordia secundum naturam* — kinship does not make the neighbour; mercy does, for mercy is according to nature.

St. Augustine, *Quaestiones Evangeliorum* II.19; *Sermo* 131.6; *De doctrina christiana* I.30 Augustine fixes the classic table, verified in the Latin: the man is Adam *in genere humano*; Jerusalem the heavenly city of peace; Jericho — his own touch, from the Hebrew — *luna interpretatur et significat mortalitatem nostram*, the moon that waxes, wanes and sets; the robbers the devil and his angels, who stripped the man of immortality and left him *semivivum* — half-alive because *ex parte qua potest intellegere et cognoscere Deum vivus est*; priest and Levite the *sacerdotium et ministerium Veteris Testamenti, quod non poterat prodesse ad salutem*; Samaritanus *custos interpretatur*; the binding is *cohibitio peccatorum*, the oil *consolatio spei bonae*, the wine *exhortatio ad operandum ferventissimo spiritu*; the beast the flesh of the Incarnation, and to be set on it *in ipsam incarnationem Christi credere*; the inn the Church that refreshes travellers returning to the eternal country; the two denarii the two precepts of charity, or the promise of this life and of the life to come; the innkeeper the Apostle. In *Sermo* 131 the same table turns anti-Pelagian and pastoral at once: the half-dead man is free will after the fall, baptism forgives all sins — *numquid quia deleta est iniquitas, finita est infirmitas?* — and the Church’s inn is where the cure *continues*: *adhuc curatur*, he is still under treatment; let no one exalt himself. And in *De doctrina christiana* I.30 Augustine draws the moral boundary of the whole figure: since no one was neighbour to the wounded man “except him who took pity upon him,” every man is to be counted our neighbour, and the Lord himself “wished also to be called our neighbour.”

St. Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* XX (on Job 29:25); *Regula pastoralis* II.6; *Homiliae in Evangelia* II.18.2 Gregory never preached on this pericope — none of the forty Gospel homilies takes a lection from it — but he made the parable’s medicine into a rule of government: wine and oil are applied to the half-dead man’s wounds *ut per vinum mordeantur vulnera, per oleum foveantur* — so that everyone set over the healing of wounds must mix the bite of discipline with the softness of mercy: *miscenda est ergo lenitas cum severitate*. In the same tradition as Origen he keeps the etymology, and gives it its finest formulation, on Jn. 8:48: charged with having a demon and with being a Samaritan, the Lord denied the one and was silent about the other, *custos namque humani generis venerat* — for he had come as the guardian of the human race, and to deny the name would have been to deny the office.

St. Bede, *In Lucae Evangelium Expositio* III (PL 92, coll. 467–470) Bede’s exposition is a mosaic of Augustine’s table and Ambrose’s phrases — whole clauses recur verbatim — and its one legislative sentence is his own, a rule Bede sets for any reading of the parable: the Lord framed the parable *ut omnem qui misericordiam faceret cuilibet proximum doceret*, and yet the same parable specially designates the Son of God; but we must not so interpret it *ut moralia mutuae fraternitatis instituta sub allegoriae regulis extenuare et auferre conemur* — the rules of allegory must not thin out or carry off the moral institutes of mutual brotherhood. Both senses stand, and at v. 36 he keeps them side by side: *iuxta litteram*, the Lord’s meaning is plain — no one is more a neighbour than the one who shows mercy; *sacratiore autem intellectu*, no one is more a neighbour *quam qui vulnera nostra curavit*. His own extensions: the denarii are handed over *altera die* because the risen Lord opened the Scriptures’ sense, and the innkeeper widens from Paul to all the Spirit-taught preachers.

The tradition’s own dissent, and its modern balance

The chain is not unanimous, and its disagreement is precise. Cyril’s sermon on the parable, quoted above, works entirely at the moral level and never makes the Samaritan Christ — the major Greek commentator declining the reading the Latin West systematised. Eleven centuries later Calvin reports the allegory — “This Samaritan they imagine to be Christ, because he is our guardian” — and rejects it whole: “I acknowledge that I have no liking for any of these interpretations; but we ought to have a deeper reverence for Scripture than to reckon ourselves at liberty to disguise its natural meaning” (*Harmony of the Evangelists* at Lk. 10:30, tr. Pringle, public domain). The parable’s scope, for him, is that neighbourhood “extends to the whole human race.” What Calvin treats as rivals, Bede had held together five centuries earlier; and the 1911 *Catholic Encyclopedia*, warning generally that parables must not be made to establish dogmas by riddling detail, still judges of this one that “it can be explained mystically in detail, and is therefore as much an ‘allegory’ as a parable.” The modern magisterial reading completes the circle in the other direction: *Salvifici doloris* 28–30 (1984) makes the parable the charter of the “Good Samaritan” vocation toward the suffering and — fusing it with Mt. 25 — sets Christ no longer in the Samaritan’s place but in the wounded man’s: “he himself is the one who receives help.” The casting has reversed, and the command has not moved.

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

Aquinas’s chain on this pericope (cap. 10, lect. 7–9) stacks Cyril’s moral reading and the full Latin allegory side by side without adjudicating, and its sourcing says as much as its content. The long allegorical extracts under Chrysostom’s name are flagged in the Oxford edition’s own margins as *Hom. in loc. Ed. Lat.* — a homily existing only in the old Latin editions, which the preface assigns to “some very early imitator or epitomist of Chrysostom” — so the one great Greek name the chain seems to add to the allegory is not genuinely there. The genuinely Greek voices Thomas adds are Basil’s geography at v. 30 and the “Greek expositor” the margins identify as Severus, who has Christ “fully call Himself a Samaritan.” The chain ends morally, with genuine Chrysostom (*Hom. 10 on Hebrews*): help the oppressed, “be he Gentile or Jew.” English quoted from the public-domain Oxford translation (1840s).

Offertory (*Off.*)

Precátus est Móyses · Antiphona ad Offertorium — Exodi 32, 11, 13 et 14 · marginal no. 1558

One of the rare offertories that tells a story, and among the most admired pieces in the repertory — Schuster calls it, in words and music alike, “a little liturgical gem.” While the gifts go to the altar the choir sings Moses at the mountain: the question flung at God, the plea, the appeal to the oath sworn to the patriarchs, and the ending no drama would risk — *et placátus factus est Dóminus* — and the Lord was appeased.

The text is older than the Bible beside it. The five divergences tabulated at the head of this commentary have one explanation: the chant is not loose quotation of the Vulgate but an Old-Latin, Septuagint-shaped centonisation. Its *Precátus est . . . in conspéctu Dómini* construes the prayer as made *before* the Lord, where Jerome’s *orabat Dominum* takes a direct object; its *Quare, Dómine, irásceris in pópulo tuo* addresses God in the second person where Jerome has the third (*irascitur furor tuus*); its *Parce iræ ánimæ tuæ* doubles anger upon anger and carries the matter of a verse the citation does not even name; its *terram fluéntem lac et mel* keeps the accusative where Jerome wrote *lacte et melle*; and its closing clause construes *de malignitáte, quam dixit fácere* where Jerome wrote *ne faceret malum quod locutus fuerat*. Each of those is the shape the Septuagint’s Greek has at Ex. 32:11–14, and the chant is therefore Septuagint-shaped; but no Greek witness was collated here, so the Greek is the proposed explanation and is not quoted. What *is* checkable is that this text-form circulated in Latin before Jerome: Augustine’s lemma in the *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* reads *Et propitiatus est Dominus de malitia quam dixit facere populo suo* — the chant’s construction, not the Vulgate’s. Verified in the Latin at the cited edition.

The chant’s own history. In an early manuscript of the Gregorian Sacramentary tradition, the Mass-set before this Sunday’s orations carries the chant cues *Ant. Deus in adiutorium. Resp. Benedicam dominum. Off. Precatus est moyses. Com. De fructu operum* — this Sunday’s exact four chants, paired a thousand years before the 1962 printing (Wilson’s 1915 edition of the Hadrianum, p. 172, apparatus; the old Sunday-count runs one ahead of the missal’s). The offertory once had verses, dropped with all offertory verses centuries ago: Ott’s *Offertoriale* prints two, the first continuing the scene with *Dixit Dominus ad Moysen: Invenisti gratiam in conspectu meo*, the second answering with the glory in the cloud. The 1911 *Catholic Encyclopedia* records the shrinkage: the offertory was once a whole psalm with antiphon; by Durandus’s day the verses were already being omitted. Johnher’s 1940 commentary hears in the melody’s mounting figures over *Quare* “violent agitation” — the music arguing with God as the text does. And the piece kept working after the choirbooks: Palestrina set *Precatus est Moyses* for five voices in his *Offertoria totius anni* (Rome, 1593) under this very Sunday’s rubric, and Lassus set it before him; both settings survive in their printed editions.

St. Augustine, *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* II, qq. 141–149 (on Ex. 32); *De civitate Dei* XV.25

The intercession scene drew from Augustine his most careful analysis of prayer that “changes God’s mind.” On v. 14: *malitiam hic poenam intellegi voluit* — the “evil” God is appeased of is penalty, not malice — *malus enim Deus non est; sed malis ingerit mala, quia iustus est*. On Moses’ astonishing offer at v. 32, the logic is a lawyer’s: he spoke it *securus*, safe, “so that the conclusion would follow from what came after: since God would not blot Moses from his book, he would forgive the people that sin.” Deepest of all, on *Sine me* — God’s “Let me alone” before Moses has said a word: by these words “God signified how much that people profited with him from being loved by such a man . . . so that we might be advised that, when our own merits weigh us down, we can be relieved before him by the merits of those he loves”; the sentence is spoken *ac si diceretur . . . dilectio tua in illos intercedit mihi* — as if to say, your love intercedes with me for them. God, he adds, “was loving them the more secretly while terrifying them aloud.” And the *City of God* supplies the rule for the whole scene: *ira Dei non perturbatio*

animi eius est, sed iudicium quo inrogatur poena peccato — God’s anger is not a disturbance of his mind but the judgment by which penalty is imposed — and God does not repent as a man does, his sentence being as fixed as his foreknowledge is sure; Scripture speaks so “to terrify the proud and rouse the negligent.” Latin verified at the cited public editions.

St. Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* IX.xvi.23 and XX.v.14 Gregory turns the scene into a doctrine of intercessory boldness: “Did not Moses resist God’s wrath, when standing up for the fallen people . . . by the oblation of his own death?” The saints “lift up themselves against Him, and the Divine Power arms them in alliance with Itself against Itself . . . He bears the supplicant’s contradiction which He inspires.” His reading of *Sine me* converges with Augustine’s from the other side: “What is it to say to His servant, Let Me alone; but to give him boldness to supplicate?” — the prohibition is the permission. In Book XX Moses is the pattern ruler, “mercy united with severity . . . he who begged for the life of all even with his own death.” English from the public-domain Library of the Fathers translation.

Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* II.26; St. John Chrysostom, *Homily 16 on Romans* Tertullian is the witness who actually says what preachers often attribute to the whole tradition: Moses deprecating the Father’s wrath is a figure of Christ — the chapter presents “Christ, prefigured in the person of Moses as the deprecator of the Father, and the offerer of His own life for the salvation of the people,” and reads *Sine me* as spoken precisely “in order that by his entreaty, and by offering himself, he might hinder” the judgment — “that you might by such an instance learn how much privilege is vouchsafed with God to a faithful man.” Chrysostom, expounding Paul’s own anathema-wish, makes Moses the model of the intercessor whose daring is zeal for God’s honour: “as Moses seemed to be pleading for the Jews, yet was doing everything for God’s glory . . . so also does Paul.” English from the public-domain ANF vol. 3 and NPNF first series vol. 11. John’s liturgical commentary draws the same line under this very chant: Moses “is but a weak type of Christ and His redemptive work,” who did not only pray but gave himself, and “can show His wounds” — the offertory’s intercession completed at the altar it accompanies.

Secret (*Sec.*)

Hóstias, quæsumus, Dómine · *Secreta*, composed oration, with *Præfatio de Sma Trinitate* · marginal no. 1559

English: Cummiskey 1861, Secret of this formulary, printed p. 422

Mercifully look down, O Lord, on the offerings we lay on thy holy altar; that they may be to the honour of thy name, by obtaining pardon for us. Thro’.

What that English reverses. The 1861 rendering reverses the Latin’s order — honour first, pardon as the means — and the Latin’s point is in the order it actually has. *Ut, nobis indulgéntiam largiéndò, tuo nómini dent honórem*: the gerund clause makes God’s act of lavishing pardon the very mode in which the offerings render him honour. Not pardon in exchange for glory, but pardon *as* glory: God’s name is honoured precisely in his largesse. The two ends of sacrifice that a treatise would distinguish — propitiation and praise — are fused in one clause of liturgical grammar. Schuster reads it just so: perfect adoration, and the pardon “to which every other favour is subordinate.”

Transmission. Not located in the Verona collection; in the Gelasian it stands in the same Mass-set as this Sunday’s Collect and Postcommunion, reading *largiáris* where the later books read *largiéndò* (Wilson, pp. 228–229, with the apparatus recording the eighth-century reading); the Hadrianum has the 1962 wording exact (Wilson 1915, p. 173). And the prayer outlived the 1962 books twice over: the postconciliar Missal appoints it, with the same wording, as the *super oblata* of Thursday after Ash Wednesday — its current official English, “that, bestowing on us your pardon, our oblations may give honor to your name,” keeps the gerund’s theology intact.

Communion (*Comm.*)

De fructu operum tuorum · Antiphona ad Communionem — Ps. 103, 13 et 14-15 · marginal no. 1560

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 103:13–15, the verses printed whole

Thou waterest the hills from thy upper rooms: the earth shall be filled with the fruit of thy works: Bringing forth grass for cattle, and herb for the service of men. That thou mayst bring bread out of the earth: And that wine may cheer the heart of man. That he may make the face cheerful with oil: and that bread may strengthen man's heart.

The antiphon's path through those verses is exact and is declared by the missal's own citation: v. 13's second clause with its order inverted and a vocative added, v. 14's cattle-and-herb clause omitted, then vv. 14b–15 entire. What the Church sings at the rail is the creation psalm's pantry: bread out of the earth, wine that gladdens the heart, oil that brightens the face, bread that strengthens the heart — sung at the moment the faithful receive what the day's Secret called *hóstias* and the tradition calls the Bread.

The reception of these verses runs the full spectrum, from providence to sacrament. At the literal pole, Theodoret: God supplies rain so that the earth brings forth every kind of fruit — “bread to strengthen and nourish human nature, wine to gladden and make life sweeter, oil to nourish within and brighten without” — providence, and nothing else; and Bellarmine agrees (“‘wine may cheer the heart of man,’ intelligible enough”), drawing three morals: gratitude to the source of all supports of bodily life, wonder that the Father gave “even the luxuries,” and the duty of frugal meals and moderate drink. At the other pole stand the two Latin doctors the liturgy has, in effect, sided with by singing these verses here.

St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 103 (New Advent “Psalm 104”), Sermo 3, §§12–14 “That it may bring forth bread out of the earth. What bread? Christ. Out of what earth? From Peter, from Paul, from the other stewards of the truth . . . He is the bread who descended from heaven, that He might be brought forth out of the earth.” On the wine, the sober inebriation: “How excellent is Your cup which makes inebriate! . . . Be inebriated; yet beware, from what source” — an ebriety seen “in the holy love of righteousness” and in a mind estranged from earth toward heaven. On the oil: Christ is Christ from the chrism, “but He anoints over His whole Body,” so every comer receives the grace that gladdens the countenance. And on the psalm's strange restriction — bread strengthening the *heart* — “as it were, he has forced us to understand what bread he was speaking of”: visible bread strengthens the stomach; there is another bread, *panis cordis*. English from the public-domain NPNF first series, vol. 8, checked against the Latin sermon divisions.

Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum* 103, ad vv. 14–15 The most explicitly sacramental witness among those checked. Lest anyone take the bread as common bread, Cassiodorus says, the psalm adds three things to be understood spiritually: *vinum laetificat cor hominis, cum sacratum fuerit in sanguinem Domini Christi* — wine gladdens the heart of man *when it has been consecrated into the blood of the Lord Christ* — “hence we are permitted to be inebriated, as it is written: and thy cup which inebriateth, how excellent it is . . . *ebrietas sobria, satietas felix*”; and the face is gladdened with oil *cum regale chrisma conficitur*, when the royal chrism is confected — that face of which it is said *Accedite ad eum et illuminamini*. The proof-text he reaches for is Ps. 33:6 — the Gradual's own psalm, quoted inside the Communion's: the two chants of this Mass were already cross-linked in a sixth-century commentary. On *panis cor hominis confírmnet* he makes the letter itself force the spirit: if you take it bodily, does bread strengthen only the heart and not the other members? Latin from the public Migne text; the copyrighted ACW translation was not used.

That the 1962 books appoint these verses as a *Communion* chant is a fact about the liturgy that sits squarely on the Augustine–Cassiodorus line. The pairing itself is old: the same early Gregorian witness that cues *Precatus est moyses* for this Sunday cues *Com. De fructu operum* beside it.

Postcommunion (*Postcomm.*)

Vivificet nos, quésumus, Dómine · *Postcommunio*, composed oration · marginal no. 1561

English: Cummiskey 1861, Postcommunion of this formulary, printed p. 423

May the sacred participation of these thy mysteries, O Lord, we beseech thee, give us life; and be to us both an expiation and protection. Thro’.

What that English loses. The Latin’s one verb of bestowal, *tribuat*, and its equaliser *páriter* both vanish in “be to us both”; and the 1861 English pluralises “these thy mysteries” where the Latin has the singular *huius . . . mystérii*. The Latin carries the argument.

The prayer opens on the day’s most loaded verb. The Epistle’s hinge was *spíritus autem vivificat*; the last oration of the same Mass begins *Vivificet nos* — the lesson’s verb turned into a petition over the sacrament just received. The shared vocabulary is verified on the two printed texts. What the prayer then asks is a pair held level: *et páriter nobis expiatiónem tribuat, et munímen* — that the one holy participation bestow, equally and at once, expiation for what is past and a rampart for what is coming. Cleansing looks backward, *munímen* forward; *páriter* refuses to rank them. Schuster’s verdict on the prayer is exact: in its Latin brevity, reminiscent of an ancient inscription, it “is an epitome of Eucharistic doctrine.”

Transmission. The Verona collection carries it among the July Masses with one different word — *participatio tui sancta mysterii*, participation in thee (Feltoe, p. 60) — a reading worth a footnote all by itself; the Gelasian and the Hadrianum have the 1962 form with *huius* (Wilson, pp. 228–229; Wilson 1915, p. 173, where the older *tui* form also recurs in the Masses in time of war, p. 199). The postconciliar Missal keeps the prayer verbatim as the postcommunion of Tuesday of the third week of Lent. First attested in the fifth-to-sixth-century collection, still asked after Communion today: of this Sunday’s three orations, none has been allowed to retire.

Source-Grounded Synthesis Across the Propers

Read as one book-order, the ten collated texts and their checked witnesses support the four relations that follow, and three of the four rest on witnesses that disagree; connections that go further are the exploratory proposals of *Interpretive Possibilities*.

1. The same Latin word fails twice, and the second failure is a story

The Epistle’s technical term for what Moses’ covenant was is *ministratio*: *ministratio mortis*, the ministration of death engraved in letters on stones, set against *ministratio spíritus*. The Gospel then puts two ministers on a road. Augustine’s table on the parable, verified in the Latin, reads priest and Levite as the *sacerdotium et ministerium Veteris Testamenti, quod non poterat prodesse ad salutem* — the priesthood and ministry of the Old Testament, which could not profit unto salvation. That is more than a resemblance; it is the same noun and the same judgment, made by a witness expounding the Gospel and not thinking about the Epistle. Paul argues the point in the abstract, with tables and glory and an a fortiori; Luke stages it as two men who look and walk on. The formulary prints them forty lines apart.

What that convergence does *not* license, the tradition itself refused. Ambrosiaster reads *littera enim occídit* juridically — the written law was given to Moses *ut contemnentes Legem occideret*, to execute its despisers — and Chrysostom the same way: the Law seizes a murderer and puts him to death, the Gospel seizes a murderer and gives him life. On that reading the letter kills the guilty, and the Old Testament’s ministry is deficient rather than culpable. The older Augustine moves the killing inward: the letter is any command without grace, the Decalogue included, because the bare precept shows what to do and supplies no power to do it. Aquinas then formalises Augustine’s own definition of “letter” and draws the conclusion that closes every exit — *littera etiam Evangelii occideret, nisi adesset interius gratia fidei sanans*. Held together, these witnesses forbid the cheapest reading of this Sunday: that the priest and the Levite failed because they were Jewish ministers, and that the Christian reader is on the Samaritan’s side by membership. On Augustine’s and Aquinas’s account the letter that cannot heal is the reader’s own text, and the ministry that walks past is available to anyone holding one.

2. Sufficiency is confessed before it is argued

The Collect concedes the Epistle's thesis in its opening subordinate clause, before it asks for anything: *de cuius múnere venit, ut tibi a fídelibus tuis digne et laudabíliter serviátur*. Worthy service is God's gift, not the petitioner's contribution. The Epistle then supplies the argument the oration took as given — *non quod sufficiéntes simus cogitare áliquid a nobis, quasi ex nobis . . . sed sufficiéntia nostra ex Deo est* — disclaiming not merely the deed but the interior act. The link is Schuster's own: his commentary on this Sunday quotes that verse of 2 Corinthians against any suspicion that the Collect overstates. And the Introit has already put the same confession in the mouth of a body that cannot help itself, with the tradition's most concentrated commentary on why: Cassian hands over this one verse because "it contains the thought of one's own weakness, confidence in the answer, and the assurance of a present and ever ready help"; Augustine grounds it at *ego vero egenus et pauper sum*, "help I seek, always mine infirmity I confess."

Three elements therefore make one claim in three grammars — sung petition, oration concession, apostolic argument — and the transmission records show the concession is not a late refinement: the Collect stands in the Verona collection and in the Gelasian, with the 1962 wording exact in the Hadrianum, and the postconciliar Missal still says it. The Hadrianum witness shows the chants and the orations already travelling together for this Sunday.

3. The chants answer in the voice of the person the Gospel vindicates

Between the two lessons the Mass sings the posture of someone whose standing is received. The Gradual's *áudiant mansuétí* drew from Cassiodorus a pointed exclusion — *non dixit, lege docti, non ieiunántes, non psalléntes, sed mansuétí* — not the law-learned, not the fasters, not the psalm-singers, but the meek are bidden rejoice. He was expounding a psalm, not a lectionary; the Gospel that follows in this book stages a *legisperítus* who is exactly *lege doctus*, answers his citation exam perfectly, and is corrected by a Samaritan. Basil, on the same clause, had already made the meek those who win "without battle," and guessed prophetically at the disciples — whose eyes the same Gospel calls blessed. Both expositors wrote on the psalm alone; its juxtaposition with the Gospel is the missal's.

The Alleluia keeps the day honest about how long that posture lasts. Its verse is the opening of the psalter's one lament that never turns, and the checked witnesses divide on the speaker: Augustine, Cassiodorus and Bellarmine hear Christ in the Passion, with the day-and-night pair concretised at last into Good Friday and Gethsemane; Theodoret hears exilic Israel and, expressly, "the pains of all human nature after sin." Neither reading absorbs the other. Both leave the chant doing the same liturgical work: a cry that does not stop, framed in *Allelúia* — unstopped petition sung inside praise, which is precisely the difference between the Introit's plea and despair.

4. Intercession is carried to the altar and answered in kind

The Offertory is the formulary's hinge, and its evidence is unusually hard. The chant is an Old-Latin, Septuagint-shaped adaptation of Exodus 32, and the proof is checkable rather than stylistic: Augustine's own lemma in the *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* reads *de malitia quam dixit facere populo suo*, the chant's construction and not Jerome's. What the Church therefore sings while the gifts are carried up is a text older than the Bible printed beside it, and what it narrates is a man interceding for people who have just disqualified themselves.

The reception of that scene is where the day's doctrine becomes an action rather than a thesis. Augustine, on God's *Sine me*, hears the whole mechanism: the words are spoken *ac si diceretur . . . dilectio tua in illos intercedit mihi* — your love intercedes with me for them — so that "when our own merits weigh us down, we can be relieved before him by the merits of those he loves." Gregory reaches the same place from the other side: to say "let me alone" to a servant is to give him boldness to plead, and God "bears the supplicant's contradiction which He inspires." Tertullian alone among the checked witnesses names the figure outright — Moses deprecating the Father's wrath is "Christ, prefigured . . . as the deprecator of the Father, and the offerer of His own life for the salvation of the people" — and that is one witness, not a consensus, though preaching commonly attributes it to the tradition at large.

The two orations that follow convert intercession into exchange, and their grammar carries the argument. The Secret's gerund makes God's act of lavishing pardon the very mode in which the offerings honour his name — *ut, nobis indulgéntiam largiéndó, tuo nómini dent honórem* — so that propitiation and praise, which a treatise would distinguish, are one clause. The Postcommunion then opens on the Epistle's own verb: *spíritus autem vivificat* in the lesson, *Vivíficet nos* over the sacrament. Two collated texts share the vocabulary, and the sharing proves nothing further; but what the prayer asks with that verb answers the Gospel's diagnosis exactly. *Páriter* refuses to rank

expiation and *munímen*: cleansing for what is past, a rampart for what is coming. Augustine’s *Sermo* 131 had said the same of the inn — baptism forgives all sins, and yet *adhuc curatur*, the man is still under treatment — which is why the Church’s last word on this Sunday is not thanksgiving for a completed rescue but a request that the rescue keep working.

What the whole formulary supports, and where it stops

Read in book order, the ten texts hold one position that no single element states: that diagnosis and cure are different acts, and that this Mass is arranged around the second. The letter can show the wound and cannot bind it; the Law’s own ministers see and pass; sufficiency, worthy service, rescue, pardon and life are each asked for or confessed as received. Mercy is what crosses the gap — *Non enim cognatio facit proximum, sed misericordia* in Ambrose’s sentence, and *Vade, et tu fac similiter* in the Lord’s.

That position is drawn from the texts as the book assembles them and from their checked reception; the Hadrianum’s cue line pairing *Deus in adiutorium*, *Benedicam dominum*, *Precatus est moyses* and *De fructu operum* shows that the four chants were joined early. And Bede’s rule governs the allegory throughout — the parable specially designates the Son of God *and* teaches that everyone who shows mercy is a neighbour, and the rules of allegory must not *moralia mutuae fraternitatis instituta . . . extenuare et auferre*. Bede’s own prohibition rules out making this Sunday only a doctrine of grace. The imperative is the last thing the Gospel says.

The Propers: Notable and Quotable

Four verified afterlives of wording from the scriptural propers, each one a use that moves the phrase into a register its author did not occupy. Straight exegesis, devotional reuse and bare quotation keep the phrase in its own register, and the exegesis and reuse stand in the commentary above. Two of the four are judicial, and the pairing is telling: of everything these appointed texts contain, what the law took and kept were a lawyer’s evasive question and a warning against reading by the letter.

Gospel, Lk. 10:29 — the lawyer’s dodge becomes the law of negligence, 1932

Appointed phrase. *Et quis est meus próximus?*, Douay–Rheims “And who is my neighbour?”

Later use and locus. Lord Atkin’s speech in *Donoghue v Stevenson*, House of Lords, 26 May 1932, [1932] A.C. 562 at 580 — the case of the snail in the ginger-beer bottle, and the foundation of the modern law of negligence: “The rule that you are to love your neighbour becomes in law you must not injure your neighbour; and the lawyer’s question ‘Who is my neighbour?’ receives a restricted reply. You must take reasonable care to avoid acts or omissions which you can reasonably foresee would be likely to injure your neighbour. Who then in law is my neighbour?” Verified in the Scottish Council of Law Reporting’s transcription of the judgment.

The turn. Luke frames the question as an evasion — the lawyer asks it *volens iustificáre seípsum* — and the parable refuses to answer it, replying instead with a neighbour who acted. Atkin does the opposite of the parable on purpose: he takes the evasive question seriously, announces that in law it “receives a restricted reply,” and builds the boundary the Gospel declined to draw. The turn is double: sacred command becomes tort doctrine, and the question Christ deflected becomes the one the judge must answer — while naming it, candidly, “the lawyer’s question.”

Rights and limit. A 1932 United Kingdom judgment, freely quotable. Atkin’s verbal dependence is on the English Bible’s wording of this verse; he cites no evangelist, and the “restricted reply” is his own coinage.

Gospel, Lk. 10:30–32 — the seminarians step over the man in the road, 1973

Appointed phrase. *Homo quidam descendébat ab Ierúsalem in Iéricho*, Douay–Rheims “A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho” — and the priest and Levite who, seeing him, “passed by.”

Later use and locus. John M. Darley and C. Daniel Batson, “‘From Jerusalem to Jericho’: A Study of Situational and Dispositional Variables in Helping Behavior,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 27.1 (1973), pp. 100–108. Seminarians at Princeton Theological Seminary were sent between two buildings past a shabbily dressed confederate slumped in a doorway; some had been told to hurry, and some were on their way to

give a talk on this very parable. From the published abstract: “Subjects in a hurry to reach their destination were more likely to pass by without stopping.” From the discussion, p. 107: “on several occasions, a seminary student going to give his talk on the parable of the Good Samaritan literally stepped over the victim as he hurried on his way!”

The turn. The pericope becomes an experimental protocol, and the experiment re-enacts it: the title is the parable’s own road, the slumped confederate is the *semivivo relicto*, and the finding — hurry, not piety or personality, predicted who stopped — is the priest and the Levite measured at $p < .05$. Scripture’s most famous indictment of religious professionals was confirmed on religious professionals by their own psychology department.

Rights and limit. The article is under APA copyright; only the short sentences above are quoted, with citation. The study engages the parable’s narrative, and its title quotes the verse’s route exactly; the phrase “passed by on the other side” in its abstract is the King James idiom, where the Douay of vv. 31–32 has simply “passed by.”

Epistle, 2 Cor. 3:6 — Paul’s covenant contrast becomes a canon of statutory construction, 1950

Appointed phrase. *Littera enim occidit*, Douay–Rheims “For the letter killeth.”

Later use and locus. Justice Felix Frankfurter, dissenting in *United States ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy*, 338 U.S. 537 (1950), at 548 and 550, verified in the official United States Reports: “It is true also of Acts of Congress that ‘The letter killeth,’” and, of the statute before the Court, “Due regard for the whole body of immigration laws and policies makes it singularly appropriate in construing the War Brides Act to be heedful of the admonition that ‘The letter killeth.’” The case was the summary exclusion, without a hearing, of an American soldier’s German war bride.

The turn. Paul’s sentence contrasts two covenants — the ministration engraved on stones and the ministration of the Spirit — and says nothing about how to read documents. English usage long ago re-cut it into a maxim of interpretation, letter against spirit, and Frankfurter completes the migration: the Apostle’s theology of the new testament is quoted as authority for construing an Act of Congress generously. That a dissent on behalf of an excluded immigrant wife reaches for a verse about a covenant of mercy is the kind of fit no one planned.

Rights and limit. United States Reports text, public domain. The four quoted words are common to the Douay and the King James; Frankfurter cites no scripture reference, and the interpretive maxim he invokes is the naturalised idiom, not Paul’s argument, which concerns covenants, not construction.

Introit, Ps. 69:2 — the cry for help rides a ducal fanfare, 1610

Appointed phrase. *Deus, in adiutorium meum intende: Domine, ad adiuvandum me festina*, Douay–Rheims “O God, come to my assistance; O Lord, make haste to help me.”

Later use and locus. Claudio Monteverdi, *Vespro della Beata Vergine* (Venice: Ricciardo Amadino, 1610), opening versicle and response “Deus in adiutorium meum intende / Domine ad adiuvandum me festina.” The whole choir intones the response on a single repeated chord while the orchestra plays the opening toccata of Monteverdi’s 1607 opera *Orfeo* — the Gonzaga court’s own instrumental flourish — around it; the borrowing is documented in the standard literature and stated plainly in, for example, Jennifer More Glagov’s 2016 Music of the Baroque programme note, which identifies the versicle and response “into which Monteverdi incorporates music from the opening of his 1607 opera *Orfeo*.”

The turn. This verse is among the most-repeated petitions in Western liturgy: since Cassian commended it and the Rule of Benedict appointed it, it has opened every hour of the Office but Matins, always as a bare cry before anything else is allowed to happen. Monteverdi opens his most ambitious sacred publication by dressing exactly that cry in opera-house brass — a plea for rescue delivered as a court fanfare, sacred urgency wearing theatrical splendour. The setting does not merely decorate the text; it makes the Church’s plainest sentence arrive like a duke.

Rights and limit. The 1610 print and its music are public domain; the programme note is quoted in short compass with attribution. The register reading — liturgical cry inside a theatrical fanfare — is the standard musicological account of a documented self-borrowing, not a recorded intention of Monteverdi’s; and the versicle’s Office use belongs to the Breviary, this Introit being the one place the 1962 Missal sings the same verse at Mass.

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, the search boundary, the novelty result and the controlling limit of each are recorded in `research/scope.md`. Evidence, doctrine, and the literal sense of the appointed texts govern; where a proposal and a checked witness conflict, the witness wins. Bede's rule binds here as everywhere in this guide: no allegory may thin out the moral command the parable ends with.

Editorial proposal — Half-dead is a diagnosis of exactly what the letter can reach

Anchors: Gospel (*Gosp.*), *semivivo relicto* with Augustine's gloss in *Quaestiones Evangeliorum* II.19 — half alive *ex parte qua potest intellegere et cognoscere Deum*; Epistle (*Ep.*), *littera enim occidit*, with Aquinas's mechanism in *Super II ad Corinthios* c. 3, *littera legis dat solam cognitióem peccáti*.

Mechanism: Augustine divides the man on the road along a precise line: he is alive in the part that can know God and dead in the part wasted by sin. Aquinas, eight centuries later and expounding a different text, describes the letter's whole competence along the same line: it delivers knowledge of sin and does not touch the cause. Set the two together and the parable stops being an illustration of the Epistle and becomes its case history. The letter can speak to the half of the man that is still awake — and that half is precisely what the priest and the Levite, who could read, address by walking past. What the road needs is an intervention aimed at the other half, and the Samaritan's first act is not instruction but binding.

Fruit: "The letter killeth" stops sounding like a rhetorical antithesis about covenants and acquires an anthropology: a creature left with cognition and without power is not helped by more accurate cognition. It also disciplines the preacher, who is by definition working on the waking half.

What the ordinary element-by-element reading misses: Read separately, Augustine's *semivivum* is a remark about original sin and Aquinas's *occasionaliter* is a remark about Romans 7. Neither witness has the other's text in view, and the missal's page gives no cue that the two diagnoses are the same diagnosis.

Strongest limit: Augustine wrote in about 400 and Aquinas in the 1260s; they are not in conversation, and the shared line is drawn here, not by them. Augustine's own point at *semivivum* is the survival of the *imago*, not the failure of written law, and the parable never says the wounded man had read anything. The proposal is a conjunction of two anthropologies, not evidence about either author's intention or about the missal's.

Editorial proposal — The road supplies two of the three medicines; the rail supplies all three

Anchors: Gospel (*Gosp.*), *infundens óleum et vinum*; Communion (*Comm.*), *et vinum lætíficet cor hóminis: ut exhílalet fáciem in óleo, et panis cor hóminis confírmet*; and, at one remove, Gradual (*Grad.*), through Cassiodorus's own cross-reference of the Communion's gladdened face to Ps. 33:6.

Mechanism: The Samaritan carries oil and wine and nothing else; the inn is where he stops, pays, and leaves the man in another's keeping. The Communion antiphon names the same two substances and adds a third the roadside could not carry — bread, twice, framing the other two. The tradition has read each list, separately and in opposite directions: Augustine makes the Samaritan's oil *consolatio spei bonae* and his wine *exhortatio ad operandum ferventissimo spiritu*, Gregory makes the wine bite and the oil soothe, while Cassiodorus reads the Communion's wine as gladdening *cum sacratum fuerit in sanguinem Domini Christi* and its oil as the face brightened *cum regale chrisma conficitur*. The proposal is structural rather than allegorical: the formulary moves the day's medicine from the road to the table, and the item it gains in transit is the one the Church can only give indoors.

Fruit: The Communion stops being a pleasant creation-psalm coda and becomes the answer to a question the Gospel left open — what happens at the inn. It also gives the day's mercy a location: not a gesture on a road, but a house with provisions and a bill already paid.

What the ordinary element-by-element reading misses: Element by element the Gospel's oil and wine are first aid, the Communion's are providence, and the two lists never meet; each has its own witnesses, and the evidence for each stops at its own element.

Strongest limit: The orders differ — Luke has oil then wine, the antiphon wine then oil — and the psalm’s triad is agricultural, with no wound anywhere in it. Reading the Samaritan’s oil and wine as sacraments is old and common in devotional commentary on this Sunday, but no checked witness joins that reading to *this* antiphon, and Cassiodorus’s sacramental reading of the psalm was written with no parable in view. The pairing of these two chants with this Gospel is attested early in the Gregorian tradition, which proves association and not purpose.

Editorial proposal — The day’s danger is a verb of thinking, and it survives only in the chant’s psalter

anchors: Introit (*Int.*), *qui cōgitant mihi mala*, the chant reading against the Clementine’s *qui volunt mihi mala*; Epistle (*Ep.*), *non quod sufficiens simus cogitare aliquid a nobis*; Gospel (*Gosp.*), the lawyer who asks *volens iustificare seipsum*.

Mechanism: The Introit’s verb is a verified collation finding: the missal sings *cōgitant*, devise, where the Clementine and therefore the Douay have *volunt*, desire. Augustine’s exposition turns on exactly that reading — open persecution has passed, “now there has remained the malice of them *thinking*.” The Epistle then disclaims sufficiency at the same faculty and in the same verb, *cogitare*; and the Gospel’s antagonist is neither a robber nor a persecutor but a reader engaged in an interior operation, justifying himself. Across three elements the day’s trouble is located inside the head, and in the Introit it is located there only because the Mass kept an older psalter than the Bible did.

Fruit: The formulary’s enemies stop being external. A Mass that opens by asking for rescue from people who *think* evil, argues that we cannot *think* anything sufficient, and then shows a man ruined by thinking well of himself, is describing one danger three times — and the petition it makes is not for cleverness.

What the ordinary element-by-element reading misses: The link is invisible in English: the Douay renders the Clementine, so the Introit reads “desire evils” and the verbal chain breaks at its first link. It is also invisible in any book that prints the Clementine psalm instead of the chant.

Strongest limit: The Latin words do not mean the same thing. *Cogitare* at 2 Cor. 3:5 renders a verb of reckoning or accounting, and Paul is not describing malice; the Introit’s *cōgitant* is hostile intent; and the lawyer’s own verbs are *tentans* and *iustificare*, not *cogitare* at all. The chant’s reading is a fact of Latin psalter history, not a choice made for this Sunday, and Augustine was expounding persecutors, not lawyers.

Editorial proposal — An unanswered cry, then someone else’s prayer with the answer printed in it

anchors: Alleluia (*All.*), Ps. 87:2, *in die clamavi et nocte coram te*, the opening of the one psalm that never brightens; Offertory (*Off.*), *Precatus est Moyses in conspectu Domini*, ending *et placatus factus est Dominus*.

Mechanism: Three chants apart, the Mass sings two prayers with opposite endings. The first is a cry whose own psalm records no answer at all; the second is an intercession whose last clause *is* the answer, sung while the gifts are carried. The difference between them is not intensity but person: the second prayer is offered by someone else, for people who have disqualified themselves, and the checked reception says exactly that this is how such prayers work — Augustine hears God’s *Sine me* as *dilectio tua in illos intercedit mihi*, your love intercedes with me for them, so that when our own merits weigh us down we may be relieved by the merits of those God loves. On that reading the liturgy does not answer the Alleluia’s lament by improving it. It answers it by changing who is speaking.

Fruit: Intercession stops being a courtesy and becomes the day’s structural solution: the formulary that denies self-supplied sufficiency also declines to make the sufferer’s own petition the instrument of rescue. It also explains, without sentiment, why a psalm that ends in darkness can be sung under *Alleluia*.

What the ordinary element-by-element reading misses: The Alleluia is usually treated as a bright verse detached from a dark psalm, and the Offertory as a narrative chant admired for its melody. Their sequence carries an argument that neither carries alone.

Strongest limit: Only Ps. 87’s opening confession is appointed, so the psalm’s darkness is not in the Mass at all — the reader supplies it from the psalter. *Coram te* and *in conspectu Domini* are different phrases, and Theodoret’s reading makes the lament exilic Israel’s rather than any individual’s. Augustine’s remark is on Exodus and has no chant in view, Alleluia verses are commonly assigned on musical and cyclical grounds, and no checked witness joins these two chants.

Editorial proposal — The office named by an etymology is asked for as an effect of Communion

anchors: Gospel (*Gosp.*), the Samaritan read as *custos*, guardian — Origen’s *sciebat enim se custodem*, Ambrose’s *Samaritani etenim vocabulo custos significatur*, Augustine’s *Samaritanus custos interpretatur*, Gregory’s *custos namque humani generis venerat*; Postcommunion (*Postcomm.*), *et páriter nobis expiatióem tríbuat, et munímen*.

Mechanism: Four witnesses across four centuries agree that the Samaritan’s name states an office, and Gregory presses it furthest: charged with being a Samaritan, the Lord denied the demon and kept silent about the name, because to deny it would have been to deny the office. The last oration of the same Mass asks for that office as a sacramental effect. *Munímen* is what the man on the road lacked and what the inn supplied: he was already robbed when the guardian arrived, and the last thing the Samaritan does is guarantee the future — *quodcúmque supererogáveris, ego . . . reddam tibi*. The Postcommunion’s two gifts fall on the same two sides of the story: *expiatio* for what has already happened on the road, *munímen* for the road still to come, and *páriter* refuses to rank them.

Fruit: *Munímen* stops being a vague word for protection and acquires the parable’s content — a guardian who paid, left instructions, and promised to return. It also gives Augustine’s *adhuc curatur* a liturgical form: the Mass ends by asking for the continuing treatment the inn was for.

What the ordinary element-by-element reading misses: Element by element the etymology is a curiosity of patristic philology and the Postcommunion is a compact prayer for grace; neither suggests the other, and the oration’s own transmission history has no Gospel attached to it.

Strongest limit: *Custos* and *munímen* are unrelated words with unrelated images — a person and a fortification — and the etymology itself is contested reception rather than settled philology. The Postcommunion is attested in the Verona collection with no lection beside it, stands in the Gelasian in a Mass-set the missal’s Sundays do not match, and serves a Lenten weekday in the postconciliar Missal; nothing indicates it was chosen for this Gospel, and no checked witness joins them.

Appendix: Scope and Qualifications

As of 20 August 2026. Retrieval mechanics, checksums, query detail, discarded leads, and the full reception matrix and audits are in `propers/verified.md` and `research/scope.md` beside this document’s source; they are not repeated here.

Which edition this is. This canonical *full edition* carries the map, the dossiers and the thematic movement, then the complete appointed formulary — the Latin of the 1962 Vatican *editio typica* with the English of the registered public-domain witnesses — and then the element-by-element commentary, synthesis, and apparatus from the same source leaf. The mechanical *synthesis edition*, published at the same identity with a **-synthesis** suffix, omits the complete appointed texts and the element-by-element sweep and carries instead one integrated commentary; it adds no research of its own. The two editions rest on one body of research and share one set of source records.

Edition and formulary identity. The work is the temporal formulary printed *DOMINICA DUODECIMA post Pentecosten, II classis*, on pp. 392–393 of the 1962 *editio typica* of the *Missale Romanum* (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis), with marginal numbers 1552–1561. 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 Eleventh Sunday (no. 1551) before it and the heading *DOMINICA DECIMA TERTIA post Pentecosten* (no. 1562) after it.

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 independently against page images of the 1962 Benziger *editio iuxta typicam* (printed pp. 386–388). The two editions differ at the eight points recorded in `propers/verified.md`, six of them 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 thirteen places where it diverges are tabulated in the commentary as verified textual observations. The Internet Archive OCR was used only to locate the formulary and controls no published wording. Two observations from the tracked Venice Missal of 1570 are recorded as OCR-level leads only and nothing is built on them.

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

Translation and received text. The project has composed, translated, paraphrased, modernised and adapted nothing. English for the scriptural propers — Introit, Gradual, Alleluia, Epistle, Gospel, Offertory, Communion — is the Douay–Rheims as revised by Bishop Challoner (1749–1752), the English of the Clementine Vulgate the missal prints, quoted from the Project Gutenberg e-text of that revision. English for the three orations is the anonymous rendering in *The Roman Missal translated into the English language for the use of the laity*, first revised edition (Philadelphia: Eugene Cumiskey, 1861), taken from the three lines that book supplies for this formulary and reproduced with its own spelling and abbreviated conclusions. Both are in the public domain in the United States; neither is an official liturgical translation, and neither was composed for the 1962 books. One word of the Douay text used here differs from the printed 1899 American edition: at Ex. 32:11 the e-text reads “is thy indignation enkindled” where the American edition prints “kindled.” Every other verse quoted in this guide agrees at both.

Seven places where the English does not answer the Latin, and is not made to. The Introit’s antiphon sings *inimici mei*, which has no counterpart in Clementine Ps. 69:3 and none in the Douay; its psalm verse sings *qui cōgitant mihi mala*, “devise,” where the Clementine and therefore the Douay read *volunt*, “desire”; the Offertory is an Old-Latin adaptation, so the Douay answers its Vulgate base and not its wording, and its three cited verses are printed whole with the chant’s departures marked rather than stitched into a project-made join; the Communion’s vocative *Dōmine* is the antiphon’s own and is not in Ps. 103:13. In the orations, the 1861 English gives one adverb where the Collect prays two (*digne et laudabiliter*) and “thy people” for *a fīdēlibus tuis*; it reverses the Secret’s order of pardon and honour, which is where that prayer’s whole argument lies; and it flattens the Postcommunion’s *tribuat* with *pārīter* into “be to us both” and pluralises the Latin’s singular *huius . . . mystērii*. In each case the gap is stated where it falls and the argument is conducted on the Latin. No rendering of the project’s own has been supplied anywhere.

Search bounds. Reception was searched in Latin, Greek in translation, and English, across the major reasonably accessible patristic, medieval and later corpora relevant to each appointed passage: Origen’s Lucan homilies in Jerome’s Latin, *De principiis* and *Contra Celsum*; Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria; Tertullian; Ambrose on Luke; Ambrosiaster on 2 Corinthians; Augustine’s *Enarrationes*, *Quaestiones Evangeliorum*, *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum*, sermons, *De doctrina christiana*, *De spiritu et littera* and *De civitate Dei*; Chrysostom on Second Corinthians, on Matthew, on Romans and on Hebrews; Basil’s psalm homilies; Cassian; the Rule of St Benedict; Cyril of Alexandria on Luke; Theodoret on the Psalms and on Paul; Cassiodorus on the Psalms; Gregory the Great’s *Moralia*, *Regula pastoralis* and the complete forty *Homiliae in Evangelia*; Bede on Luke; Bernard on the Canticle; Aquinas’s *Super II ad Corinthios*, *Summa theologiae* and *Catena aurea*; Bellarmine on the Psalms; and, for the orations and the chant, the Verona, Gelasian and Gregorian sacramentaries in their standard editions, Ott’s *Offertoriale*, Johnner and Schuster. Consequential negative results — that no genuine Chrysostom treatment of the Good Samaritan was located and that the *Catena aurea*’s “Chrysostom” on this pericope is margin-flagged as a Latin-only homily; that Gregory’s forty Gospel homilies carry no lection from this Gospel and no Gregory locus for 2 Cor. 3:6 was located; that Ambrose passes over the blessed-eyes verses; that Basil preached on none of this Sunday’s other three psalms; that Augustine nowhere remarks on the Ps. 39/69 doublet; and that Aquinas does not cite *De spiritu et littera* in the relevant chapter — are reported in the commentary. No exhaustive search of Syriac originals, chant manuscripts, untranslated homiliaries, subscription databases or current specialist monographs is claimed, and none of these negatives is offered as a claim about literature outside the corpora named.

Bounds carried by particular claims. Theodoret’s psalm expositions were read on the registered facsimile of PG 80 and are quoted from Migne’s parallel Latin; Robert Hill’s modern English is in copyright and was not used. His commentary on 2 Corinthians (PG 82) was verified as publicly reachable but his sentences there were not verified, so nothing from it is printed as his words. Cassiodorus’s ACW translation, Basil’s Fathers of the Church translation, and the Larcher English of Aquinas’s Pauline commentary are in copyright; those witnesses are quoted only from public Latin or Greek. Origen’s Lucan homily has no public-domain English, so only Jerome’s Latin is quoted. Column numbers are printed only where they were actually seen: PL 70 for Cassiodorus on Ps. 69 alone, PG 80 and PG 29 where Migne’s running numerals were read, PL 92 from the registered Bede transcription’s embedded markers. Ambrosiaster is cited to PL 17 without columns because the source page displays none; Bellarmine’s pages are those of the registered 1866 facsimile. Schuster’s English translation (1924–30) is openly hosted but may still be in copyright in some jurisdictions and is quoted only in short compass; Johnner’s 1940 chant commentary shows no copyright renewal in the standard record, which points to but does not establish public-domain status, and it

too is quoted briefly. The Septuagint comparisons at the Offertory are stated from its standard text and marked as comparisons; no Greek witness was collated for this guide, and the Old-Latin character of that chant rests on the Latin collation together with Augustine’s verified lemma. Palestrina’s and Lassus’s settings are cited for their existence from their own editions.

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; the dossiers print it beside the Vulgate number. *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. 33:2–3 *Vulg.* is Heb. 34:2–3; Ps. 69:2–4 is Heb. 70:2–4; Ps. 87:2 is Heb. 88:2; and Ps. 103:13–15 is Heb. 104:13–15, which is also its English number, since English Bibles number that psalm as the Vulgate does. The conversions were taken from the concordance registered with the Douay–Rheims edition used here, not computed by this guide; all four psalms have a uniform offset, so it holds from the head of each psalm.

Historical bounds. Dates and places in the page-2 dossiers distinguish traditional attribution from current historical judgment and are orienting rather than probative. This guide does not settle the century of the Exodus, the authorship or date of any psalm, the date or place of Luke’s composition, the year of the ministry, or whether canonical 2 Corinthians is one letter or several.

Rights. No public-domain conclusion is claimed for the 1962 typical edition. This repository’s rights record for the facsimile finds that edition’s own status unresolved, and more likely than not restored in the United States under 17 U.S.C. §104A to the end of 2057 (that record is `missale-romanum-1962-facsimile-rights-v1.toml`, under `src/sources/inventories/`). What permits the Latin quoted here is 17 U.S.C. §103(b): the copyright in a revised edition extends only to what that edition itself contributed and “does not affect or enlarge the scope, duration, ownership, or subsistence of” any copyright in the preexisting material. This formulary is preexisting material. All ten appointed elements of it — Introit, Collect, Epistle, Gradual, Alleluia, Gospel, Offertory, Secret, Communion and Postcommunion, in the same order and at the same scriptural references — are printed in the Pustet printing of Ratisbon, 1862, which this repository tracks as public-domain text, and all ten were located in the tracked Venice Missal of 1570 besides, so the 1962 edition’s copyright does not reach them; the element-by-element check and its bounds are recorded in `propers/verified.md`. That is this project’s own reading of the statute and of the evidence, not a clearance anyone granted, and it is not legal advice. No page image of either digitisation is reproduced here, and none of the 1962 edition’s own new matter 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.

Liturgical witnesses

- *Missale Romanum*, editio typica (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1962), pp. 392–393, marginal nos. 1552–1561. Facsimile: <https://media.churchmusicassociation.org/pdf/missale62.pdf>, PDF pp. 473–474. *Controlling text for every Latin form printed above.*
- *Missale Romanum*, editio iuxta typicam (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1962), pp. 386–388. Page images in Internet Archive item `MissaleRomanum1962RomanMissalColorLatin`, leaves `n462–n464`: <https://archive.org/details/MissaleRomanum1962RomanMissalColorLatin>. *Second 1962 edition, collated for the edition differences.*

- *The Roman Missal translated into the English language for the use of the laity*, first revised edition (Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, 1861), Collect, Secret and Postcommunion of this formulary, printed pp. 420, 422 and 423. Anonymous translation; public domain in the United States. *Source of the English of all three orations*. Registered as `edition.eugene-cummiskey.roman-missal-english-laity.philadelphia-1861`, passage `post-pentecosten-12`.
- *Sacramentarium Leonianum*, ed. C. L. Feltoe (Cambridge: University Press, 1896), pp. 60 and 74 (Masses of July). <https://archive.org/details/sacramentariumle00cath>. *Earliest located witnesses to the Collect and Postcommunion*.
- *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, ed. H. A. Wilson (Oxford: Clarendon, 1894), Book III, no. VIII, pp. 228–229, with the incipit index and the appendix collation at p. 354. <https://archive.org/details/gelasiansacrame00gelagoog>. *All three orations in one Mass-set, with the largiaris reading*.
- *The Gregorian Sacramentary under Charles the Great*, ed. H. A. Wilson, Henry Bradshaw Society 49 (London, 1915), no. LXXXI, p. 173; the apparatus to no. LXXX at pp. 172–173 for the chant cues; and p. 199. <https://archive.org/details/gregoriansacrame00cath>
- *Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia (Vatican City, 2008): the Collect at *Dominica XXXI per annum*, the Secret as *super oblata* of *Feria quinta post Cineres*, the Postcommunion of *Feria tertia hebdomadae III Quadragesimae*. *Cited for those assignments and, once, for the official English of the super oblata; that translation is under copyright and the single clause quoted does not substitute for the book*.
- Karl Ott, *Offertoriale sive versus offertoriorum* (Tournai: Desclée, 1935), no. 59, pp. 97–100. <https://media.churchmusicassociation.org/books/offertoriale1935.pdf>. *The two historic offertory verses, no longer appointed*.
- Dominic Johner, *The Chants of the Vatican Gradual* (Collegeville: St. John’s Abbey Press, 1940), pp. 296–297. <https://archive.org/details/chantsofvaticang00john>
- Ildefonso Schuster, *The Sacramentary (Liber Sacramentorum)*, English edition (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1924–30), vol. III, “Twelfth Sunday after Pentecost,” pp. 128–132. <https://archive.org/details/LiberSacramentorum>. *The English translation may still be in copyright in some jurisdictions; quoted only in short compass*.

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. 33:2–3; 69:2–4; 87:2; 103:13–15; Ex. 32:11–14; Lk. 10:23–37; 2 Cor. 3:4–9. *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. Exactly one quoted locus appears in that collation: Ex. 32:11, where the e-text reads “is thy indignation enkindled” and the American edition prints “kindled.”
- Clementine Vulgate, consulted for Ps. 33, 39, 69, 87, 103; Ex. 3, 32, 33; Lk. 10; 2 Cor. 3. <https://www.drbo.org/lvb/>

Patristic, medieval and later reception

- Ambrose, *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* VII, §§69–84 (PL 15, coll. 1717–1720), and the lemma scan of Book VII that establishes his silence at Lk. 10:23–24. [https://la.wikisource.org/wiki/Expositio_Evangelii_secundum_Lucam_\(Ambrosius\)/7](https://la.wikisource.org/wiki/Expositio_Evangelii_secundum_Lucam_(Ambrosius)/7)
- Ambrosiaster, *Commentaria in Epistolam ad Corinthios Secundam*, ad 3:6–9 (PL 17; the source page displays no column numbers). [https://la.wikisource.org/wiki/Commentaria_in_Epistolam_ad_Corinthios_Secundam_\(Ambrosiaster\)](https://la.wikisource.org/wiki/Commentaria_in_Epistolam_ad_Corinthios_Secundam_(Ambrosiaster))
- Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 33 (two sermons; New Advent’s “Psalm 34” carries only the second, so Sermo I is quoted from the Latin); 69 §§1–4, 7 (New Advent “Psalm 70”); 87 §§1–2 (“Psalm 88”); 103 Sermo 3 §§12–14 (“Psalm 104” §§19–21). English in NPNF first series, vol. 8: <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1801.htm>. Latin: https://www.augustinus.it/latino/esposizioni_salmi/

- Augustine, *Quaestiones Evangeliorum* II.19; *Sermo* 131.6; *De doctrina christiana* I.30 and III.5.9; *De spiritu et littera* 4.6, 14.23–25 and 19.34; *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* II, qq. 10 and 141–149; *De civitate Dei* XV.25. English in NPNF first series, vols. 2 and 5 (<https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/>); Latin at <https://www.augustinus.it/latino/> and <https://www.thelatinlibrary.com/augustine/>
- Basil the Great, *Homilia in Psalmum* 33 (PG 29, coll. 349–356), read in the public Migne scan with the parallel Latin. No public-domain English of this homily exists; the copyrighted Fathers of the Church translation was not used.
- Bede, *In Lucae Evangelium Expositio* III, on Lk. 10:23–37 (PL 92, coll. 467C–470D). Registered in the repository's source library as passage `passage.bede.in-lucae-evangelium-expositio.latin-migne-corpus-corporum-web-2026-07-25.iii-lk-10.23-37`.
- Robert Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos*, Pss. XXXIII, LXIX, LXXXVII and CIII, tr. John O'Sullivan (Dublin: James Duffy, 1866), artifact pp. 100–105, 220, 275–278 and 333–339. <https://archive.org/details/commentaryonbook0000bell>
- Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum* 7.5 (PL 183, col. 809B).
- John Cassian, *Conferences* X.10. NPNF second series, vol. 11: <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/350810.htm>
- Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum* 33, 69 (PL 70, coll. 493–494), 87 and 103, in the public Migne text. The copyrighted ACW translation was not used.
- John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Second Corinthians* 6 and 7; *Homily 45 on Matthew*; *Homily 16 on Romans*; and *Homily 10 on Hebrews* as excerpted in the *Catena aurea*. NPNF first series, vols. 10, 11 and 12: <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/220206.htm>, <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/220207.htm>, <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/210216.htm>
- Clement of Alexandria, *Quis dives salvetur* 28–29. ANF vol. 2: <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0207.htm>
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on Luke*, Sermons 67 and 68, tr. R. Payne Smith (Oxford, 1859). https://www.tertullian.org/fathers/cyril_on_luke_09_sermons_63_69.htm
- Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* IX.xvi.23 and XX.v.14; *Regula pastoralis* II.6; *Homiliae in Evangelia* II.18.2, and the enumeration of all forty homilies that establishes the bounded negative. Library of the Fathers translation: <https://www.lectionarycentral.com/GregoryMoralia/Book09.html>, <https://www.lectionarycentral.com/GregoryMoralia/Book20.html>
- Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III.17.3. ANF vol. 1: <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0103317.htm>
- Jerome, *Epistle* 108.12 (Adummin, “the Place of Blood”). NPNF second series, vol. 6: <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3001108.htm>
- Origen, *Homily 34 on Luke* in Jerome's Latin (PL 26); *De principiis* I.1.2, with the bounded negative at Book IV; *Contra Celsum* VII.20. Latin: https://la.wikisource.org/wiki/Translatio_XXXIX_Homiliarum. English (ANF vol. 4): <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/04121.htm>, <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/04167.htm>. The modern English of the Lucan homilies (FC 94) is in copyright and is not quoted.
- *The Rule of St. Benedict*, cc. 17–18 and 35. Latin: <https://www.thelatinlibrary.com/benedict.html>. English, Boniface Verheyen (1902): <https://www.ccel.org/ccel/benedict/rule.html>
- Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* II.26. ANF vol. 3: <https://www.tertullian.org/anf/anf03/anf03-29.htm>
- Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos* 69 (PG 80, coll. 1415–1418), 33 (coll. 1101–1109), 87 (coll. 1567–1573, the last figure approximate) and 103 (coll. 1693–1707), read on the registered facsimile of PG 80 and quoted from Migne's parallel Latin; *Interpretatio* in 2 Corinthians (PG 82, from col. 376), verified as publicly reachable but not quoted. Robert Hill's modern English translations are in copyright and were not used.
- Thomas Aquinas, *Super II ad Corinthios*, cap. 3, lect. 1–2 (<https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/c2c.html>); *Summa theologiae* I-II q. 106 aa. 1–2 (<https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/sth2106.html>; English, public domain, <https://www.newadvent.org/summa/2106.htm>); *Catena aurea* on Lk. 10, lect. 7–9, in the Oxford translation of the 1840s, whose marginal sigla and preface carry the pseudo-Chrysostom finding. Larcher's English of the Pauline commentary is in copyright and was used only for checking.
- John Calvin, *Harmony of the Evangelists*, at Lk. 10:30, tr. William Pringle. <https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/alcom32>

Magisterial and official texts

- John Paul II, *Salvifici doloris* (11 February 1984), §§28–30. https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_11021984_salvifici-doloris.html
- Pontifical Biblical Commission, responses of 1906 on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, as reported in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Pentateuch” (vol. 11, 1911). <https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11646c.htm>

Historical orientation and cultural afterlives

- *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1907–1912), all at <https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/>: “Breviary” (vol. 2, 1907), for the *Psalterium Romanum* still in liturgical use at Rome; “Epistles to the Corinthians” (vol. 4, 1908); “Golden Calf” (vol. 6, 1909); “Gospel of Saint Luke” (vol. 9, 1910); “Offertory” (vol. 11, 1911); “Parables” (vol. 11, 1911); “Pentateuch” (vol. 11, 1911); and “Psalms” (vol. 12, 1911).
- *New American Bible, Revised Edition*, introductions to Luke and to 2 Corinthians and the note to Ps. 70, at <https://bible.usccb.org/bible/>. Summarised; protected text is not reproduced.
- *Donoghue v Stevenson* [1932] A.C. 562 at 580 (House of Lords, 26 May 1932), Lord Atkin. Read in the transcription of the judgment published by the Scottish Council of Law Reporting, Lord Atkin page 2: <https://www.scottishlawreports.org.uk/resources/donoghue-v-stevenson/appeal-papers/index-of-judgement/lord-atkin-page-1/>
- John M. Darley and C. Daniel Batson, “‘From Jerusalem to Jericho’: A Study of Situational and Dispositional Variables in Helping Behavior,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 27.1 (1973), pp. 100–108. Under APA copyright; only short sentences are quoted, with citation.
- *United States ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy*, 338 U.S. 537 (1950), Frankfurter J., dissenting, at 548 and 550, in the official United States Reports. Public domain.
- Claudio Monteverdi, *Vespro della Beata Vergine* (Venice: Ricciardo Amadino, 1610), opening versicle and response; and Jennifer More Glagov, programme note, *Music of the Baroque* (2016), for the documented borrowing of the *Orfeo* toccata.
- Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, *Precatus est Moyses*, 5vv, in *Offertoria totius anni* (Rome: Francesco Coattino, 1593), under the rubric *Dominica XII post Pentecosten*; Orlande de Lassus, *Precatus est Moyses*, LV 858, in *Sämtliche Werke* vol. 3 (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1895), pp. 23–25. *Cited for their existence and publication facts only.*

Last revised (UTC): 2026-09-24T17:00:16Z

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.