

Sixteenth Sunday after Pentecost

Dominica Decima Sexta post Pentecosten · II classis · Green

1962 *Missale Romanum*, editio typica, pp. 397–398 · *Credo* · Preface of the Most Holy Trinity

The Propers: Map

Proper	1962 Missal text / reference	Scriptural axis	Connection
Introit (<i>Int.</i>)	<i>Miserere mihi, Domine</i> (<i>Ps. 85:3, 5, with v. 1</i>)	Mercy asked all day	Two verses joined across a third the page does not mark; five departures from the psalter.
Collect (<i>Coll.</i>)	<i>Tua nos, quæsumus, Domine, grátia</i> (<i>composed oration</i>)	Grace before and after	One grace, two verbs, and <i>iúgiter</i> over the good works.
Epistle (<i>Ep.</i>)	<i>Fratres: Obsecro vos</i> (<i>Eph. 3:13–21</i>)	Prayer for the inner man	It resumes a sentence broken off at 3:1, and the break is not read.
Gradual (<i>Grad.</i>)	<i>Timébunt gentes nomen tuum</i> (<i>Ps. 101:16–17</i>)	Nations fear the name; Sion built	<i>Maiestáte</i> where the psalter has <i>glória</i> ; Cassiodorus's lemma carries the chant's noun.
Alleluia (<i>All.</i>)	<i>Cantáte Dómino cánticum novum</i> (<i>Ps. 97:1</i>)	A new song, for wonders	It names the subject the psalter leaves implicit, and stops before the arm.
Gospel (<i>Gosp.</i>)	<i>Cum intráret Iesus in domum</i> (<i>Luke 14:1–11</i>)	A sabbath meal, then places at table	Its last sentence makes humbling and exalting acts, and names no agent.
Offertory (<i>Off.</i>)	<i>Domine, in auxílium meum respice</i> (<i>Ps. 39:14 and 15</i>)	A petition to be looked at	Printed twice; its <i>in auxílium meum respice</i> stands verbatim at <i>Ps. 70:12</i> , a verse of the Communion's own psalm, under another name for God.
Secret (<i>Sec.</i>)	<i>Munda nos, quæsumus, Domine</i> (<i>composed oration</i>)	Cleansing by this sacrifice	<i>Mereámur</i> stands under <i>périfice miserátus in nobis</i> .
Communion (<i>Comm.</i>)	<i>Domine, memorábor iustitiæ tuæ solius</i> (<i>Ps. 70:16–17 et 18</i>)	One justice, youth to age	The one chant with no verbal departure; made by where it stops.
Postcommunion (<i>Postcomm.</i>)	<i>Purífica, quæsumus, Domine</i> (<i>composed oration</i>)	Renewed; helped now and after	<i>Auxílium</i> stands at the Offertory and here and nowhere else; <i>rénova</i> asks the newness the Alleluia sings.

The four senses

Sense	Synthesis
Literal	A psalmist asks mercy because he has cried all the day, and calls himself needy and poor (<i>Int.</i>). Paul bows his knees to the Father, asking that Christ dwell by faith in the heart (<i>Ep.</i>). At a chief Pharisee's sabbath table Christ heals a man with the dropsy, then tells the guests to take the lowest place (<i>Gosp.</i>).
Allegorical	Augustine reads the Gradual's Sion as building now — <i>Hoc agitur nunc</i> — and its builder as seen at the Judgment, having been seen at the first coming in weakness (<i>Grad.</i>). At the Epistle's four measures the tradition divides at least three ways: Augustine reads them as the four members of the Cross, Chrysostom for the extent of God's love figured by a solid body, and not for the Cross at all , and Guéranger's continuator Dom Lucien Fromage for the dimensions of Christ's indwelling (<i>Ep.</i>).
Moral	Bede ties the first place at table to <i>de meritis gloriando</i> and argues that the parable must be read <i>typice</i> ; Cyril of Alexandria makes seizing an honour not due a theft with restitution owed; Ambrose has the lesson taught gently (<i>Gosp.</i>). Augustine at the Introit's psalm verse: God draws near the humbled and departs far from the exalted (<i>Int.</i>).
Anagogical	Augustine, Cassiodorus and Bellarmine read the Gradual's <i>vidébitur</i> of the Judgment; Theodoret reads it of Sion rebuilt in this world (<i>Grad.</i>). Bede holds <i>Tunc erit tibi glória</i> in an eschatological and a daily sense together and does not choose (<i>Gosp.</i>). In <i>usque in senéctam et sénium</i> Augustine hears the Church's voice, her youth the age of the apostles; Theodoret hears the age of Moses, and old age the end of the Law (<i>Comm.</i>).

Scriptural Date and Location

Seven passages are directly appointed; the orations quote no Scripture. Psalms carry the missal's Vulgate number, with the modern number in parentheses. **An attributed author's regnal era dates neither composition nor occasion:** the Communion cell distinguishes all three.

Proper	Citation	Location	Date
Offertory	Ps. 39:14–15 (Hebr. 40:14–15; Eng. 40:13–14)	Title names David, no place or occasion	Traditional attribution – disputed: David (reign in the usual chronology), B.C. 1055–1015. Composition: Before c. 165 B.C.
The Clementine title verse reads <i>In finem. Psalmus ipsi David</i> , the Douay <i>Unto the end, a psalm for David himself</i> ; no place, episode or audience is named there or anywhere in the psalm , and beside the attributed reign the corpus adds only the boundary shared by the whole Psalter, whose own source declines to date any individual psalm securely. Ps. 39 is one of the two psalms here whose numbered Hebrew title an English Bible leaves unnumbered , so an English psalter at 40:14–15 gives the Offertory's second verse and the one after it.			
Communion	Ps. 70:16–17 et 18 (Eng. 71:16–18)	Title: the sons of Jonadab, the former captives	Traditional attribution – disputed: David (reign in the usual chronology), B.C. 1055–1015. Superscription setting: Preferred: In the third year of the reign of Joakim, king of Juda; alternative: A.M. 3398. Historical setting: When he fled from the face of his son Absalom. Composition: Before c. 165 B.C.
Three settings stand here at once, below the attributed reign, and the corpus resolves none of them. The title reads <i>Psalmus David, filiorum Jonadab, et priorum captivorum</i> . The flight from Absalom reaches it through the corpus's grouping with Ps. 62 and Ps. 3's superscription; Joakim's third year comes from Dan. 1:1. The world-year is the Haydock printing's Ussher-attributed marginal figure, reported and excluded from the corpus's own basis. The whole-Psalter composition boundary is from a critical-profile source; the other displayed claims are from the traditional profile.			
Introit	Ps. 85:3, 5, with v. 1 (Eng. 86:3, 5, 1)	Title names David, no occasion	Traditional attribution – disputed: David (reign in the usual chronology), B.C. 1055–1015. Composition: Before c. 165 B.C.
The Clementine heads the psalm <i>Oratio ipsi David</i> inside v. 1 — the words the Introit's psalm verse begins after — and names no place, no episode and no audience . Beside the attributed reign the corpus carries composition only for these verses, at the whole-Psalter boundary above. Augustine's single sermon on this psalm asks no chronological question of it, and his lemma at v. 1 reads <i>egenus et inops ego sum</i> where the missal sings <i>inops et pauper sum ego</i> .			
Alleluia	Ps. 97:1 (Eng. 98:1)	Title names David, no place	Traditional attribution – disputed: David (reign in the usual chronology), B.C. 1055–1015. Composition: Before c. 165 B.C. Prophetic referent – disputed: B.C. 3; c. B.C. 7.
The Clementine folds <i>Psalmus ipsi David</i> into v. 1 and the chant drops it, opening at <i>Cantate Domino</i> . The two Nativity labels in the Date cell are prophetic-referent claims and not composition claims, and neither is made of Ps. 97 alone: both reach this verse through the corpus's grouping of Pss. 67, 95, 96 and 97, and both stand disputed side by side. The composition side carries only the whole-Psalter boundary.			
Gradual	Ps. 101:16–17 (Hebr. 102:16–17; Eng. 102:15–16)	Title: a poor man; no name, no place	Composition: Before c. 165 B.C.
The title verse reads <i>Oratio pauperis, cum anxius fuerit, et in conspectu Domini effuderit precem suam</i> — a genre and a condition, with no name, no place and no occasion . Ps. 101 is the one appointed psalm the attribution to David does not reach , and the corpus carries composition only. This is also the second psalm whose numbered Hebrew title an English Bible leaves unnumbered , so an English psalter at 102:16–17 gives the Gradual's second verse and the one after it. Augustine expounds both verses in <i>Enarratio in Ps. 101</i> sermo I §§16–17 on a lemma reading a future <i>aedificabit</i> and <i>in gloria sua</i> .			
Gospel	Luke 14:1–11	Written by Luke; no place, no audience	Event – No narrated-event date in the chronology corpus. Composition – disputed: c. A.D. 70; Before the end of the Roman imprisonment, when the Acts was finished.
<i>Event: a sabbath meal in the house of one of the chief of the Pharisees (14:1), the third and last of the sabbath-healing controversies in Luke after 6:6–11 and 13:10–17, inside the journey narrative and closing immediately before the parable of the great supper (14:16–24).</i> The corpus makes no dated assertion about this sabbath dinner: it carries no narrated-event claim for the pericope at all.			
The two composition labels stand disputed side by side: one from the <i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i> , vol. XIV, New Advent article 14530a, the other from the Pontifical Biblical Commission's responsa <i>De auctore, tempore et veritate evangeliorum Marci et Lucae</i> , which fixes the writing relative to Acts and to the Roman imprisonment rather than by a year. Place, first audience and life stage remain unresolved here; article 14530a is “The New Testament”, not a separate article on Luke. The corpus returns no critical-profile claim for this Gospel.			
Epistle	Eph. 3:13–21	Paul in captivity; Rome or Caesarea	Composition – disputed: A.D. 58–63; A.D. 61.
The missal heads the lesson <i>Lectio Epistolæ beati Pauli Apostoli ad Ephésios</i> , and the pericope names its writer's imprisonment only at <i>tribulationibus meis pro vobis</i> . Both labels in the Date cell are disputed and both are traditional-profile , from the <i>Catholic Encyclopedia</i> , vol. V, New Advent article 05485a, and vol. XI, article 11567b; the default answer here selects traditional claims for this letter . Ladeuze's article 05485a favours Rome over Caesarea and discusses a disputed Asian audience: the traditional Ephesian destination beside his hypothesis of a circular letter to churches in north-eastern Asia Minor.			

The Propers: Themes and Movement

This Mass says one thing three times over in three registers that share almost no vocabulary — a doctrine of grace in the three orations, a christological pattern in the chants, and a parable of place in the Gospel. Augustine reads the Communion’s psalm in the Collect’s terms, Bellarmine beside him and Cassiodorus restating him; Theodoret does not. **The Epistle is not an interlude between the other two registers but their centre**, and where the tradition most visibly develops and divides. Four commentators stand at each of the Mass’s five psalms and differ at every one.

1. Grace before and after, said in three prayers and sung in the first person

The Collect asks one grace to do two things — *et prævéniat et sequátur* — then names what they are for: *ac bonis opéribus iúgiter præstet esse inténtos*. The Secret puts *meredámur* inside a purpose clause under *périfice miserátus in nobis*, so the sharing follows God’s completing. The Postcommunion asks help *præsens páriter et futúrum*. **Three spans of three kinds stand across the four**: before and after, present and future, and — in the Communion — youth to old age.

Augustine states the Collect’s distinction outside any commentary on it, at *Enchiridion* 32: *nolentem praevenit, ut velit, volentem subsequitur, ne frustra velit*. **His exposition of the Communion’s own three verses states the same distinction at an appointed text**. *Enarratio in Ps. 70* sermo II §§1, 2 and 4 are exactly Ps. 70:16, 17 and 18, the extent the antiphon sings: *Iustitia tua sola me liberat; docuisti me nihil in me praecessisse*; and at the last verse *gratia tua semper perseveret mecum*. **His nihil in me praecessisse is the Collect’s prævéniat said as a confession, and his semper stands where the Collect’s does**. Sermo II §3 cites Ps. 85:11, the psalm of this Mass’s own Introit, for the same point. Cassiodorus reaches it at the Communion’s psalm, opening his in Ps. LXX on a charity *quae nullis meritis praecedentibus gratis semper impenditur*, which is what Augustine’s *docuisti me nihil in me praecessisse* says there. **But he names doctor Augustinus inside these five psalms** (in Ps. LXXXV §18), so there the two Latins are one judgment restated and not two.

At the antiphon’s decisive word the four part. Augustine takes *iustítiae tuæ soliús* to exclude any righteousness of the singer’s own, Bellarmine human counsel and his own strength, Cassiodorus to refer the remembering forward to the Judgment, Theodoret to name God’s just sentence in the speaker’s favour. **The grace-alone sense here is Augustine’s, with Bellarmine beside him, and not the tradition’s one voice**. Fromage, a fifth voice from outside the exegetical tradition, makes the antiphon the Church’s promise to keep God’s justice, which is his law.

Trent, Session VI, cap. XVI puts the doctrine in three verbs where the Collect has two: Christ’s power precedes, accompanies and follows the justified person’s good works. **The middle verb is Trent’s and not the Collect’s**, and cap. X quotes not this Collect but the Thirteenth Sunday’s, altered. Fromage, above this Collect, states it in the prayer’s own two verbs: without the grace that anticipates, not the thought; without the grace that follows, not the act. **The Postcommunion carries the doctrine into the chants**: its *auxílium* is the Offertory’s own word and stands nowhere else in this Mass, and its *rénova* asks as a petition the newness the Alleluia sings in *cánticum novum*.

2. The humbling and the exalting are God’s acts before they are a rule of conduct

Omnis, qui se exáltat, humiliábitur: et qui se humiliat, exaltábitur closes the Gospel and names no agent for either verb. **Bede supplies one, arguing from the sentence itself**: it is plainly false that everyone who exalts himself before men is humbled by men, so the parable must be read *typice*, and the humbling and the exalting are the Lord’s (PL 92, 513A). He reads the first place at table as a glorying in one’s own merits (512A), the matter the Collect and the Communion state doctrinally; and Fromage joins the same sentence to grace through Ecclus. 3:20–21.

The chants carry the pattern without stating it. At the Introit’s own psalm verse Augustine makes the motion a rule about God: he draws near the humbled and goes far from the exalted, unless he has himself humbled and then raised him; his boasting Pharisee there is Luke 18’s, not Luke 14:1’s chief Pharisee. Cassiodorus says the exchange at the Gradual’s own psalm, and Theodoret reaches Philippians 2 there at the appointed v. 16. The Epistle’s *flecto génua mea ad Patrem* is that motion inside the reading, and Phil. 2:8–11 holds both of this Mass’s motions in one sentence.

At the Gradual Augustine reads the descent and the return together — Sion is being built now, *Hoc agitur nunc*, and he who was seen at the first coming *in infirmitate sua* will be seen at the Judgment. **His lemma says in gloria sua where the chant sings in maiestáte sua**, and his verb is a future where the chant prints a perfect,

so no sentence built on *maiestate* is his. Neither difference is the missal's: the future is the Greek tradition's, which Theodoret expounds, and the chant's noun is Cassiodorus's. **Theodoret does not hold the two appearances at all**, taking *videbitur* of Jerusalem rebuilt. **Benedict makes that Gospel sentence the head of *Regula* 7**, naming no chapter; it stands at Luke 18:14 and Matt. 23:12 too.

3. The Epistle is the formulary's centre, and the tradition divides inside it

The lesson opens by resuming a sentence the Mass does not read. Eph. 3:1 begins *Huius rei gratia* and breaks off; vv. 2–13 are the digression; v. 14 resumes with those same words — so **the resumption is heard in church and the thing resumed is not**, and the liturgical incipit removes even the connective, substituting *Fratres: Obsecro vos* for *Propter quod peto*. It closes at the end of the letter's doctrinal half, the exhortation opening at 4:1.

At vv. 18–19 the witnesses read the four measures at least three ways. Chrysostom, in Homily 7 on Ephesians, takes them for the immensity of God's love, sketched by the visible dimensions of a solid body — **he does not read them as the Cross**. Augustine reads them as the four members of the Cross in three works, assigning the virtues differently in each: *Epistula* 55.14.25, *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus* 118.5, and *Sermo* 165.3.3–5.5. **So the cross-reading is a development inside one author and not one fixed patristic position.** Aquinas, at *Super Ephesios* cap. 3 lect. 5, sets out three readings without choosing and names the hidden depth **predestination** at the Cross. And Fromage takes them of neither, but of the indwelling: Christ dwelling in man and filling him with God's plenitude.

The last of Augustine's three, *Sermo* 165, ties the reading to the Collect too. Headed *deque gratia et libera voluntate, contra Pelagianos*, it divides at §1.1 the hinge where the Collect divides grace: what the Apostle asks of his hearers belongs to their will, what he asks God to give to God's help — *auxilium*, the word the Offertory and the Postcommunion both use — and at §7.9 it closes on no merit preceding grace. **That sermon stops three verses short of the doxology**, and its remark that the day's Apostle, psalm and Gospel agreed is about Augustine's own African order, whose psalm was Ps. 56:2. The Alleluia supplies the other tie: there Augustine moves from the new song to the new man to an inward healing, and Cassiodorus bids Christians sing it *novae regenerationis sacramenta sumentes*, the sacramental term the Postcommunion uses. The Epistle asks for inward strengthening; the Postcommunion asks for renewal in *rénova*.

4. Four chants of five depart from the psalter, and the fifth departs at no word

The Introit departs from the Gallican psalter at five places, the Gradual at three, the Alleluia at one and a stop, the Offertory at two and a printed refrain — **and the Communion at none**, the antiphon made entirely by where it starts and stops. The Offertory's *in auxilium meum respice* is verbatim Ps. 70:12, a verse of this Mass's own Communion psalm.

The consequence for the Fathers is not one rule but two. At four of the five chants Cassiodorus's lemma stands with the missal against the psalter — *videbitur in maiestate sua* among them — and at the Alleluia Theodoret's Greek names the Lord as the chant does. **Augustine's lemma differs at three places where the difference carries his argument:** *in gloria sua* at the Gradual, *Sanavit ei dextera eius* at the Alleluia's unsung half-verse, and *in adiuvandum mihi respice* at the Offertory, where Jerome, ruling against a reported *festina*, has a fourth form again.

One departure runs the other way and ties the chants to the Gospel. *Mitis* as a whole word stands in exactly two verses of the Clementine Vulgate, Ps. 85:5 and Matt. 11:29, where Christ pairs it with *humilis corde* and *iugum meum suave est* follows at once in v. 30: the two adjectives of the antiphon thus meet in Christ's invitation, and the humility the Gospel ends on is in the Mass's first sung line.

No New Testament book quotes any verse this Mass appoints, Hebrews reaching Ps. 101 and Ps. 39 only at verses the chants do not sing. The christological readings therefore draw on a wider scriptural and exegetical setting than the appointed excerpts alone.

One grammatical fact runs under all of it. **All three antiphons speak in the first person singular and address God directly, all three orations in the first person plural, and the Gradual and the Alleluia carry no first-person form at all.** One voice confesses and the other asks, and the Gospel stands between them telling a guest what to do with a seat.

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 — except the Alleluia, over which the edition prints no separate heading and cites the versicle in line — and beneath it the English of an identified public-domain witness.

Formulary. *DOMINICA DECIMA SEXTA post Pentecosten, II classis*, printed pp. 397–398, marginal nos. 1592–1601. It opens immediately below the Postcommunion of the Fifteenth Sunday (no. 1591) and closes immediately above the heading *DOMINICA DECIMA SEPTIMA post Pentecosten* (no. 1602). The two pages appoint no Tract, no Sequence, no second or third oration, no commemoration, no blessing and no ritual or seasonal alternative.

The English below. 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), at the three prayers that book prints for this formulary, reproduced with its own nineteenth-century spelling and its abbreviated conclusion “Thro’.” **That English is a free devotional rendering and not a word-for-word translation.** The Douay, for its part, renders the psalter and not the chant.

1. Introit (*Int.*)

Ant. ad Introitum — Ps. 85, 3 et 5 — marginal no. 1592

Miserére mihi, Dómine, quóniam ad te clamávi tota die: quia tu, Dómine, suávis ac mitis es, et copiósus in misericórdia ómnibus invocántibus te. Ps. ibid., 1 Inclína, Dómine, aurem tuam mihi, et exáudi me: quóniam inops et pauper sum ego. V̇. Glória Patri.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 85:3, 5 and 1

v. 3 Have mercy on me, O Lord, for I have cried to thee all the day. **v. 5** For thou, O Lord, art sweet and mild: and plenteous in mercy to all that call upon thee. *Ps. v. 1* A prayer for David himself. **Incline thy ear, O Lord, and hear me: for I am needy and poor. V̇. Glória Patri.**

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The antiphon joins v. 3 to v. 5 across a verse it does not sing, and nothing on the page marks the join. **One of its five departures from the psalter has no English here:** the Douay’s *Incline thy ear, O Lord* does not carry the dative *mihi* the chant adds. The psalm title *A prayer for David himself* runs the other way — the Douay prints it inside v. 1 and the chant does not sing it — and it is not one of the five. The doxology cue *Glória Patri* is the Ordinary’s text and no part of this formulary’s own.

2. Collect (*Coll.*)

Oratio — marginal no. 1593

Tua nos, quésumus, Dómine, grátia semper et prævéniat et sequátur: ac bonis opéribus iúgiter præstet esse inténtos. Per Dóminum.

English: Cumiskey (Philadelphia, 1861), Collect of this formulary

May thy grace, O Lord, always prevent and follow us; and make us constantly zealous in the practice of good works. Thro’.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. *Prevent* here is the seventeenth-century sense of *go before*, answering *prævéniat*; it does not mean *hinder*. The rendering turns *bonis opéribus iúgiter præstet esse inténtos*, which asks that grace make us intent on good works, into a state of zeal in practising them, and *iúgiter* and *semper* arrive as one word, *always*.

3. Epistle (*Ep.*)

Lectio Epistolæ beāti Pauli Apóstoli ad Ephésios. — Ephes. 3, 13-21 — marginal no. 1594

Fratres: Obsecro vos, ne deficiátis in tribulatióibus meis pro vobis: quæ est glória vestra. Huius rei grátia flecto génuæ mea ad Patrem Dómini nostri Iesu Christi, ex quo omnis patrénitas in cælis et in terra nominátur, ut det vobis secúndum divítias glóriæ suæ, virtúte corroborári per Spíritum eius in interiorem hóminem, Christum habitáre per fidem in córdibus vestris: in caritáte radicáti, et fundáti, ut possíis comprehendere cum ómnibus sanctis, quæ sit latitúdo, et longitúdo, et sublímitas, et profúndum: scire étiam supereminéntem sciéntiæ caritátem Christi, ut impleámini in omnem plenitúdinem Dei. Ei autem, qui potens est ómnia fácere superabundánte quam pétimus, aut intellégimus, secúndum virtútem, quæ operátur in nobis: ipsi glória in Ecclésia, et in Christo Iesu, in omnes generatióes sæculi sæculórum. Amen.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Eph. 3:13–21

v. 13 Wherefore I pray you not to faint at my tribulations for you, which is your glory. **v. 14** For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, **v. 15** Of whom all paternity in heaven and earth is named: **v. 16** That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened by his Spirit with might unto the inward man: **v. 17** That Christ may dwell by faith in your hearts: that, being rooted and founded in charity, **v. 18** You may be able to comprehend, with all the saints, what is the breadth and length and height and depth, **v. 19** To know also the charity of Christ, which surpasseth all knowledge: that you may be filled unto all the fulness of God. **v. 20** Now to him who is able to do all things more abundantly than we desire or understand, according to the power that worketh in us: **v. 21** To him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus, unto all generations, world without end. Amen.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. *Fratres: Obsecro vos* is a liturgical formula and stands in no Bible: where the missal addresses the brethren, the Douay renders Paul's own *Propter quod peto, Wherefore I pray you*, and the connective that points back to a verse this Mass does not read is gone from both. At v. 20 the missal prints *intellégimus* against the Clementine's *intelligimus*, a received spelling of one word and not another word; the Douay's *understand* answers either.

4. Gradual (*Grad.*)

Graduale — Ps. 101, 16-17 — marginal no. 1595

Timébunt gentes nomen tuum, Dómine, et omnes reges terræ glóriam tuam. V̇. Quóniam ædificávit Dóminus Sion, et vidébitur in maiestáte sua.

English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 101:16–17

v. 16 And the Gentiles shall fear thy name, O Lord, and all the kings of the earth thy glory. **v. 17** For the Lord hath built up Sion: and he shall be seen in his glory.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The Douay does not answer this chant at its decisive word. *He shall be seen in his glory* renders the psalter's *in gloria sua*; the Gradual sings *in maiestáte sua*, and no public-domain English witness of the appointed text carries that noun. The Douay also keeps the connective *And* which the chant drops, and its *For* renders *quia* where the chant reads *Quóniam*.

5. Alleluia (*All.*)

No separate heading — <i>Ÿ. Ps. 97, 1, cited in line</i> — marginal no. 1596
<i>Allelúia, allelúia. Ÿ. Ps. 97, 1 Cantáte Dómino cánticum novum: quia mirabilia fecit Dóminus. Allelúia.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 97:1
v. 1 A psalm for David himself. Sing ye to the Lord a new canticle: because he hath done wonderful things. His right hand hath wrought for him salvation, and his arm is holy.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The chant supplies *Dóminus* as the subject of *fecit*, which the psalter leaves implicit and the Douay renders *he*; that added noun has no counterpart in this English. The psalm title is not sung, and neither is the second half of the verse, where the Lord’s arm stands.

6. Gospel (*Gosp.*)

+ <i>Sequéntia sancti Evangélíi secúndum Lucam.</i> — Luc. 14, 1-11 — marginal no. 1597
<i>In illo témpore: Cum intráret Iesus in domum cuiúsdam princípís pharisæórum sábbato manducáre panem, et ipsi observábant eum. Et ecce homo quídam hydrópícus erat ante illum. Et respóndens Iesus dixit ad legisperítos et pharisæos, dicens: Si licet sábbato curáre? At illi tacuérent. Ipse vero apprehénsus sanávit eum, ac dimísit. Et respóndens ad illos, dixit: Cuius vestrum ásinus, aut bos in púteum cadet, et non contínuo éxtrahet illum die sábbati? Et non póterant ad hæc respondére illi. Dicébat autem et ad invitátos parábolam, inténdens quómodo primos accúbitus elígerent, dicens ad illos: Cum invitátus fúeris ad núptias, non discúmbas in primo loco, ne forte honorátior te sit invitátus ab illo, et véniens is qui te et illum vocávit, dicat tibi: Da huic locum: et tunc incípías cum rubóre novíssimum locum tenére. Sed cum vocátus fúeris, vade, recúmbe in novíssimo loco: ut, cum vénerit qui te invitávit, dicat tibi: Amíce, ascénde supérius. Tunc erit tibi glória coram simul discumbéntibus: quia omnis, qui se exáltat, humiliábitur: et qui se humiliat, exaltábitur.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Luke 14:1–11
v. 1 And it came to pass, when Jesus went into the house of one of the chief of the Pharisees, on the sabbath day, to eat bread, that they watched him. v. 2 And behold, there was a certain man before him that had the dropsy. v. 3 And Jesus answering, spoke to the lawyers and Pharisees, saying: Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath day? v. 4 But they held their peace. But he taking him, healed him and sent him away. v. 5 And answering them, he said: Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fall into a pit and will not immediately draw him out, on the sabbath day? v. 6 And they could not answer him to these things. v. 7 And he spoke a parable also to them that were invited, marking how they chose the first seats at the table, saying to them: v. 8 When thou art invited to a wedding, sit not down in the first place, lest perhaps one more honourable than thou be invited by him: v. 9 And he that invited thee and him, come and say to thee: Give this man place. And then thou begin with shame to take the lowest place. v. 10 But when thou art invited, go, sit down in the lowest place; that when he who invited thee cometh, he may say to thee: Friend, go up higher. Then shalt thou have glory before them that sit at table with thee. v. 11 Because every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled: and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. *In illo témpore* stands in no Bible either: the Douay gives Luke’s own *And it came to pass*, which the liturgical incipit replaces. At vv. 8–9 the missal runs two verses into one sentence, lowercasing the *Et* and setting a comma where the Clementine ends a sentence, so the Douay’s full stop after *invited by him* has no counterpart on the missal’s page. The missal reads *éxtrahet* at v. 5, which the Douay answers with *draw him out*.

Credo. is printed immediately after *exaltábitur.*, at the head of the right-hand column and set apart from the pericope. It is the rubric appointing the Creed and is no part of the Gospel text.

7. Offertory (*Off.*)

<i>Ant. ad Offertorium</i> — Ps. 39, 14 et 15 — marginal no. 1598
<i>Dómine, in auxílium meum respice: confundántur et revereántur, qui quærunt ánimam meam, ut áuferant eam: Dómine, in auxílium meum respice.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 39:14–15
v. 14 Be pleased, O Lord, to deliver me: look down, O Lord, to help me. v. 15 Let them be confounded and ashamed together, that seek after my soul to take it away. Let them be turned backward and be ashamed that desire evils to me.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The second decisive word of this Mass has no English either. *Look down, O Lord, to help me* renders the psalter's *ad adjuvandum me respice*; the antiphon sings *in auxílium meum respice*, which is verbatim Ps. 70:12 — a verse of this Mass's own Communion psalm — and no public-domain English of the appointed text answers it. The Douay also carries *together*, the *simul* the chant drops. The repetition of the first clause is printed in full on the page and is not a cue, and the psalm carries no refrain answering it.

8. Secret (*Sec.*)

<i>Secreta</i> — marginal no. 1599
<i>Munda nos, quæsumus, Dómine, sacrificií præsentis efféctu: et pérfice miserátus in nobis; ut eius mereámur esse partícipes. Per Dóminum.</i>
English: Cummiskey (Philadelphia, 1861), Secret of this formulary
Cleanse us, O Lord, we beseech thee, by the efficacy of this sacrifice: and by thy mercy make us worthy to partake thereof. Thro'.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. *Pérfice miserátus in nobis* is an imperative addressed to God, and *mereámur* hangs on it in a purpose clause, so what the Latin asks God to complete is one thing and the sharing that follows from it another. Cummiskey folds the two together as *by thy mercy make us worthy to partake thereof*: the verb the Latin gives God, and the clause it governs, do not survive into this English. The rendering compresses *sacrificií præsentis efféctu* into *the efficacy of this sacrifice*.

Præfatio de Ssma Trinitate. stands between the Secret and the Communion antiphon, in the place the missal gives the preface direction, and it is a rubric of this formulary.

9. Communion (*Comm.*)

<i>Antiphona ad Communionem</i> — Ps. 70, 16-17 et 18 — marginal no. 1600
Ps. 70, 16-17 et 18 <i>Dómine, memorábor iustitiæ tuæ solúus: Deus, docuísti me a iuventúte mea: et usque in senéctam et sénium, Deus, ne derelínquas me.</i>
English: Douay–Rheims (Challoner), Ps. 70:16–18
v. 16 I will enter into the powers of the Lord: O Lord, I will be mindful of thy justice alone. v. 17 Thou hast taught me, O God, from my youth: and till now I will declare thy wonderful works. v. 18 And unto old age and grey hairs: O God, forsake me not, Until I shew forth thy arm to all the generation that is to come: Thy power,

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. The missal's citation *Ps. 70, 16-17 et 18* describes what the antiphon takes: the second half of v. 16, the first half of v. 17 and the first part of v. 18, which no verse range would express. There is no gap of wording here and this is the only appointed chant of which that is true: every word of the antiphon is the Clementine's, and its whole distance from the psalter is where it starts and stops.

10. Postcommunion (*Postcomm.*)

<i>Postcommunio</i> — marginal no. 1601
<i>Purifica, quæsumus, Dómine, mentes nostras benígnus, et rénova cæléstibus sacraméntis: ut consequénter et córporum præsens páriter et futúrum capiámus auxílium. Per Dóminum.</i>
English: Cummiskey (Philadelphia, 1861), Postcommunion of this formulary
Mercifully, O Lord, we beseech thee, purify our souls, and renew them by these holy mysteries; that we may receive help thereby, both while we are in these mortal bodies and hereafter. Thro'.

Where the registered English does not answer the Latin. In *cóporum præsens páriter et futúrum . . . auxílium* the two adjectives agree with *auxílium* and qualify the help asked for, not the ones who receive it, and *cóporum* says whose help it is. Cummiskey has *both while we are in these mortal bodies and hereafter*, which keeps the two times, attaches them to the worshippers and loses the noun they belong to. *Auxílium*, which the Offertory has already sung, is the word the two elements share, and the English carries it as *help* in one place and as *to help me* in the other.

The Propers: Detailed Commentary

The typical edition against the Benziger printing

The Vatican *editio typica* prints this formulary at pp. 397–398 under marginal nos. 1592–1601. The Benziger *editio iuxta typicam* of the same year prints the same ten elements and differs from it in eight places. **Two of the eight are substantive and six are pointing, abbreviation or paging.**

Place	Vatican <i>editio typica</i>	Benziger <i>iuxta typicam</i>
Introit, after <i>Ÿ. Glória Patri.</i>	nothing follows	<i>Miserére.</i> — a repetition cue giving the antiphon’s incipit. Substantive. The Benziger prints such cues habitually, <i>Iustus.</i> at the Seventeenth Sunday on the same page image; the typical edition prints none here and none there
Secret, conclusion	<i>Per Dóminum.</i>	<i>Per Dóminum nostrum.</i> Substantive: the Benziger conclusion is the longer of the two
Introit verse	<i>quóniam inops et pauper sum ego</i>	<i>quóniam inops, et pauper sum ego</i> — a comma. The 1861 Cummiskey’s parallel Latin agrees with the typical edition; the 1862 Pustet agrees with the Benziger
Gospel, at <i>humiliábitur</i>	<i>humiliábitur: et qui se humiliat</i>	<i>humiliábitur, et qui se humiliat</i>
Gospel, joining vv. 8–9	<i>ab illo, et véniens is qui te et illum vocávit</i>	<i>ab illo, et véniens is, qui te, et illum vocávit</i>
Postcommunion, at <i>páriter</i>	<i>præsens páriter et futúrum</i>	<i>præsens páriter, et futúrum.</i> The 1862 Pustet points it as the Benziger does and the 1604 sets a comma after <i>præsens</i> instead: the older books point this clause and the typical edition does not
Heading style	<i>DOMINICA / DECIMA SEXTA / post Pentecosten</i> on three lines; <i>Ant. ad Introitum</i> and <i>Ant. ad Offertorium</i> abbreviated, <i>Antiphona ad Communionem</i> spelled out	two lines of capitals; <i>Antiphona ad ...</i> spelled out throughout
Running head	none for this Sunday anywhere in the book	<i>Dominica XVI post Pentecosten</i> over its printed p. 392

The typical edition is not uniform with itself inside this one formulary: it abbreviates two of the three antiphon headings and spells the third out. And no page of the 1,088-page facsimile carries a running head naming this Sunday — printed p. 397 is headed *Dominica XV post Pentecosten* and p. 398 *Dominica XVII post Pentecosten* — so no running head anywhere in the book leads to this formulary.

Everything else agrees word for word and accent for accent. Both witnesses print *intellégimus* in the Epistle, both print the Communion citation as *Ps. 70, 16-17 et 18*, and both print *éxtrahet* in the Gospel where the controlling facsimile’s own embedded text layer gives *extranet*.

The ten appointed texts do not move across the century before 1962. The Pustet Ratisbon of 1862, the Vatican typical edition of 1920, the Benziger *iuxta typicam* of the pre-1955 rubrics and the 1962 typical edition print the same ten texts in the same order, and all four give the Alleluia as *Cantáte Dómino cánticum novum.* **The psalm citations of the two middle books carry less than their texts do.** The optical layers of the 1920 typical edition and of the pre-1955 Benziger damage this formulary’s own numerals: the 1920 gives the Offertory’s citation as *Ps. 39, 24 et 15*, where the 1962 book prints *Ps. 39, 14 et 15*, and the Gospel’s reference as *huc. 24, 2-22.* **So what holds steady across the century before 1962 is the ten texts and their order,** and the psalm citations of those two books, as their layers give them, do not show it. What changes around the texts is the apparatus: the rank at the head is *semiduplex* in 1920 and in the Benziger and *II classis* in 1962, and the three cross-references to the seasonal supernumerary orations that stand in the two earlier books are gone from the last.

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

The Bible text beside these propers is the Clementine Vulgate, the Latin behind the Douay–Rheims Challoner English printed with them. Fifteen divergences stand between the two texts. **Four of the five chants depart from the psalter and the Communion departs at no word at all.** The two books differ besides in consonantal *i* and *j*, in the *æ* and *œ* ligatures and in stress accents; those are the same words, spelled as each book spells them.

Proper and locus	Appointed	Clementine
(<i>Int.</i>) Ps. 85:3	<i>Miserére mihi, Dómine</i>	<i>Miserere mei, Domine</i> — a different word: the chant asks mercy <i>for me</i> in the dative
(<i>Int.</i>) Ps. 85:5	<i>quia tu, Dómine</i>	<i>Quoniam tu, Domine</i> — a different conjunction
(<i>Int.</i>) Ps. 85:5	<i>suávis ac mitis es</i>	<i>suavis et mitis</i> — a different conjunction, and the chant supplies the verb the psalter leaves out
(<i>Int.</i>) Ps. 85:5	<i>et copiósus in misericórdia</i>	<i>et multæ misericordiæ</i> — a different construction of the same sense
(<i>Int.</i>) verse, Ps. 85:1	<i>aurem tuam mihi</i>	<i>aurem tuam</i> — the chant adds the dative; and the psalm title <i>Oratio ipsi David</i> is not sung
(<i>Grad.</i>) Ps. 101:16	<i>Timébunt gentes</i>	<i>Et timebunt gentes</i> — the chant drops the connective that opened the verse
(<i>Grad.</i>) Ps. 101:17	<i>Quóniam ædificávit</i>	<i>quia ædificavit</i> — a different conjunction, the verb the same perfect in both
(<i>Grad.</i>) Ps. 101:17	<i>videbitur in maiestáte sua</i>	<i>videbitur in gloria sua</i> — a different noun, and the substantive divergence of this element
(<i>All.</i>) Ps. 97:1	<i>quia mirabilia fecit Dóminus</i>	<i>quia mirabilia fecit</i> — the chant names the subject the psalter leaves implicit; it stops before <i>Salvavit sibi dextera ejus, et brachium sanctum ejus</i> and omits the title <i>Psalmus ipsi David</i>
(<i>Off.</i>) Ps. 39:14	<i>Dómine, in auxílium meum réspice</i>	<i>Domine, ad adjuvandum me respice</i> — a different construction of the same petition
(<i>Off.</i>) Ps. 39:15	<i>confundántur et revereántur, qui quærunt</i>	<i>Confundantur et reveareantur simul, qui quærunt</i> — the chant drops <i>simul</i> ; it also opens at the second half of v. 14, stops at the first half of v. 15, and repeats the second half of v. 14 as a refrain the psalm has not
(<i>Ep.</i>) Eph. 3:13	<i>Fratres: Obsecro vos, ne deficiátis</i>	<i>Propter quod peto ne deficiatis</i> — the liturgical incipit adaptation
(<i>Ep.</i>) Eph. 3:20	<i>quam pétimus, aut intellégimus</i>	<i>quam petimus aut intelligimus</i> — a different received spelling of one word, and not a different word
(<i>Gosp.</i>) Luke 14:1	<i>In illo témpore: Cum intráret Iesus</i>	<i>Et factum est cum intraret Jesus</i> — the liturgical incipit adaptation
(<i>Gosp.</i>) Luke 14:8–9	<i>ab illo, et véniens is qui te et illum vocávit</i>	<i>ab illo. Et veniens is, qui te et illum vocavit</i> — the missal runs the two verses into one sentence, lowercasing the <i>Et</i> and setting a comma where the Clementine ends a sentence

Nothing else in the Gospel departs. **The Communion departs at nothing:** every word is the Clementine's, and the antiphon's whole distance from the psalter is where it begins and ends.

At four of these five chants Cassiodorus's sixth-century lemma stands with the missal against the Clementine. He reads *suavis ac mitis es; et copiosus in misericordia omnibus invocantibus te* at the Introit, *videbitur in maiestate sua* at the Gradual, *quia mirabilia fecit Dominus* at the Alleluia and *Domine, in auxilium meum respice* at the Offertory; Migne's apparatus records no manuscript variant against the Introit's clause or the Offertory's. At the Communion his text and the Clementine both agree with the antiphon. **Migne's transcription is not a**

critical edition, so each of those four agreements rests on one lemma of a single printing. Theodoret's Greek names the Alleluia's subject too. **The Greek cuts the other way at two of the four:** Theodoret's lemma at Ps. 101:17 is a future carrying the Clementine's noun and not the chant's, and his Ps. 39:14 is the Septuagint's, which Migne's facing Latin renders with the Clementine's *ad adiuvandum me respice* and not with the chant's clause.

Psalm numbering, and where the two modern series part

Which psalm numbering the parentheses give

The missal cites five psalms in the Vulgate numbering, which the Douay carries: Ps. 85, 97, 101, 70 and 39 are Ps. 86, 98, 102, 71 and 40 in a modern Bible. **At two of the five the modern verse number depends on which modern series is meant.** Ps. 39 and Ps. 101 carry their titles as numbered first verses, which English Bibles leave unnumbered, so the Offertory is Hebrew 40:14–15 but English 40:13–14 and the Gradual is Hebrew 102:16–17 but English 102:15–16. Ps. 70, 85 and 97 fold their titles into verse one, so the Introit, the Alleluia and the Communion answer to the same numbers in both series. **The same offset governs the marginal figures on the New Advent pages of Augustine's *Enarrationes*,** which pair a Vulgate psalm number with a Hebrew verse number and therefore run one behind the missal at Ps. 101 and Ps. 39. And the NPNF series titles each exposition by the Hebrew psalm number, so Augustine on the Introit's Ps. 85 is filed as “Psalm 86”. **The printings of the three commentators who stand beside him at these psalms present three further numbering hazards, and no two of the three are the same.** Migne's numerals for Cassiodorus run level with the missal at Ps. 85, Ps. 101 and Ps. 70, three ahead at Ps. 39, where they begin at *Exspectans exspectavi* and split two later verses, and one ahead from the first verse at Ps. 97. The 1866 Bellarmine prints the appointed verses one number *below* the Vulgate at Ps. 39 and Ps. 101, whose superscriptions its printing omits, and level with it at the other three. And in the Migne facsimile of Theodoret pp. 878–879 reprint the same opening as pp. 876–877, so the two openings are distinguished by column and not by page number.

1. Introit (*Int.*) — *Miserere mihi, Dómine*

The antiphon is a centonisation of two verses that do not adjoin — v. 3 entire, then v. 5 — with the psalm verse drawn from v. 1. Nothing on the page marks that v. 4 has been passed over. Its five departures from the psalter are the most of any element here, and the commentators fall out two ways over the antiphon's wording: Augustine's lemma differs from the chant at three places, two of them among those five, and Cassiodorus's carries the chant's whole second half.

Augustine, *Enarratio in Ps. 85*, one sermon, entire §1 sets the whole psalm inside the *totus Christus*: the Son of God *qui et oret pro nobis, et oret in nobis, et oretur a nobis*. §2, on the verse the Introit sings as its psalm verse: *Inclinat aurem, si tu non erigas cervicem: humiliato enim appropinquat; ab exaltato longe discedit, nisi quem ipse humiliatum exaltaverit*, with the rich Pharisee boasting his merits set against the needy publican. §3 turns on who the poor man is, and answers that the rich may be *in Deo pauperes* (1 Tim. 6:17). §5, on the antiphon's own *tota die: omni tempore intellige . . . corpus Christi tota die clamat, sibi decedentibus et succedentibus membris* — the cry is the Body's and runs through the members who die and the members who follow. §7, on *suavis: Quid est mitis? Portans me, donec perficias me . . . nec meminit tantas quas incondite fundimus, et accipit unam quam vix invenimus*. His lemma reads *Miserere mei* where the chant sings *Miserere mihi* and *egenus et inops ego sum* where it sings *inops et pauper sum ego*; at v. 5 it reads *suavis es ac mitis*, nearer the chant than the Clementine. Latin from the Migne transcription and the *augustinus.it* text; English from the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, first series, where the exposition is filed under the Hebrew number as “Psalm 86”.

Cassiodorus, *Expositio psalmorum*, in Ps. LXXXV §§2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 18, 23–24 He assigns all three appointed verses to Christ alone. His *divisio* makes the whole psalm Christ's prayer, *in prima sectione dicens quae ipsi tantum probantur aptari*, the section prayed *pro membris suis* beginning only at v. 11. At v. 1 the poor man is Christ in the form of a servant — *Inclina, ostendit quia se ad ipsum extendere non poterat humana conditio, nisi ipse suam Maiestatem piissimus inclinaret* — and the poverty is *conditionem, quam susceperat humanitatis, quae ex se nihil habere potest, nisi quod largitate Divinitatis acceperit*; he turns it pastorally at once, *Audiant egeni et pauperes*, and does not shut out the rich, *egenus enim et pauper Dei est, quisquis meruerit mundi istius*

perversitate vacuari. His tota die is one human life and not the Body's succession: totius vitae tempus ostenditur, ut per multa tempora annorumque curricula quasi unius diei continuus clamor esse monstretur, and the crying is done by works, Magna siquidem voce ille clamat ad Dominum, qui quamvis lingua taceat, bonis tamen operibus perseveranter exclamat. At v. 5 he takes suavis ac mitis as a formal definition, per quintam speciem definitionis, quae Graece dicitur kata ten lexin: Suavis, quia post amaritudinem huius mundi dulcis est ad se recurrentibus. Mitis, quia diu sustinet peccatores. Copiosus in misericordia, quia licet sint nostra numerosa peccata, multo abundantior est pietas. His lemma there is the antiphon's second half word for word, and his v. 1 reads aurem tuam ad me against the missal's mihi and egenus against inops.

Theodoret of Cyrus, Interpretatio in Psalmos, PG 80 cols. 1553–1556 Antiochene throughout. His hypothesis is historical — *Praecinit autem et Assyriorum in Hierosolymam impetum, et Ezechiae spem* — and the poverty is a philosopher's and not a moralist's: *Nam uterque iustitiae divitias possidens, et divinus David, et admirabilis Ezechias, has quidem non considerabant, ad naturae vero paupertatem respiciebant. Inclina, Domine, aurem tuam* he takes *per metaphoram desumptam ab aegroto, qui ob imbecillitatem non potest clare loqui, et medicum cogit, ut aurem ori ejus admoveat. At v. 3 he allegorises tota die not at all* and reports a version instead: *Nam toto die, Symmachus singulis diebus dixit. At v. 5 he supplies the Greek the Latins argue from without, and reports what the other versions made of the antiphon's second adjective: Pro mitis autem Aquila et Theodotio placabilis dixerunt. Mansuetudo igitur patientiam quoque innuit. His Migne Latin at v. 1 reads inops et pauper, which is the missal's pair where Cassiodorus's is not. This is Migne's reprint of Schulze's recension with a facing Latin version, not a critical Greek text, and the Greek and that Latin do not always agree.*

Robert Bellarmine, Explanatio in Psalmos, in the 1866 English of John O'Sullivan, printed pp. 259–261 The form of the prayer is his point at v. 1: “He begins his prayer by touching on God's greatness and his own poverty, an excellent form of prayer . . . As I am the beggar sitting at the rich man's gate, incline thy ear to your poor servant.” The poor man is a disposition and not a purse — “the person, who, though he may abound in the riches of the world, still does not put his trust in them, takes no pride in them” — and he cites Augustine that “Lazarus was not taken up into Abraham's bosom by reason of his poverty, but on account of his humility.” At v. 3 *tota die* is perseverance in prayer. At v. 5 he glosses each word of the antiphon in turn, attributes the distracted-prayer reading of *mitis* to Augustine, and extends it with his own image of the judge and the culprit who turns aside to talk with his friends. O'Sullivan's translation is an abridgement its own translator declares, and the argument line and psalm text printed above each exposition in this edition are the Douay's and not Bellarmine's.

All four read *inops et pauper* as the confession of a man who has nothing of his own, and none of them reads it as a statement about money; two of them volunteer the qualification that the rich are not excluded, Cassiodorus and Bellarmine, and Augustine reaches it at §3's question of who the poor man is, answering that the rich may be *in Deo pauperes*. Each supplies a different image for the bending of the ear — Theodoret's sick man too weak to speak, whom the physician must stoop to; Cassiodorus's human condition that cannot stretch upward; Bellarmine's beggar at the rich man's gate; Augustine's ear bent only to the neck that is not stiffened. **And they divide four ways on tota die:** Augustine's is the whole time of the Body, Cassiodorus's a single human life crying by its works, Bellarmine's fervour and perseverance in prayer, and Theodoret's Symmachus's “on each day” and nothing further. The fourth of them stands against any reading that leans on the singularity of one long day.

Aquinas does not reach this psalm. His *Postilla super Psalmos* as the Corpus Thomisticum serves it breaks off inside Psalm 54, so of this Mass's five psalms he is a direct commentator on the Offertory's alone.

The appointed words stand in four canonical relations. *Mitis* as a whole word stands in exactly two verses of the Clementine, Ps. 85:5 and Matt. 11:29, where Christ pairs it with *humilis corde*; *iugum meum suave est* follows immediately at 11:30, so it is across those two verses that the antiphon's *suavis* and *mitis* are joined, and neither verse carries both alone. *Copiosus in misericordia* answers no phrase anywhere in that Bible; the psalter's own formula stands at Ps. 85:5 itself, at Ps. 85:15, at Num. 14:18 and at Joel 2:13. The dative the chant adds gives Ps. 85:1 the petition-form *inclina aurem tuam mihi*, which in that psalter stands at Ps. 16:6 and nowhere else, against the *inclina ad me aurem tuam* of Ps. 30:3, Ps. 70:2 and Ps. 101:3 — the last two the psalms of this Mass's own Communion and Gradual, and not one of the three carrying *mihi* at all. **What the two verses share is that four-word petition and the et exaudi beside it, and nothing wider:** the Introit sings *Inclina, Domine, aurem tuam mihi, et exaudi me*, where Ps. 16:6 carries *Deus* in its opening clause, asks that God hear *verba mea*, and opens

on a clause the Introit's psalm verse has not. And Apoc. 15:4 brings together the nations coming to adore and the fear of the divine name, which are Ps. 85:9 and Ps. 101:16, though Ps. 85:9 is not appointed here.

Four psalms in the whole Clementine open with *Oratio*, and this Mass appoints two of them — Ps. 85, *Oratio ipsi David*, and Ps. 101, *Oratio pauperis* — while a third, Ps. 16, *Oratio David*, is the psalm whose v. 6 the added dative reproduces. Neither title is sung: the missal omits Ps. 85's, and Ps. 101's stands fifteen verses before the Gradual's excerpt.

No New Testament book quotes Ps. 85:1, 3 or 5, and the antiphon's English produced no later reuse: *Miserere mihi* is not the famous *Miserere*, which is Ps. 50, and the secular lives of that word in English attach there.

2. Collect (*Coll.*) — *Tua nos, quæsumus, Dómine, grátia*

One grace is asked to do two things and then to produce a third: to go before, to follow, and to make us continually intent on good works. **No Father expounds this prayer**, which is the ordinary state of a Roman sacramentary oration: no commentator working through a Sunday's own orations stands behind it. **The one witness who comments on this Collect as this Mass's own is a nineteenth-century liturgist**, and he writes for devotion rather than argument.

The continuation of Prosper Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year* (Dom Lucien Fromage), vol. XI, printed p. 357 Above this Collect he sets out the distinction the two verbs make, here in Dom Laurence Shepherd's English: "unless grace prevent, that is, anticipate, us, we cannot have so much as the thought of doing what is holy; and again, unless it follow up the inspirations it has given us, and lead them to a happy termination, we shall never be able to pass from the simple thought to the act of any virtue whatsoever. If, on the other hand, we be faithful to grace, our life will be one uninterrupted tissue of good works." The English page sets *follow*, *grace* and *good works* in italic; *prevent* is Shepherd's word in this exposition and not in his English of the prayer, which renders *præveniat* as "ever go before us." **Fromage witnesses that the Collect is read this way; the technical distinction is Augustine's and Trent's**; and "persevering continuity of this most precious aid," his *continuité persévérante*, is his phrase and not a rendering of *iúgiter*.

Augustine, *Enchiridion* 32 and *De gratia et libero arbitrio* 17.33 *Misericordia eius praeveniet me ... Misericordia eius subsequetur me: nolentem praevenit, ut velit, volentem subsequitur, ne frustra velit.* The scriptural substratum is Ps. 58:11, which stands verbatim in the Clementine; the following clause answers to Ps. 22:6, where the Clementine reads *misericordia tua subsequetur me* against Augustine's *eius*. In *De gratia et libero arbitrio* the same pair is put as *operatur* and *cooperatur*.

Council of Trent, Session VI Cap. XVI: *virtus ... bona eorum opera semper antecedit et comitatur et subsequitur*, which shares *iúgiter* and *semper* with this Collect at the doctrinal point. Cap. X and can. 32 stand with it. **Trent's three verbs are not the Collect's two**: *comitatur* is the council's addition. Cap. X does quote a Sunday collect of this series for its doctrine, and the Tauchnitz printing's own footnote identifies it as the Thirteenth Sunday's — quoted altered. So a council does cite a collect of this series, and it does not cite this one.

Cassiodorus reaches the prevenient half of the doctrine at the Communion's psalm: Christ's charity precedes merit. At the Offertory's psalm he makes God's very looking our protection. His two expositions below give the Collect's petition a voice within the appointed chants; the Communion's commentary places his account beside Augustine's.

The Collect's *bonis opéribus* and the Postcommunion's *rénova ... mentes nostras* share vocabulary with Eph. 2:10 and Eph. 4:23, both outside the appointed pericope; those are echoes, and the three orations of this Mass quote no Scripture at all.

3. Epistle (*Ep.*) — Eph. 3:13–21

The lesson begins one verse before the sentence it completes. Eph. 3:1 opens *Huius rei gratia* and breaks off into a digression that runs to v. 13; v. 14 resumes with the same three words. What a congregation hears is the resumption without the thing resumed, and the liturgical incipit removes even that signal by substituting *Fratres*:

Obsecro vos for the Clementine's *Propter quod peto*. At the other end the pericope closes the doctrinal half of the letter: the exhortation opens at 4:1 with *Obsecro itaque vos*, which is the same verb the liturgical incipit put at the front — the two Latin texts coinciding in one verb. Every petition inside the reading asks that God give, and every principal noun of the petition is a word Ephesians has already used.

The calendar registry named in the References gives Ephesians 3 three appointments and two of them cut v. 13 out, the Sacred Heart and St Margaret Mary Alacoque reading 3:8–12, 14–19 and 3:8–9, 14–19; and in that registry vv. 20–21, the doxology, stand here and at no other Mass.

John Chrysostom, Homily 7 on Ephesians The homily runs from 3:8 to the doxology of 3:21, so the whole appointed pericope stands inside it and Homilies 6 and 8 fall outside it on either side. At v. 13 he answers the difficulty in the Apostle's own terms: the tribulations are the readers' glory because God so loved them as to afflict his servants for them, with Hos. 6:5. At vv. 14–15 the bowing of the knees shows that the prayer is heartfelt, and *omnis paternitas* means that the tribes are now reckoned by their Creator rather than, as before, "according to the number of Angels." **At the four measures he does not read the Cross:** they are the immensity of God's love "and how it extends every where," sketched by the visible dimensions of a solid body, "pointing as it were to a man." The words quoted are Gross Alexander's English in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, first series, vol. 13, and not Chrysostom's Greek.

Augustine, Sermo 165 Headed *De verbis Apostoli (Eph 3, 13-18) ... deque gratia et libera voluntate, contra Pelagianos*. §1.1 reads the Epistle's hinge as a distinction between what the hearer's will can do and what it cannot: *Quia ergo voluntatis habetis arbitrium: Peto. Quia vero voluntatis non sufficit arbitrium ad implendum quod peto: Huius rei gratia flecto genua mea ad Patrem ... Peto enim a vobis, propter arbitrium voluntatis: rogo det vobis, propter auxilium maiestatis*. §§3.3–5.5 assign the four measures; §7.9 closes on *unde gratiam tuam meritum meum praecedat? Non*. **The sermon covers 3:13–18 and stops three verses short of the doxology**, and its opening remark that the day's Apostle, psalm and Gospel all agreed *ut spem non in nobis, sed in Domino collocemus* is evidence about Augustine's own African order — the psalm sung there was Ps. 56:2 — and says nothing about this Roman formulary. At §2.2 he pauses to defend the translator's *altitudo*, which is his African text's reading where the missal and the Clementine print *sublimitas*: **a sentence of his about altitudo is not a sentence about the missal's word**.

Augustine on the four dimensions elsewhere: Epistula 55.14.25 and In Iohannis euangelium tractatus 118.5 Both name Eph. 3:18 as the text expounded, so neither attribution is an inferred echo, and both read the four measures as the four members of the Cross. **They differ from each other on two of the four assignments and reverse the order of height and length**, and *Sermo* 165 differs again — breadth the charity that alone works well, length perseverance to the end, height the *sursum cor* and the loving of God *gratis*, depth the unsearchable judgments of God. **Three cross-readings with three sets of virtues is a development inside one author**, and no one of them is "the" patristic reading of the verse. English from the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, and the Latin from Migne rather than from CCSL 36 or CSEL 34.

Thomas Aquinas, Super Epistolam ad Ephesios lectura cap. 3 lect. 4–5 Lect. 4 treats v. 13. At lect. 5 he sets out three readings of the measures and chooses none: the Dionysian, taking the dimensions of God metaphorically and grounded on Job 11:8–9; the charity reading; and the Cross, where he specifies the hidden depth as **predestination**. **He names Augustine nowhere in the cross-reading**. Marietti text, not Leonine.

The continuation of Prosper Guéranger, The Liturgical Year (Dom Lucien Fromage), vol. XI, printed pp. 358–360 He takes the four measures neither of the Cross nor of the extent of love, but of the indwelling: "God alone ... can strengthen in us the inward man enough to make us understand, as the saints do, the dimensions (breadth, length, height, and depth) of the great mystery of Christ dwelling in man, and dwelling in him for the purpose of filling him with the plenitude of God." And he reads the lesson as this Mass's Collect prays: "Now, it depends on us to follow God's grace; nothing else but our own resistance prevents the Holy Ghost from making saints of us." He observes at p. 358 that the Church borrows more from Ephesians in this season than from any other Pauline letter.

So the four measures are read at least three ways by the witnesses standing over this verse — the extent of love, the members of the Cross, the dimensions of the indwelling — and the cruciform reading is one of them and not the reading. The Antwerp 1614 *Commentaria in omnes D. Pauli Epistolas* of Cornelius a Lapide, whose title promises all the epistles, **stops at Galatians 6:17**: no *ad Ephesios* running head stands anywhere in it. Lapide did comment on Ephesians; that book does not carry it.

Two Pauline places carry the reading's own vocabulary from outside the pericope. 2 Cor. 4:16–17 puts *non deficimus*, the inward renewal, tribulation and a weight of glory in one movement; Col. 1:24 is the nearest Pauline statement of the exchange Eph. 3:13 makes between an apostle's affliction and his hearers' glory.

4. Gradual (*Grad.*) — *Timébunt gentes nomen tuum*

The two verses stand at the psalm's hinge, where it turns from the wasting of one afflicted man to the rebuilding of Sion; the psalm's own title makes the whole a poor man's prayer. Four commentators expound them, and they divide on the tense, on the noun, on who is speaking and on what is seen.

Augustine, *Enarratio in Ps. 101*, sermo I §§16–17 §16 reads the fear of the name as the ingathering of the Gentiles, who become the second wall meeting Israel in the corner stone — and he cites **Eph. 2:20**, a verse of the appointed Epistle's own letter which this Mass does not read. §17 reads a future: Sion is being built now, *Hoc agitur nunc*, and the seeing is the Judgment, set against the first coming when he was seen *in infirmitate sua* and, in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* English, “had no form nor comeliness” (Isa. 53:2). §18 expounds the verse the Gradual stops before, *Resperit in orationem humilium*, and §19, three verses past the Gradual's cut, gives *ex alto factus est humilis, ut humiles exaltaret*. Both sections fall inside Sermo I, before the heading *SERMO II. De secunda parte Psalmi*.

Cassiodorus, *Expositio psalmorum*, in Ps. CI §§2–3, 22–23 His lemma is the missal's at both **disputed words**: *Quia aedificavit Dominus Sion, et videbitur in maiestate sua*. At v. 16 the fear of the nations is historical and ascetic rather than ecclesiological: the true Lord was not feared while the world served idols, and after the saving advent *gentes conversae sunt per timorem*; the kings of the earth are those who bridled their own bodies, *qui corpora sua divinis regulis infrenantes, sui imperatores esse (Domino praestante) valuerunt*. At v. 17 the building is finished and the thing built is the Church, *hoc est mater Ecclesia, de vivis lapidibus fabricata, in qua Domini cultura usque ad finem mundi sine intermissione proficiet*, and the seeing in majesty is the Judgment in the assumed body, *quando haedos sequestrat ab agnis*. **And he records Augustine's reading of the speaker and declines it** (§2): *Quamvis aliqui praesentem psalmum Domini Salvatori aptandum esse putaverint, conveniens tamen videtur afflicti magis et gementis pauperis . . . quia multa sunt quae illi immacolatae sanctae incarnationi nequeunt convenire. Et primum, quod anxius nusquam fuisse legitur Dominus Christus* — assigning the psalm instead to an afflicted penitent poor man left nameless on purpose, *ut cum uni datur, omnes sibi pauperes Christi cognoscerent attributum*.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG 80 cols. 1679–1682 His Greek lemma at v. 17 is a future, and its noun is the Clementine's and not the chant's, where Migne's facing Latin quietly prints the Vulgate's perfect *aedificavit* on the opposite column. **And his exposition is historical, not eschatological**: the rebuilding of the city is itself God's glory and answers the charge that the exile proved him weak, *Sione rursus aedificata, in pristina gloria universorum Deum omnes cernent*. At v. 16 he holds the historical and the christological together and calls the fulfilment partial, *hoc vero proprie ac vere post Dei et Salvatoris nostri incarnationem contigit*, with an explicit already-and-not-yet on Heb. 2:8 and Phil. 2:10 — *omne genu ipsi flectendum esse*. **The speaker, for him, is the people in the Babylonian captivity**.

Robert Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos*, printed p. 317, his own vv. 15–16 He holds together what Augustine and the missal divide. The building is accomplished “in the present day, having established his Church in spite of all kings and nations,” and the seeing is “in the time to come, when he shall come with all his Angels . . . When he began to build up Sion he was seen in his lowliness. ‘We have seen him, and there was no sightliness’ . . . but when he shall come to pass judgment, then ‘he shall be seen in his glory.’” **That antithesis**

is Augustine's own, made from the same Isaian verse. At the preceding verse he glosses the psalm's "thy glory" as "that is, thy *majesty*" — a gloss on the sense, his own printed lemma reading "in his glory."

The chant's two disputed words divide the witnesses along two different seams. The tense divides by text tradition: the Greek Theodoret expounds and Augustine's Latin both read a future, while the Clementine, Cassiodorus and Bellarmine read the perfect the chant prints. The noun divides Latin from Latin: the chant and Cassiodorus read *maiestate* where the Clementine, Augustine and Bellarmine's English read *gloria*. **So no sentence built on *maiestate* is Augustine's**, and the difference between him and the chant is not a peculiarity of the missal.

The exegetical divergence is sharper than either, and it does not follow the tense. All three Latins refer *vidébitur* to the Judgment; Theodoret refers it to Jerusalem restored. And Fromage, above this Gradual at printed p. 363, refers it to neither: "The Church, which is showing herself in the midst of the Gentiles, bears on herself the mark of her divine Architect; God shows Himself, in her, *in all majesty*; and, by her, the kings of the earth are made to fear Him" — the majesty seen now, in the Church. He is introducing a chant rather than construing a psalm, and the eschatological reading is not the whole Latin position once he is counted.

The verse the Gradual stops before divides the four again, three ways. Augustine and Cassiodorus take the poor whose prayer is regarded for the faithful of Christ, one and many; Bellarmine refers them to the martyrs of Apoc. 6:10; Theodoret to the captives whose prayer was admitted, *Non enim desepxit, veluti captivos et servos*. What follows the chant's cut is the psalm's and not the chant's.

Heb. 1:10–12 quotes this psalm of the Son, but at vv. 26–28, outside the appointed excerpt; the Epistle's *radicáti, et fundáti* shares its verb with *fundasti* at that same v. 26, nine verses past the Gradual, and the Gradual's own building word is *ædificávit*. These two verses produced no later reuse: "the Gentiles shall fear thy name" matches no page at all in the Library of Congress's *Chronicle of America*.

The Gradual is not proper to this Mass. **The calendar registry named in the References** also gives it to the Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Sundays after the Epiphany, and gives its first verse as the Alleluia verse of the Eighteenth Sunday, two Sundays after this one; Schuster names the Epiphany Gradual independently. **It does not, however, return with the resumed Epiphany Sundays in November:** a resumed Sunday keeps its own orations, Epistle and Gospel and borrows the Twenty-third Sunday's chants, a rule *The 1962 Roman Calendar: Rules, Ranks, and Reckoning* prints from *Rubricæ generales* n. 18 and Missal rubric 298.

5. Alleluia (*All.*) — *Cantáte Dómino cánticum novum*

The chant prints two clauses and stops, and the four commentators who stand over them give four answers to the one question the clauses leave open: what the *mirabilia* are.

Augustine, *Enarratio in Ps. 97*, §1 Nothing later in the psalm is appointed, so the exposition of the appointed words is §1 alone. The new song belongs to the new man; and because the psalm bids the whole round of the earth sing it, those who cut themselves off from the communion of the whole earth cannot sing it — *quia canticum novum in toto, non in parte cantatur*. The *mirabilia* are the raising of the whole world from everlasting death by the Lord's holy arm, which he identifies with Christ out of Isa. 53:1. And the passage moves from the new song to the new man to an inward healing: *Quis est qui intus sanatur? Qui credit in eum . . . in novum hominem reformatus*. His lemma for the second half of the verse reads *Sanavit ei dextera eius* — "healed," and "for him" — and he builds a distinction on it, *Multi enim sanantur sibi, non ei*, where the Clementine reads *Salvavit sibi* and Cassiodorus a third form, *salvavit eum*; the Alleluia stops before that clause entirely. The NPNF English carries its editors' own ellipses inside the sections, so the Latin is the fuller witness; even there his treatment of this verse is short.

Cassiodorus, *Expositio psalmorum*, in Ps. XCVII §§2, 4, 6–7, 14 His lemma carries the chant's *Dóminus* against the Clementine. The new song is regeneration and the Incarnation, and he gives it the sacramental term this Mass's Postcommunion uses: *Propheta fideles admonet Christianos, ut novae regenerationis sacramenta sumentes, novum canticum de Domini incarnatione concelebrent. Novus enim homo cantare debet canticum novum, non ille vetustus qui necdum Adæ peccata deponens, in praevaricatione veteris hominis perseverat*. On the wonders he first takes the Gospel healings — *quando caecis lumen, claudis gressum, surdis etiam donavit*

auditum — and then denies at once that these are the singular thing, *Sed ista fecerunt et sancti eius*, locating the novelty in the Resurrection.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG 80 cols. 1657–1658 The most austere of the four: the wonders are simply what exceeds nature and expectation, *Supra naturam enim et conceptum sunt ea quae a Deo universorum fiunt*, and the new song answers a change of dispensation — his Greek word is one for a polity or manner of common life, which Migne’s facing Latin flattens to *religionem*. **His lemma too names the Lord**, the subject the chant supplies and the Clementine leaves implicit. His rule that in this idiom *Manum actionem appellari, Dexteram vero, bonam actionem* is a lexical principle and not an allegory.

Robert Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos*, printed p. 306 He answers the same question by enumeration, and the list gathers both of the readings the Fathers give apart: conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of a virgin, committed no sin, justified sinners, the deaf hearing and the blind seeing, the dead raised, “and, what is the most strange and wonderful of all, shewed himself alive within three days after he was buried . . . and, finally, as St. Augustine says, conquered the world, not by the sword but by the cross.” He and Theodoret agree, in almost the same words, that the psalm foretells both advents and dwells on the first.

The chant supplies *Dóminus* as the subject of *fecit* and stops before the Gentile horizon of vv. 2–3. *Canticum novum* occurs in the Clementine at Ps. 32:3, 39:4, 95:1, 97:1, 143:9, 149:1, Isa. 42:10, Apoc. 5:9 and 14:3, and nowhere else; four of the nine carry the chant’s full incipit *Cantate Domino canticum novum* — Ps. 95:1, Ps. 97:1, Ps. 149:1 and Isa. 42:10. **Two of those four touch this formulary’s other elements**: Ps. 95:1 stands under the title *quando domus aedificabatur post captivitatem*, beside the Gradual’s *aedificavit Dóminus Sion*; and Ps. 149:1 continues *laus eius in ecclesia sanctorum*, beside the Epistle’s *cum ómnibus sanctis* and *glória in Ecclésia*. A third place in the list of nine, Ps. 39:4, belongs to the Offertory’s own psalm.

The Gradual’s psalm itself reaches for this verse two verses past the Gradual’s cut. At Ps. 101:19 Cassiodorus quotes the Alleluia outright — *Hic laudabit Dominum, novo scilicet cantico, sicut in alio psalmo dictum est: Cantate Domino canticum novum* — while Augustine and Theodoret reach there for 2 Cor. 5:17 and the new creation. The join is inside that psalm; this Mass sings the new song immediately after the Gradual.

The chant’s full incipit is not distinctive to this verse, standing also at Ps. 95:1, Ps. 149:1 and Isa. 42:10, and no later use of it can be tied to Ps. 97:1.

6. Gospel (*Gosp.*) — Luke 14:1–11

The pericope cuts one continuous sabbath meal in half. It keeps the healing and the parable of places and stops before the instruction to invite the poor and before the parable of the great supper; the bread motif frames the whole scene at v. 1 and v. 15, and only its first half is appointed. The sabbath argument repeats, with the same pair of animals, the argument of Luke 13:15, where Matthew’s analogue at 12:11 argues from one sheep, and this is the third and last of Luke’s sabbath-healing controversies. **The calendar registry gives Luke 14 in three separated blocks** — 14:1–11 here, 14:16–24 at the Second Sunday after Pentecost, and 14:26–33 and 14:26–35 in the sanctoral and a Common — and it appoints vv. 12–15 and v. 25 nowhere.

Four commentators expound the pericope directly and they divide over what its first half is about.

Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on Luke*, Sermons 101 and 102 Two consecutive sermons dividing the pericope exactly where it divides internally. Sermon 101 makes the healing an argument about the sabbath: the law was shadow and type waiting for the truth, keeping the sabbath rationally means ceasing from sins and not from mercy, and the lawyers’ silence is malice — pressed to sarcasm, that a man had better commit his child joyfully to the grave than break the day. Sermon 102 reads the seating parable as the ordinary virtue of a modest mind: to seize an honour not due is like a theft, with the stolen goods to be given back, and worldly honour is grass on a housetop. **Cyril’s commentary survives entire only in Syriac**, and the English quoted is R. Payne Smith’s 1859 rendering of that Syriac, so its words are a translator’s twice over. **His lemma at 14:5 reads “whose son of yours, or whose ox”**, and the rhetorical force he draws from a father’s endangered child does not transfer to the missal’s *ásinus*.

Ambrose, *Expositio in Lucam* VII.195–196 The whole pericope gets one paragraph. The dropsical man is one *in quo fluxus carnis exuberans, animae gravabat officia, spiritus exstinguebat ardorem*; humility follows as the next lesson, taught by forbidding the appetite for the higher place and taught gently, *ut humanitas persuasionis coercionis asperitatem excluderet*; then hospitality, which is the Lord's kind only when spent on the poor, *nam hospitalem remuneraturis esse affectus avaritiae est*. **He passes over the sabbath controversy that occupies Cyril's whole first sermon**, and books VIII and IX carry no second treatment of the chapter: his own heading in book VII reads *Cap. XIV. — Vers. 2–14*, and the paragraph is the whole of what he gives it.

Augustine, *Quaestiones euangeliorum* II q. 29 The dropsical man is compared to the animal fallen into the well, because he laboured under a humour, and then to the covetous rich man. The numbering here is Migne's and not CCSL 44B's.

Bede, *In Lucae euangelium expositio*, PL 92 cols. 510D–513A The fullest continuous Latin exposition, and the one nearest this formulary. He argues the sequence from the body's disease to the heart's — *per huius aegritudinem corporis, in illis exprimeretur aegritudo cordis* (511B) — after setting out the etymology and pathology of dropsy (511A). The ox and the ass are the wise and the dull, or the two peoples, all found sunk in the pit of concupiscence and drawn out *iustificati gratis per gratiam ipsius*, Rom. 3:24 (511C). The marriage feast is the union of Christ and the Church, and the first place is glorying in one's own merits: *non se, de meritis gloriando, quasi caeteris sublimior extollat* (512A) — which is the matter this Mass's Collect and Communion state doctrinally, grace going before merit and a justice that is God's alone, and is why he is the witness that most nearly meets the formulary. **At *Tunc erit tibi gloria* he holds two readings and does not choose:** eschatological, *ne nunc quaerere incipias quod tibi servatur in fine*, and present, *Potest autem et in hac vita intelligi . . . quia quotidie Dominus suas nuptias intrat* (512D). At v. 11 he argues that the conclusion proves the parable must be read *typice*, because it is plainly false that everyone who exalts himself before men is humbled by men: *omnis qui se incaute de meritis allevat, humiliabitur a Domino* (513A). In the answering letter to Acca prefixed to this work he says he compiled it from Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory and Jerome and marked each borrowing with the author's initial in the margin; **the Migne transmission carries no such marks**, and the dropsy-and-miser comparison at 511A stands almost word for word in Augustine's *Quaestiones*, which the *Catena aurea* attributes to Augustine.

The *Catena aurea in Lucam* cap. 14 lect. 1–2 follows the pericope exactly and names eight authorities. Four of them — Cyril, Bede, Ambrose and Augustine's *Quaestiones* — stand above at their own works. Theophylact, Gregory's *Moralia*, Basil on the order of places at table, and a Chrysostom excerpt at lect. 2 rest on the *Catena*'s attribution alone, in its medieval Latin, which for the three Greek Fathers is not their Greek.

The closing sentence has a reception the pericope does not. **Benedict opens *Regula* 7, *De humilitate*, by quoting Luke 14:11 as the voice of Scripture itself** — *Clamat nobis Scriptura divina, fratres, dicens: Omnis qui se exaltat humiliabitur et qui se humiliat exaltabitur* — draws from it that every self-exaltation is a species of pride, and builds on it Jacob's ladder and the twelve degrees. **He names no chapter, and the sentence stands three times in the canon**, at Luke 14:11, Luke 18:14 and Matt. 23:12, so the Rule attests the reception of the sentence and not demonstrably of this pericope. Gregory the Great quotes it likewise at *Regula pastoralis* III.18, where the NPNF editors refer it to Luke 18:14; his nearest citation of this chapter is at III.21 and is of Luke 14:12–14, which the Missal does not appoint.

The continuation of Prosper Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year* (Dom Lucien Fromage), vol. XI, printed pp. 365, 367–368 He relays Ambrose at this Gospel and says the Church has chosen him: “she bids them listen to St. Ambrose, whom she has selected as her homilist for this Sunday . . . he may become like the man mentioned in to-day's Gospel, who had the dropsy; and dropsy, says our saintly preacher of Milan, is a morbid exuberance of humours, which stupefy the soul, and induce a total extinction of spiritual ardour. And yet, even if he were to have such a fall as that, let him not forget that the heavenly physician is ever ready to cure him.” **That the Breviary appoints Ambrose here is his statement and rests on him alone.** At p. 365 he makes the parable's wedding “that of heaven, of which there is a prelude given here below, by the union effected in the sacred banquet of holy Communion,” reading it through Matt. 22:2 rather than through Luke; and at p. 368 he joins the Gospel's closing axiom directly to grace through Ecclus. 3:20–21: “The greater thou art, the more humble thyself in all things, and thou shalt find grace before God; for great is the power of God alone, and

He is honoured by the humble.” No other witness on this formulary as a whole joins two of its elements outright.

The appointed words stand in two further canonical relations. *Amice* occurs in exactly five verses of the Clementine, and Luke 14:10 and Matt. 22:12 are the only two where a host at a wedding feast addresses a guest so — in the second the guest is expelled. And the logion stands in a family with Matt. 23:12, Luke 1:52, Jas. 4:10 and 1 Pet. 5:6, and sapientially with Prov. 25:6–7 and Ecclus. 3:20–21, of which Prov. 25:7’s *Ascende huc* is the nearest Old Testament wording to *Amice*, *ascende superius*, in the same situation. **The appointed Latin is one clause shorter than the Greek-based English at 14:3:** the missal and the Clementine read *Si licet sabbato curare?* where the Revised Version prints “or not.” *Legisperitus*, the word the pericope gives the Lord’s interlocutors, stands seven times in Luke and once elsewhere in the whole Clementine, at Tit. 3:13, and Luke 14:3 is its last occurrence in that Gospel; the other synoptic sabbath controversies name the objectors otherwise.

7. Offertory (*Off.*) — *Dómine, in auxilium meum respice*

The antiphon takes the second half of v. 14, then the first half of v. 15, then repeats the second half of v. 14. **The repetition is printed in full and is not a cue**, and the psalm has no such refrain. It is the best attested of the five chants and the one where the witnesses divide most sharply on what the psalm is doing.

Augustine, *Enarratio in Ps. 39* §§23–25 At v. 14 the heart that has forsaken me is the heart that cannot comprehend itself — Peter at Matt. 26:35 — and the cry is that of *membra sub ferramentis medici clamantia, sed sperantia*. §24 states the speaker: *Christus in passione loquitur*. At v. 15 the confounding of those who sought the soul is fulfilled in the Resurrection, *illi gavisi sunt cum posuit, confusi sunt cum recepit* (John 10:18). At the clause the Offertory does not print, *convertantur retrorsum*, he reads benevolently: that the proud who tried to walk in front of their Lord be turned into followers behind him. **His lemma is a third form of the petition**, *Placeat tibi . . . Domine, in adiuvandum mihi respice*, neither the missal’s nor the Clementine’s.

Cassiodorus, *Expositio psalmorum*, in Ps. XXXIX §§21–24 His lemma is the missal’s clause word for word: *Complaceat tibi, Domine, ut eripias me: Domine, in auxilium meum respice*, with no manuscript variant recorded against it in Migne’s apparatus. His gloss on it is the thesis Aquinas states seven centuries later: *ut intelligamus respectum ipsius nostrum esse praesidium; sicut est illud Evangelii: Respexit Petrum, et flevit amare. Aliter enim liberari non possumus, nisi nos Divinitas propitiata respiciat*. On the imprecation he reads conversion — *Confundantur, dixit, mirabilem operatione turbentur. Revereantur autem, resurrectionis gloria corrigantur . . . sicut persecuti sunt, ita et praedestinati conversionis munere liberentur* — and distinguishes two ways of seeking a soul, *sive ad honorem, sive ad mortem*, the added *ut auferant eam* fixing which is meant. In his psalter the clause at Ps. 70:12 reads *in adiutorium meum respice* and Ps. 39:14 *in auxilium meum respice*, which is the reverse of the Clementine’s distribution.

Thomas Aquinas, *Postilla super Psalmos* in ps. 39 nn. 6–7 The one appointed psalm of this Mass his commentary reaches. *Respectus Dei est auxilium nostrum* answers the petition directly. He allows two confusions, of penitence (Rom. 6:21) and of punishment; he takes *convertantur retrorsum in bonum, idest sequantur Christum retro eum*, which is Augustine’s and Cassiodorus’s reading; and at *cor meum dereliquit me* he reads the distraction of fervour by venial sins, citing 2 Kings (2 Samuel) 7:27 — **the same verse Augustine reaches for at this Mass’s Introit**, for the same fugitive heart.

Robert Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos*, printed p. 122, his own vv. 13–14 He breaks with the other Latins twice. He reads the first verse as the Passion — “you seem as if you had for some time abandoned me . . . but now ‘look down to help me,’ that you may at once replenish me in the joy of a glorious resurrection” — and calls the imprecation a prophecy in disguise, “That he now prophesies in the form of an imprecation, a thing usual with the prophets . . . But immediately after, when they heard of his resurrection . . . ‘they were confounded and ashamed.’” And where Augustine, Cassiodorus and Aquinas all read the next verse’s turning backward as a prayer for conversion, he does not: it is more of the same confusion. His remark about “the Jews” at this place is sixteenth-century polemical register and is his.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG 80 cols. 1159–1160 He supplies a speaker none of the Latins gives. At v. 13, immediately before the appointed verses and governing his reading of them: *Sic igitur in hoc loco Dei Ecclesia, impiorum fluctibus concussa, non effertur, tanquam pugnare volens, sed quae accidunt, peccatis et delictis tribuit . . . nec Dei Ecclesia ex hominibus perfectis tota constat, sed habet etiam ignavos . . . Et quoniam unum est corpus, tanquam ex una persona et haec et illa proferuntur. That is a different solution from Augustine's *totus Christus* to the same problem. On the appointed verses his gloss is one sentence and it is about intent, *Non enim vulnerare volunt, sed sempiternae morti tradere*; at the unprinted next verse he reads rout and not conversion, *Verte ipsos in fugam*.*

Jerome, *Epistula* 106 §23, on this very verse His correspondents found in their Greek the verb the Latin renders *festina*; he answers that the Septuagint has the verb the Latin renders *respice*, and lets the Latin stand. **So the verb the Offertory sings twice was contested in the fourth century and Jerome ruled for it.** What he settles is the verb and not the noun: his own form of the clause is *in adiutorium meum respice*, a fourth Latin again, and nothing in the letter bears on *auxilium* against *adiutorium*. The variant he corrects, *festina*, is the reading of Ps. 69:2, the verse this psalm doubles.

Four Latin forms of one clause stand among these witnesses: Augustine's *in adjuvandum mihi respice*; the Clementine's and Theodoret's Migne Latin's *ad adjuvandum me respice*; Cassiodorus's and the missal's *in auxilium meum respice*; and Jerome's *in adiutorium meum respice*. **None of these commentaries has a counterpart to the printed refrain**, and none of them is expounding a chant.

Not one of the five reads *confundantur et reveantur* as wishing the enemies' destruction, and the five relieve it four ways: Augustine and Bellarmine together as a prophecy already fulfilled at the Resurrection, Cassiodorus as a prayer for the persecutors' conversion, Theodoret as a petition that historical enemies be routed and fail of what they want, Aquinas by allowing the penitential and the punitive confusion together. The gentlest of them is a Latin reading and not the tradition's. **Fromage, above this Offertory at printed p. 370, is the one witness who keeps the enemies as enemies:** "The greater the conquests made by the Church, the greater are the efforts of hell to destroy the souls of her dear children. This fearful danger calls for her fervent prayers; and our Offertory-anthem is one of these."

The chant's own reading is verbatim Ps. 70:12, a verse of this Mass's own Communion psalm, with the subject differing. *Simul* stands in Ps. 39:15 and the chant drops it, and in dropping it the chant agrees with the Ps. 69:2–6 doublet at Ps. 69:3, which does not carry the word; but the Offertory keeps *ut auferant eam*, which Ps. 69:3 has not, so the chant is not the Ps. 69 form and the agreement is partial. The psalm is also that of *Ecce venio . . . ut facerem voluntatem tuam* at vv. 7–9, quoted at Heb. 10:5–7 of Christ entering the world — though **those verses lie outside the appointed excerpt**, and the Latin of the quotation differs from the Latin of the psalm at the decisive clause, *corpus autem aptasti mihi* against *aures autem perfecisti mihi*.

This antiphon's wording produced no later reuse: *in auxilium meum respice* is close enough to Ps. 69:2's *Deus in adiutorium meum intende*, the versicle that opens every Hour, that any later use of those words is a use of that verse. The calendar registry gives this Offertory one further appointment, at the Friday after the Second Sunday of Lent; Schuster names the same one.

8. Secret (*Sec.*) — *Munda nos, quæsumus, Dómine*

The prayer asks two things in one movement: that the effect of the sacrifice now offered cleanse us, and that God mercifully complete in us what makes us fit to share it. ***Mereámur* stands in a purpose clause under *pérficie miserátus in nobis***, so the merit named is God's completed work and not a prior claim.

No Father reads this prayer or the Postcommunion. The Latin corpora that carry the reception of this Mass's other elements — Augustine's *Enarrationes* on Pss. 31–40, 61–70, 81–90, 91–100 and 101–110 and his *Quaestiones evangeliorum*, Ambrose's *Expositio* VII–IX, Bede's *In Lucam* entire, Benedict's *Regula* entire, Aquinas's *Catena in Lucam* 14–18, *Super Ephesios* entire and *Super Psalmos* 31–40, and the Tridentine text — carry neither *sacrificii praesentis* nor *mereamur esse participes* nor *Munda nos*. **The one witness who reads it is Fromage**, above this Secret at printed p. 370: "the Sacrifice, at which we are present, and which is to be consummated, in a few moments, by the words of Consecration, is the most direct and efficacious of all the immediate preparations that we can make for the Communion of the Body and Blood, which that Sacrifice produces on the altar."

What the older books supply is the prayer's provenance. **The Secret and the Postcommunion stand together, word for word, in the Old Gelasian**, Book III sect. XII no. 693 at printed p. 231 of Wilson's 1894 edition, under the heading *ITEM ALIA MISSA* and under two collects the Roman Missal does not use here; *Tua nos* is not in that book's three books at all. All three stand together in the Gregorian Hadrianum at sect. XXXV, printed p. 174 of Wilson's 1915 edition, under the heading *DOMINICA .XVII. POST PENTECOSTEN*; and all three again in the Frankish Gelasian at printed p. 184 of Gerbert's *Monumenta veteris liturgiae Alemannicae*, under *Dominica XX. Post Pentecosten. Gelas.*, with a proper preface *VD. . . . Precantes, ut Ihs Xps Filius tuus Dns noster sua nos gratia protegat. Gerbert marks each oration: Tua nos gg.*, Gregorian as Muratori has it, alone; the Secret and the Postcommunion *g. El. gg.*, Gelasian, Eligian and Gregorian together. **The Veronese has none of the three**; its one near miss, *tua nos semper gratia praeueniens laetificatur*, is a different prayer.

The 1862 Pustet printed *Alia Secreta* beside this one, and the Vatican typica of 1604 carries *alia Secreta* and *tertia ad libitum* in the same window. Those belong to the discipline the general decree of 23 March 1955 abolished and are no part of this formulary.

9. Communion (*Comm.*) — *Dómine, memorábor iustítiae tuæ solíus*

The exposition that stands over this antiphon is an exposition of exactly its three verses and of nothing else. Four commentators reach them, and they divide at both of the antiphon's hinges — what *solíus* excludes, and what the three ages are.

Augustine, *Enarratio in Ps. 70*, sermo II §§1, 2 and 4 The three sections are Ps. 70:16, 17 and 18, the antiphon's own extent. On v. 16 he fastens on the one word: *Domine, memorabor iustitiae tuae solius. O solius! Quid addidit, solius? . . . Iustitia tua sola me liberat; mea sola non sunt nisi peccata* (1 Cor. 4:7); and *Gratia gratis data est: nam nisi gratis esset, gratia non esset . . . nihil tuum praecessit, ut acciperes*. On v. 17: *Quid me docuisti? Quia tuae solius iustitiae memorari debeo . . . Debeatur poena; reddita est gratia . . . docuisti me nihil in me praecessisse*. On v. 18 he notes the Greek pair behind the Latin doublet *senectam et senium*, then gives two senses: individually, *usque ad ultimum meum, nisi mecum fueris, non erit aliquid meriti mei: gratia tua semper perseveret mecum*; and ecclesially, *vox est enim Ecclesiae*, the Church whose youth was the age of the apostles and who endures to the end against those who predicted that Christianity would last a season. §3 of the same discourse cites **Ps. 85:11**, the psalm of this Mass's own Introit, for the point that grace must lead as well as start.

Cassiodorus, *Expositio psalmorum*, in Ps. LXX §§4, 21–23, 32–33 On the psalm as a whole he says what Augustine says and nearly in Augustine's words: the speaker preaches Christ's charity *quae nullis meritis praecedentibus gratis semper impenditur*, and *Cum totus hic psalmus gratiam Domini, quae gratis datur, summa intentione commendat*. **On the antiphon's first clause he disagrees with him.** *Solius* does not exclude the singer's own righteousness but refers the remembering to the Judgment — *illo scilicet tempore cum agnos sequestrat ab haedis . . . Tunc enim vere memor erit iustitiae solius Domini, quoniam eam et mirabilem, et singularem esse cognoscit*. On *a iuventute mea* youth is the age at which a man first comes to grace; on *usque in senectam et senium* he makes Augustine's philological observation independently and then periodises the Church's ages differently, her youth the Crucifixion and the martyrs, her *senecta* the present age near the end, her *senium* the last declining time *quando et saevus ille tyrannus adveniet*. **His Judgment gloss here is the same sheep-and-goats formula he uses at Ps. 101:17 for the Gradual's *videbitur in maiestate sua***, so in this one commentator the Gradual's second half and the Communion's first clause name one event.

Robert Bellarmine, *Explanatio in Psalmos*, printed pp. 212–213 The literal-historical voice of the four. On *solíus* the exclusion is of every other support — “I will lose sight completely of human counsel, of my own strength, or of my friends . . . ‘thy justice alone,’ by virtue of which you keep your promises.” On *a iuventute mea* he declines allegory: “it was in consequence, that I, an unarmed youth, fought with a bear and a lion, and conquered both them and the giant Goliath.” And he makes the petition run to the completion of the psalter, “until I shall have finished the book of Psalms, through which I will shew forth thy arm to all posterity” — a striking reading for a Communion antiphon, and the clause carrying it stands outside the appointed text.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG 80 cols. 1423–1426 His periodisation is unlike anything the Latins give: youth is the age of Moses and the giving of the Law, and old age is the Law’s end. *Atque hinc manifestum est, eum magni Mosis tempus juventutem vocare. Per illum enim lex data fuit; Prophetice David futura praedicit, et senectutem vocat legis finem. Hoc autem post Domini Christi adventum contigit* — with Heb. 8:13 in support, *quod autem antiquatur et senescit, prope interitum est. On memorabor iustitiae tuae* he anchors the clause in the preceding verse’s justice, the just verdict by which God judged between the speaker and his enemies. And he cross-refers *quoniam non cognovi litteraturam* to Ps. 39:5–6, a verse of this Mass’s own Offertory psalm, as Migne’s footnote records. In his Greek the word for *alone* stands in the genitive and may attach to *thy* rather than to *justice*, where the Latin *iustitiae tuae solius* attaches it to the justice; Augustine’s whole reading of the clause rests on the Latin, and the facsimile does not settle the Greek construal.

Jerome, *Epistula* 106 §43, on two clauses of these verses Against Greek copies reading *Deus meus* he holds that *meus* is superfluous in *Deus, docuisti me a iuventute mea*; and against copies reading *mirabilia tua* at *donec annuntiem brachium tuum* he holds that *mirabilia tua* has been carried up from the preceding verse and that *brachium* is right. **He adjudicates the wording of the antiphon’s own three verses, and the exact words it sings at one clause of the two:** *Deus, docuisti me a iuventute mea* is the first half of Ps. 70:17 and stands in the antiphon word for word, and *donec annuntiem brachium tuum* stands in Ps. 70:18 past *ne derelinquas me*, where the antiphon stops.

So the antiphon’s first clause carries four readings and its span carries four more. *Solius* excludes, for Augustine, any righteousness of the singer’s own; for Bellarmine, human counsel and his own strength; for Cassiodorus it refers the remembering to the Judgment; for Theodoret it is God’s just dealing with the speaker. **The grace-alone sense is Augustine’s, and Bellarmine’s in a different key, and it is not the undivided tradition’s.** The three ages are Augustine’s beginning of faith and, ecclesially, the age of the apostles; Cassiodorus’s coming to grace, with the last age Antichrist’s; Bellarmine’s David’s own boyhood; Theodoret’s the age of Moses. **All four read the span as a span of God’s teaching and none as a lifetime in the ordinary sense.** And Fromage, above this antiphon at printed pp. 370–371, reads it from outside the exegetical tradition altogether: the Church, filled with the Wisdom of the Father, “promises God, as her thank-offering, that she will keep His justice, which is His law, and that she will labour to make His divine teaching produce its fruits.”

Augustine’s most quotable formula on this doctrine, *sua dona coronabit, non merita tua*, stands in sermo II §5, on v. 19 — one verse past where the antiphon stops — so it is not a comment on the sung text. And the NPNF English runs a single section series across both discourses where the Migne Latin restarts at 1 for Sermo II.

The antiphon is the only appointed scriptural element of this Mass with no verbal departure from the Clementine, and it restates the psalm’s own earlier petitions at vv. 5 and 9. Its rare genitive *solius* stands in four verses of the whole Clementine, and one of them is **Ecclus. 3:21**, *magna potentia Dei solius, et ab humilibus honoratur*, inside the sapiential humility passage behind the appointed Gospel’s conclusion and the verse Fromage reaches for there. **Only *solius* is inside appointed text:** *potentias Domini* is the unsung first half of v. 16. *Sénium* occurs nowhere else in the Clementine.

The calendar registry gives the Communion one further appointment, the Thursday after the Fourth Sunday of Lent, which Schuster names; the 1962 book’s own text layer adds a second, a votive Mass *pro quacumque necessitate* with *T. P. Alleluia* added, the registry holding no votive Masses at all. **That Lenten feria is also where the Fifteenth Sunday’s Gospel is read**, Luke 7:11–16, so one Lenten Mass holds together what the two September Sundays hold apart, and Lasance’s 1945 hand missal prints the same pairing.

The Douay’s wording of these verses has no later use: “grey hairs” stands in English and American literature as an ageing character described and nothing else, and “I will be mindful of thy justice” matches no newspaper page in *Chronicle America*. The Authorized Version prints neither phrase at these verses.

No New Testament book quotes any verse this Mass appoints. Heb. 1:10–12 quotes Ps. 101 and Heb. 10:5–7 quotes Ps. 39, both outside the excerpts the chants sing, and Ps. 85:1, 3 and 5, Ps. 97:1, Ps. 39:14–15 and Ps. 70:16–18 are quoted in no book from Matthew to the Apocalypse. **Every christological reading of these five chants therefore rests on the psalms’ wider context, on typology, or on the commentators above, and on no apostolic citation of the words actually sung.**

10. Postcommunion (*Postcomm.*) — *Purifica, quæsumus, Dómine, mentes nostras*

The last oration asks for cleansing and renewal by the sacraments just received, and then for help to the body, *præsens páriter et futurum*. **Two words tie it back into the formulary:** *auxilium*, which stands in this Mass at the Offertory and here and nowhere else, and *rénova*, which asks for renewal where the Epistle asks for strengthening *in interiorem hóminem*, and answers the newness the Alleluia sings as *cánticum novum*.

How the Secret’s *sacrificii præséntis efféctu* stands to this prayer’s *rénova cæléstibus sacraméntis* — offered sacrifice against received sacrament — neither text says. Fromage gives a direction of dependence and only he: the Sacrifice is the immediate preparation for the Communion it produces, so the two orations are two moments of one movement. And above this prayer, at printed p. 371, he construes *præsens páriter et futurum* temporally: “let us pray, with the Church, that we may be renewed by the purity, which these heavenly mysteries bring to us, who are well prepared for the gift: the effect of such a gift tells upon our bodies, both in this and in the next life.” The Latin leaves one thing he does not consider — whether the Secret’s *eius* refers to the sacrifice or to its effect.

Its provenance is the Secret’s, the two standing together in the Old Gelasian under collects this Missal does not use here.

The 1862 Pustet corroborates this oration word for word and whole, the conjunction *et* before *rénova* included, at its printed p. 341: *Purifica, quæsumus Dómine, mentes nostras benígnus, et rénova cæléstibus sacraméntis: ut consequénter et córporum præsens páriter, et futurum capiámus auxilium. Per Dóminum.* That conjunction stands at the end of a printed line, where this printing’s optical layer loses material, and it is printed on the page image. Two older books carry it at the same prayer: the tracked full texts of the *Missale Romanum* of Venice, 1570 and of the Vatican typical edition of 1604 both have *et* before *rénova*, read there at optical state and for that word alone. The differences from the typical edition — *cæ* for *cæ*, the comma after *páriter* and none after *quæsumus* — change no word a reader would say aloud.

The 1862 book also printed *Alia Postcommunio. Mundet et muniat. and Tertia ad libitum.* at this Sunday; both belong to the pre-1955 discipline and are no part of this formulary.

Source-Grounded Synthesis Across the Propers

Taken whole, the formulary shows what no element of it says alone: its three strands reached this Sunday on different schedules, only the Introit's centonisation is its own alone, the book's general rules and not this day settle what is printed around it, and the published English reaches its doctrine at one element. Dom Lucien Fromage's chapter for this Sunday, in his continuation of Guéranger's *The Liturgical Year*, is devotional and doctrinal throughout and carries no liturgical history; Schuster carries the chant history and does not read the Mass as one action.

C1. The Sunday's number is the least stable thing about it, and its three strands were assembled on different schedules

The orations did not arrive as a set. The Secret and the Postcommunion are a pair in the older books before either is this Sunday's, and the Collect reaches them only where a Gregorian book sets all three at one Sunday, so **the trio as the 1962 book has it is a composition of the Gregorian tradition and not an inheritance entire from the Gelasian. Two editors more than a century apart agree on that from opposite directions:** Gerbert divides the three by descent, marking the Collect apart from the other two, where Wilson prints them undivided as one Mass.

The offset is not one number, and it moves inside one book. The Gregorian stands one Sunday out. The Frankish Gelasian stands two out at the Fifteenth Sunday and four out here — **and Gerbert states the arithmetic himself** in a footnote to that very page: *quae est hic Dom. XX. in Missali est XVI. & apud MURAT. XVII.* The two places that fall between are printed in his book. One is the September Ember Sunday at his p. 178, headed *Die Dom. Ad S. PETRUM*, whose collect *Absolve, quaesumus Dne, tuorum delicta populorum* is the collect the 1962 Missal prints at the Twenty-third Sunday after Pentecost, word for word apart from one word Gerbert's text carries and the Missal's does not — *a peccatorum nostrorum nexibus* there against a *peccatorum nexibus* in the 1962 book — so that Mass did not vanish from the Roman book but moved seven Sundays later. The other is at his p. 180 under the running head *DOM. XIX. POST PENT.*, headed *Dominica vacat.*: a Mass with its own items, printed as a Mass, with Gerbert's footnote that it is missing from Muratori and from the Roman Missal alike. Wilson's own footnote adds that Pamelius joins the second collect of that twentieth-Sunday Mass to the same Secret and Postcommunion at his seventeenth Sunday, which is the number Wilson's Gregorian gives.

The chants travel on a different number again. The antiphony cues of Cod. Ottobonianus lat. 313, in the margins of the Gregorian as Wilson prints them, put this formulary's Introit, Gradual, Offertory and Communion together against the heading *Dominica XV post Pentecosten* — one below the 1962 heading and two below the sacramentary heading carrying the same Sunday's orations — and the alleluia they give there is *Laudate dominum*. The same alignment holds through five consecutive Masses in that manuscript. **Two readings of Wilson's footnote reference marks place the cue block differently:** one puts the set two Sundays further on, another puts the offset at zero. What does not turn on the attachment is that the four chants travel together in that manuscript and that its alleluia is not the 1962 book's.

The readings do not travel as a set at all. In the *Liber Comitis* as Migne prints it at PL 30 col. 522, this Gospel stands under *Dominica mensis viii* — paired with Ephesians 4:1–6, not with Eph. 3:13–21, which is absent from that lectionary altogether. *Deficiatis* stands once in the whole text of PL 30, in a Pelagian commentary among the spuria; the eight Ephesians pericopes that Comes appoints are Eph. 1:3, 2:19, 4:1, 4:23, 4:29, 5:1, 5:11 and 5:15; a second independent digitisation reads the same; and neither of the two lacunae Migne marks falls where this Epistle would stand. **So at this Sunday the lectionary is the least stable of the three strands:** the chants and the orations travel as sets and differ only in the number a book gives them, and the readings do not travel together at all.

A medieval use keeps the split whole, and the English books received it. Dickinson's *Missale ad usum . . . Sarum* puts this formulary's chants and Epistle at *Dominica Decima sexta post Trinitatem*, joined to the orations and Gospel of the Roman Fifteenth Sunday, and its Collect and Gospel at *Dominica Decima septima*, joined to the chants and Epistle of the Roman Seventeenth: the chant strand one Sunday earlier than the oration strand, the same direction as the Ottobonianus margin. Its alleluias at those two Sundays are *Qui timent Dominum sperent in eum* and *Dextera Domini fecit virtutem*, neither of them the Roman book's — both incipits, and the arrangement they belong to, from an uncorrected optical layer of Dickinson's columns, without image collation. **Brightman prints that Sarum Mass of Trinity XVII against the English books of 1549, 1552 and 1661 and the arrangement is unchanged through all three** — “Lorde, we praye thee that thy grace maye alwayes preuent and folowe vs, and make vs continually to be geuen to all good workes,” with Eph. iv and Luke xiv — and Blunt tabulates this

formulary's own Epistle, Eph. iii. 13–21, at the *Sixteenth* Sunday after Trinity with a different Gospel. **The Prayer Book did not create the split; it inherited it. The four witnesses that agree the Collect is Gregorian do not agree where in the Gregorian it stands:** Wilson's Hadrianum prints it at the seventeenth Sunday and Gerbert marks it Gregorian as Muratori has it, at that same number, while Brightman tags it (*Greg. 172*) and Blunt *Greg. Orationes Quotidianae*, the Gregorian's daily orations rather than any Sunday.

And a Western rite outside the Roman one reads the same lesson at a different moment of the year. The Milan de Sirturis Ambrosian Missal of 1712 carries *flecto genua* once, in a window headed *sabbato in albis missa pro baptizatis*, and the pericope there runs from *Fratres obsecro vos ne deficiatis* to *in omnes generationes seculi seculorum amen* — **Eph. 3:13–21 entire, with the same liturgical incipit adaptation the Roman book makes**, read as the baptismal lesson of Easter Saturday with the neophyte chant *quasi modo geniti infantes* in the same stream.

Wilson and Schuster give the offset two different mechanisms: Wilson's, a difference of numeration base between *post Pentecosten* and *post Octavas Pentecostes*; Schuster's, the interruption of the post-Pentecost count by cycles reckoned from St Lawrence, St Cyprian and St Michael. **No book collated for this Sunday decides between them.** Schuster's own title for this Sunday, *Prima post natale Sancti Cypriani*, is the hinge where the Lawrence count ends and the Cyprian count begins — **a title he prints at the head of his chapter without naming the book he takes it from**, and he says elsewhere in the same series that the count of these feast-relative Sundays was not uniform. The 1962 book prints only *DOMINICA DECIMA SEXTA post Pentecosten*.

This Sunday also opens the temporal cycle's course of Ephesians, and the single break in it falls at the Eighteenth Sunday, which Schuster judges to have been originally aliturgical. **Schuster says the course runs until the Twenty-third Sunday; the 1962 book reads Ephesians on the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, Nineteenth, Twentieth and Twenty-first and Philippians thereafter**, so his extent holds of the captivity Epistles as a group, or of a differently numbered series, and of nothing narrower.

Three witnesses name stations for the days around this Sunday and none for this one. Schuster names one for the Seventeenth Sunday, one for the Nineteenth and one for each of the three September Ember Days; Wilson's Appendix names the same September stations in the books' own words — *ad S. Petrum*, *ad S. Mariam*, *ad Apostolos*; and Gerbert's own p. 178 heads the September Ember Sunday *Die Dom. Ad S. PETRUM* while his p. 184, carrying this formulary's orations, has no station of any kind.

C2. Only the Introit's centonisation is this Mass's alone, and the Alleluia has the weakest claim of the five to its place

Four of the five chants are printed elsewhere in the same 1962 book. The Gradual serves the Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Sundays after the Epiphany, and its own first verse returns as the Alleluia verse of the Eighteenth Sunday two Sundays later. The Offertory has one other appointment, the Friday after Lent II. The Communion has two, the Thursday after Lent IV and a votive Mass *pro quacumque necessitate*, this last standing in the 1962 book's own text layer, which the registry does not reach. And the Alleluia's verse, Ps. 97:1, is the Introit antiphon of the Fourth Sunday after Easter and stands as the psalm verse at four Introits besides — Easter Thursday, the Assumption, the Maternity of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Octave of the Nativity — five further appointments spread across three seasons (Paschaltide, Christmastide and the time after Pentecost) and three sections of the book, where four of the Gradual's five are a block of consecutive Epiphany Sundays and the fifth is the Alleluia verse of the Eighteenth Sunday, two Sundays after this one. **The Introit is the one exception:** no other formulary in the book takes its centonisation of Ps. 85:3 and 5 with v. 1, though the psalm itself is drawn on at the Fifteenth Sunday, at the Friday of Lent III, at the Ember Friday of Lent I and at the Most Holy Name of Jesus.

The calendar registry named in the References carries all of those appointments but the votive Mass; Schuster asserts three of them independently and the registry adds the others, and every one of the negatives above is its count.

The Alleluia is the weakest of the five. At AMS 188, as the *gregorien.info* database indexes Hesbert's six oldest Roman graduals, only three of the six — Mont-Blandin, Corbie and Senlis — carry the formulary as a set, and those three disagree about the Gradual: *Timebunt gentes* at Corbie and Senlis, *Bonum est confidere* and *Misit Dominus verbum suum* at Mont-Blandin. Monza has a Gradual at that formulary and nothing else, *Liberasti nos*, which is a fourth answer to the same question; Compiègne and Rheinau have no entry at it at all, and their indexes are not truncated. The only alleluia any of the six records there is *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes*, in Senlis — which is also what the Ottobonianus margin gives, by a wholly independent route — and *Cantate Domino canticum novum* has no

AMS 188 entry anywhere in them. Wilson brackets the Ottobonianus alleluia cues as later-hand additions; what those brackets assert about the manuscript is not established, and the database's result stands without them.

C3. What the 1962 book prints around this formulary it settles by a general rule and not at this Sunday

Three of the things a reader meets on these two pages — the rank, the *Credo* and the Preface of the Most Holy Trinity — are the book's standing dispositions for a class of days, and the fourth, the single oration where an older book printed three, is the one place where the day's own appointment visibly changed.

The formulary appoints one Collect, one Secret and one Postcommunion, where the 1862 Pustet at the same Sunday printed *Secunda Oratio. A cunctis nos.* and *Tertia ad libitum.* with their matching *Alia Secreta* and *Alia Postcommunio*. Under the 1862 book those followed from its *Rubricae generales*, tit. II and *De Oracionibus* nn. 2 and 11, which prescribed *A cunctis* as the second oration from the octave of Pentecost to Advent; under the 1960 Code the day takes one, by 1962 RG n. 434 b, *in dominicis II classis, nulla alia admittitur oratio, praeter commemorationem festi II classis*. **The step between them is the general decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites of 23 March 1955**, *De rubricis ad simpliciore formam redigendis*, at *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 47 (1955) 218–224, binding *kalendis Ianuariis anni 1956*. It does the work twice over: Tit. II n. 1, *Gradus et ritus semiduplex supprimitur*, removes the rank on which the 1862 three-oration rule for this day depended, and Tit. V a) n. 1, ***Orationes pro diversitate temporum assignatae abolentur***, abolishes the seasonally assigned orations of which the *A cunctis* is one. **The books this Sunday was celebrated from print the decree's own phrase inside this formulary**: the 1920 Vatican typical edition and the pre-1955 Benziger both set *Orationes pro diversitate Temporum assignatae, ut supra* immediately after the Collect, with *Aliae Secretae* and *Aliae Postcommuniones* matching. The 1960 Code inherited that change; its own contribution here was the reclassification from semiduplex, and then duplex, to second class.

Credo. restates a general rule rather than a decision of this Sunday: 1962 RG n. 475 a orders the symbol *in qualibet dominica*, the 1862 book ordered it *in omnibus Dominicis per annum*, and the 1955 decree narrowed the rule between them — Tit. V b) n. 7, *Credo dicitur dumtaxat in dominicis et festis I classis* — and left this Sunday inside it. **The Preface of the Most Holy Trinity is likewise not proper to this Mass**: 1962 RG n. 494 b gives it *tamquam de Tempore . . . in omnibus dominicis II classis extra tempus natalicium et paschale*, and the 1862 book carries the same rule at its *De Praefatione* n. 5 while printing no preface direction inside this Sunday's formulary. **The printing change is older than 1962**: *Præfatio de Ssma Trinitate*. already stands inside this formulary in the 1920 typical edition and in the Benziger beside it, so it arrived with the Pius X typical edition. The 1759 attribution of that Sunday preface to Clement XIII is the *Catholic Encyclopedia*'s report at its article "Preface"; the article names no *Acta* or *Decreta* locus, and Fortescue's own *The Mass* carries neither the rule nor the date.

Nothing printed around the ten appointed texts is proper to this Sunday, and the one element of the frame that did change here is the one whose removal a decree outside the Missal records.

C4. The published English reaches this Mass's doctrine at one element, and stops short at the two readings its strongest arguments turn on

The Douay follows the psalter and not the chant. It renders *gloria* at the Gradual and *ad adjuvandum me* at the Offertory, so it answers neither *maiestate* nor *in auxilium meum respice* — the two Latin readings on which the strongest cross-element arguments of this formulary turn — so what those arguments join stands only in the Latin, at the element, and no English of the appointed words shows it to a reader at all. **At the Gradual the two comings reach English even though the word does not:** Bellarmine's 1866 English states both comings at the verse itself, and where his lemma keeps the psalter's noun his exposition reaches the chant's. At the Offertory nothing answers, his English there being the Douay's.

The Communion is the exception in both directions: it departs from the psalter at no word, and therefore its English says what its Latin says. The Douay of Ps. 70:16 reads *I will be mindful of thy justice alone*, which is the antiphon's Latin word for word. **So the one place in this Mass where its doctrine of grace stands in English on the appointed words is a chant and not a prayer** — and Augustine's exposition of Ps. 70:16–18 is an exposition of the sung text and of nothing else.

The three orations reach English by another route and lose more of the Latin. Their witness is a free devotional rendering of 1861 and not a construe: *præveniat* arrives in the older sense of *prevent*, which an English reader now hears as its opposite; *pérŕice miserátus in nobis*, the verb the Secret gives God and the clause that governs *mereámur*, does not survive into it at all; and the Postcommunion's *córpórum . . . præsens páriter et futúrum . . . auxílium* becomes a paraphrase that keeps the two times and loses the noun they belong to. **What the orations lose in that rendering the English *Liturgical Year* supplies:** Shepherd's translation prints an English of the Collect beside Fromage's exposition of it and reads the Secret, the Communion and the Postcommunion in English at their own places, so the three orations and the Communion antiphon all reach an English reader by a route the missal itself does not print. **The doctrine the three prayers say in Latin is sayable to an English reader on the appointed words at the Communion and nowhere else in this Mass**, and the two decisive chant words have no English witness here at all.

The Propers: Notable and Quotable

Five afterlives of wording from the scriptural propers, each a use that moves the phrase into a register its apostle or evangelist did not occupy.

Epistle, Eph. 3:16 — “the inner man,” now the belly

Appointed text and locus. Marginal no. 1594: *ut det vobis secundum divitias glóriæ suæ, virtute corroborari per Spiritum eius in interiorem hominem.*

Later texts and loci. Jerome K. Jerome, *Three Men in a Boat (To Say Nothing of the Dog)* (London: J. W. Arrowsmith, 1889), **chapter XIX**, the supper after the Alhambra: “the odour of Burgundy, and the smell of French sauces, and the sight of clean napkins and long loaves, knocked as a very welcome visitor at the door of our inner man.” Anthony Trollope, *Barchester Towers* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1857), **chapter VII**, “**The Dean and Chapter Take Counsel**”: “When I say up rose the archdeacon, I speak of the inner man, which then sprang up to more immediate action, for the doctor had bodily been standing all along with his back to the dean’s empty fire-grate.”

“Inner man” is the sole occurrence of that collocation in the Authorized Version, and it stands at this verse. **The idiom’s ancestry is Pauline in general rather than this verse’s in particular:** the Authorized Version, and the Douay with it, reads “the inward man” at Rom. 7:22 and at 2 Cor. 4:16. **At this verse the Douay also has “the inward man” and does not carry the phrase at all**, so the English that carries it here is the Authorized Version’s.

The turn. The words Paul uses for the self strengthened by the Spirit are now most familiar as a polite word for the belly, and **that gastric sense is an idiom of the language and not a joke either novelist invented:** it stands in 1882, seven years before Jerome K. Jerome, in Henry William Herbert’s “The Yorkshire Moors,” *Life and Writings of Frank Forester*, vol. 2, p. 35 — “we should be there to refresh the inner man, and take up the fresh dogs for the afternoon.” Jerome’s narrator has been ten days on cold meat and jam, and Trollope applies the same manoeuvre to an archdeacon at a chapter meeting, the Pauline interior self standing up while the body does not.

Gospel, Luke 14:5 — “the ox is in the ditch”

Appointed text and locus. Marginal no. 1597: *Cuius vestrum asinus, aut bos in puteum cadet, et non continuo extrahet illum die sabbati?*

Later texts and loci. *San Antonio Daily Light* (San Antonio, Tex.), **Thursday 7 October 1897, page 8**, an editorial paragraph headed “THE EMERGENCY MET”: “When the ox is in the ditch its no time to stop and discuss parliamentary ethics; the thing to do is to go to work and pull the ox out of the the mire”; the 1897 page sets *the the*, and the budget was stalled while two aldermen figured on parliamentary tactics. Clifton Johnson, *Highways and Byways of the South* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904), chapter “The Birthplace of Lincoln,” **p. 169**, of a farm wife near Hodgenville, Kentucky: “‘The ox is in the ditch,’ said she, referring to the New Testament excuse for Sabbath work where the need is great, ‘and Billy must mend this gate if it is Sunday. It was broken yesterday, and I couldn’t sleep last night for thinkin’ the hogs might come in and turn over my kittle of soft soap.’”

Johnson’s own gloss documents the dependence and the idiom is not the verse’s wording: the saying has a ditch where the Latin has *puteum* and both the Douay and the Authorized Version have a pit, so it is a paraphrase of this verse and never a quotation of it. **The rival ancestors carry one half of it each:** Matt. 12:11 has a sheep in a pit on the sabbath but no ox, and Deut. 22:4, *Si videris asinum fratris tui aut bovem cecidisse in via*, has the fallen ox but no sabbath. Neither of the nearest Exodus laws carries that fallen ox: Exod. 23:4 sends back an ox that is straying, and Exod. 23:5 relieves an ass lying under its burden. Luke 14:5 is the only place in the canon carrying both, which is why the idiom’s sabbath sense points here.

The turn. The emergency shrinks from a drowning beast to a soap kettle and then to a stalled city budget, and the verse survives as the standing American excuse for suspending a rule. It runs through the Library of Congress’s *Chronicling America* from 1897 into the 1950s, in Texas, Georgia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Arkansas, Mississippi and Washington, D.C., beside a devotional life of its own: the 1942 *Evening Star* of Washington carries it as a Lutheran sermon title in a church-notice column.

Gospel, Luke 14:10 — “Sit Down in the Lowest Room.” as the title of a secular poem

Appointed text and locus. Marginal no. 1597: *Sed cum vocátus fúeris, vade, recúmbe in novíssimo loco: ut, cum vénerit qui te invitávit, dicat tibi: Amíce, ascénde supérius.*

Later text and loci. Christina G. Rossetti, “**Sit Down in the Lowest Room.**”, *Macmillan’s Magazine*, ed. David Masson, **No. 53, vol. IX** (London: Macmillan and Co., **March 1864**), **pp. 436–439**, first line “Like flowers sequestered from the sun.” Collected as “The Lowest Room” in *The Poetical Works of Christina Georgina Rossetti*, ed. William Michael Rossetti (London: Macmillan and Co., 1904), poem at **pp. 16–19**, editorially dated 30 September 1856, with the editor’s note at pp. 460–461.

The link is verbatim and it is carried by the title: the 1864 heading is the Authorized Version’s imperative clause, full stop included, set over a secular poem, and “lowest room” occurs in that Bible at Luke 14:9 and 14:10 only, both inside this appointed pericope. The poem’s body reads “Content to take the lowest place,” which is the Douay wording, so the title and the body draw on two English versions and the appointed Latin lies behind both.

The turn. A rule of banquet precedence and a promise of eschatological reversal becomes the name for Victorian women’s enforced self-effacement, with the reversal deferred to the trumpet. The poem is a dialogue between two sisters, one plain and bookish and stung by Homer’s heroes, the other beautiful and married; twenty years on the speaker sits alone — “Not to be first: how hard to learn / That lifelong lesson of the past. . . So now in patience I possess / My soul year after tedious year, / Content to take the lowest place, / The place assigned me here” — and ends “Yea, sometimes still I lift my heart / To the Archangelic trumpet-burst, / When all deep secrets shall be shown, / And many last be first.”

The editor’s own note records what the title cost her: the Gospel imperative displaced the manuscript’s title, *A Fight over the Body of Homer*, “perhaps the better title of the two”; Dante Gabriel Rossetti wrote in 1875 of “a real taint, to some extent, of modern vicious style. . . what might be called a falsetto muscularity” in “the long piece called *The Lowest Room*”; “Christina, on receiving this letter, did not acquiesce in its purport,” and “she always retained *The Lowest Room* in succeeding editions.” Rossetti also wrote a short devotional lyric “The Lowest Place” and a separate devotional piece headed “Sit down in the Lowest Room”; **neither is this poem.**

Epistle, Eph. 3:18 — “the depth and breadth and height” of a love for one man

Appointed text and locus. Marginal no. 1594: *ut possítis comprehendere cum ómnibus sanctis, quæ sit latitúdo, et longitúdo, et sublímitas, et profúndum: scire étiam supereminéntem sciéntiæ caritátem Christi.*

Later text and locus. Elizabeth Barrett Browning, *Sonnets from the Portuguese*, **Sonnet XLIII**, first published in *Poems* (London: Chapman and Hall, **1850**), lines 1–4: “How do I love thee? Let me count the ways. / I love thee to the depth and breadth and height / My soul can reach, when feeling out of sight / For the ends of Being and ideal Grace.”

The identification is a scholar’s and the relation is an echo. John S. Phillipson, “‘How Do I Love Thee?’ — an Echo of St. Paul,” *The Victorian Newsletter*, ed. William E. Buckler, **No. 22 (Fall 1962)**, **p. 22, note 7**, writes that Barrett Browning “seems to echo St. Paul, Ephesians, III, 17–19, in her famous declaration,” and closes that “Sonnet 43 echoes St. Paul’s thought and phraseology while adapting them to a new context.”

Barrett Browning names no source in the sonnet, and the dependence is Phillipson’s identification rather than her own claim. The sonnet has three of the four nouns, reordered, and drops *length*, against the Authorized Version’s “the breadth, and length, and depth, and height” and the Douay’s “the breadth and length and height and depth”: a reuse of the vocabulary and of the measuring gesture, not a quotation.

The turn. Paul prays that the Ephesians may take the measure of a love that passes knowledge; Barrett Browning measures her love for Robert Browning, keeping the religious lexis — soul, Grace, faith, saints — around it, and from that sonnet the phrase passed into the standard wedding reading and the greeting-card formula. **Phillipson reads the transfer as sacralising the profane rather than secularising the sacred**, the religious lexis moving toward the beloved and not away from God.

Gospel, Luke 14:11 — “he that humbleth himself,” improved

Appointed text and locus. Marginal no. 1597, the sentence the pericope ends on: *quia omnis, qui se exáltat, humiliábitur: et qui se humiliat, exaltábitur*. Douay: “Because every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled: and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.”

Later text and locus. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches: Ein Buch für freie Geister*, Erster Band, Zweites Hauptstück (“Zur Geschichte der moralischen Empfindungen”), **aphorism 87, entire**: “Lucas 18,14 verbessert. — Wer sich selbst erniedrigt, will erhöht werden.” In Helen Zimmern’s English of 1910, *Human, All-Too-Human: A Book for Free Spirits*, Part I, **printed p. 88**: “St. Luke xviii. 14, Improved. — He that humbleth himself *wishes to be* exalted.”

The English clause is verbatim and its alteration exact. Zimmern leaves the Authorized Version’s “He that humbleth himself” untouched and changes only *shall be* to *wishes to be*. Nietzsche’s German follows the received Luther wording of Luke 18:14 and turns it at the modal, **and that Luther wording stands unchecked in any public-domain German Bible**. And the title claims the act: *verbessert*, improved.

Nietzsche’s heading cites *Lucas 18,14*, the Pharisee and the Publican, and not Luke 14:11, the verse this Mass appoints. The two carry the identical clause in the Clementine Latin the missal prints, in the Douay and in the Authorized Version, so the sentence he rewrites is word for word the sentence the appointed Gospel ends on — but the parallel is the one he names. Matt. 23:12 carries the same reversal in different words; the two Lucan verses are the two that are verbally identical.

The turn. The promise spoken over a dinner table where guests were scrambling for the best couch is answered eighteen centuries later by a philosopher who **agrees that the humble will be exalted and says that is exactly why they humble themselves** — the parable’s cure re-described as the disease, and set under a title that claims to be repairing Scripture. It stands against Bede at the same verse, for whom the humbling and the exalting are the Lord’s acts and not men’s, and against Benedict, who makes the sentence the head of his chapter on humility.

The Propers: Interpretive Possibilities

Exploratory editorial and AI proposals

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 joins at least two precisely named appointed elements and ends on the strongest thing that stands against it. **No connection here is claimed to be unknown, unprecedented, first, or authored by a model**; where a proposal and a checked witness conflict, the witness wins. The precedent search behind each of these, its corpus and its bounds, is recorded in `research/scope.md` and summarised in the terminal appendix.

Editorial proposal — P1. Two systems of measurement in one formulary

Anchor: Epistle (*Ep.*), Eph. 3:18–19, *quæ sit latitudo, et longitudo, et sublimitas, et profundum: scire etiam supereminentem scientiæ caritatem Christi*; Gospel (*Gosp.*), Luke 14:8–11, *non discumbas in primo loco, recumbe in novissimo loco, Amice, ascende superius, qui se exaltat, humiliabitur*

Mechanism: The reading asks the hearer to take four measures of a charity it says in the next breath surpasses knowledge. The Gospel, in the same Mass, ranks two seats and a comparative — first place, lowest place, higher — and settles the ranking by an act that is not the guest's. **One magnitude is offered for measurement and declared immeasurable; the other is small, countable, and where the hearer is told to stand.**

Fruit: A way of preaching the Epistle's dimensions that does not turn them into a devotional flourish: the Mass answers an immeasurable magnitude with a measurable one and makes the measurable one the place to be.

What the element-by-element reading misses: Read separately, the Epistle's four measures are an ornament of Pauline prayer and the Gospel's places are table manners. Read together they are two measuring systems in one formulary, and the second is the one the hearer is given something to do about.

Controlling limit: **The join is lexical at one end and narrative at the other**, four spatial nouns against three seat positions, which is weaker than a shared verb would be and is stated as such. **And the Epistle says in terms that its magnitude surpasses knowledge**, so the Gospel's table must not become a measure of it: the proposal fails at once if the seating is made a scale for the charity rather than a different order of thing. And none of the six readings of the measures standing over that verse — Chrysostom's, Augustine's three, Aquinas's and Fromage's — reaches the Gospel at all.

Editorial proposal — P2. The swollen body and the cleansed mind

Anchor: Gospel (*Gosp.*), Luke 14:2 *Et ecce homo quidam hydrópicus erat ante illum* and 14:4 *Ipsa vero apprehensum sanavit eum*; Secret (*Sec.*), *Munda nos . . . sacrificiū præsentis effectū*; Postcommunion (*Postcomm.*), *Purifica . . . mentes nostras benignus, et renova cælestibus sacramentis*

Mechanism: The Mass has an outward healing in its Gospel and asks for an inward cleansing and renewal in the two orations that follow the offering and the communion. **The disease the Gospel heals is one of superfluity** — dropsy is a body holding what it cannot carry — **and what the two orations ask to have taken away is not named at all**. The formulary moves from a body relieved of what it could not hold to a mind asked for the same relief.

Fruit: The healing stops being the mere occasion of the sabbath argument and becomes the Mass's own figure for what the two orations ask; and the orations stop being generic, because the Gospel has already said what kind of excess is meant.

What the element-by-element reading misses: The healing is ordinarily read as the setting of the controversy and then dropped, and the orations are ordinarily read as conventional. Neither reading has a reason to put them side by side, and the movement from outward to inward is only visible when they are.

Controlling limit: **No checked witness joins this healing to the doctrine of grace, and the three who read the dropsy figuratively join it to something else**: Ambrose makes the dropsical man one in whom the flux of the flesh overwhelmed the soul's offices, and Bede reads the disease of the body as expressing the disease of the heart and then names avarice; Augustine likewise compares the dropsical man to the covetous rich man. **So a reading that makes the healing a figure of prevenient grace is this section's and not theirs**, and if a later sweep documents the join it belongs in the commentary instead. The verbal side is thin: *munda*, *purifica* and *renova* share no root with *hydrópicus* or *sanavit*, and the join is one of sense throughout.

Editorial proposal — P3. Three acts of looking, and only one of them is asked for

Anchor: Gospel (*Gosp.*), Luke 14:1 *et ipsi observábant eum* and 14:7 *inténdens quómodo primos accúbitus elígerent*; Offertory (*Off.*), *Dómine, in auxílium meum réspice . . . Dómine, in auxílium meum réspice*

Mechanism: Two human acts of looking stand in the Gospel — the Pharisees watching Christ, and Christ marking how the guests chose their places — and one divine act of looking is petitioned at the Offertory, and petitioned twice, the antiphon returning to its opening clause after the intervening plea. **The asymmetry is the point: the human looking is appraisal, of a guest by a host or of a guest by a guest, and the divine looking is asked for.**

Fruit: It gives the Offertory a place in the day's argument that its own words do not supply, and it recovers *observábant* from being scene-setting: the Mass has already shown what it is to be watched before it asks to be looked at.

What the element-by-element reading misses: *Observábant* is almost always read as narrative furniture, and the Offertory as a psalm of distress with no relation to the Gospel. Set side by side across two ritual moments they are one contrast between being under appraisal and asking to be regarded.

Controlling limit: Whether the printed repetition carries any weight cannot be answered here. No chant book was opened: no *Graduale*, no *Antiphonale*, no Hesbert, no manuscript of the six antiphonaries whose AMS 188 results above are a modern database's index of Hesbert's numbering. So whether an antiphon that returns to its first clause is peculiar to this piece or an ordinary convention of the genre is unknown, and if it is ordinary the doubling carries none of the emphasis this proposal puts on it. **And the looking verbs are three different words** — *observábant*, *inténdens*, *réspice* — so the series is a series of acts and not of a lexeme. Aquinas's *Respectus Dei est auxílium nostrum* at this Offertory's own psalm supports the divine half and says nothing about the Gospel.

Editorial proposal — P4. What is built and what is conferred

Anchor: Gradual (*Grad.*), *Timébunt gentes nomen tuum, Dómine, et omnes reges terræ glóriam tuam. V. Quóniam ædificávit Dóminus Sion*; Epistle (*Ep.*), *in caritaté radicáti, et fundáti, quæ est glória vestra, secúndum divítias glóriæ suæ, ipsi glória in Ecclésia*; Gospel (*Gosp.*), *Tunc erit tibi glória coram simul discumbéntibus*

Mechanism: One building vocabulary runs from a city God has built to hearers rooted and founded in charity. And *glória* is appointed in three elements with three different owners: God's own, which the kings of the earth will fear; the Ephesians', which is the Apostle's chains; and **a guest's, which is the only one in the formulary that a host confers.**

Fruit: It stops the word reading as one word said three times. The Mass sets a glory that is seen, a glory that is given and a glory that is assigned at a table, and the last of the three is the only one anybody in the Gospel could have gone looking for.

What the element-by-element reading misses: Taken singly each *glória* looks like a different word that happens to be the same word. Taken across the three, they form a sequence of owners, and the building vocabulary supplies the ground the sequence stands on.

Controlling limit: The count is a count over the appointed text and not over the psalter. The Gradual replaces the psalm's second *gloria* with *maiestáte*, so the chant says *glóriam tuam* once where the psalm says it twice, and a reader checking the Bible will not find the distribution this proposal is built on. Augustine's citation of Eph. 2:20 at the Gradual's own v. 16 is a striking convergence and is not evidence: it is a verse of Ephesians this Mass does not appoint, and nothing shows that anyone joined the two before.

Editorial proposal — P5. What both psalm chants stop just short of saying

Anchor: Alleluia (*All.*), *Cantáte Dómino cánticum novum: quia mirabília fecit Dóminus*, stopping before *Salvavit sibi dextera ejus, et brachium sanctum ejus*; Communion (*Comm.*), . . . *Deus, ne derelínquas me*, stopping before *donec annuntiem brachium tuum generationi omni quæ ventura est*; Epistle (*Ep.*), whose doxology ends in *omnes generatiónes sæculi sæculórum*

Mechanism: Both psalm chants cut immediately before the Lord's *arm*, and the Communion cuts before its announcement to a *coming generation*. The Epistle's doxology, which the Mass does read, ends on generations. The Communion also stops one clause short of *pronuntiabo mirabilia tua* — the very word the Alleluia sings.

Fruit: The formulary sings the wonders and does not sing the arm, and the one place it says “generations” is a reading and not a chant. That distributes across the Mass a thing usually noticed only at one element, and it gives the Epistle’s doxology a function beyond closing the lesson.

What the element-by-element reading misses: Each cut looks arbitrary on its own, and an element-by-element reading has no occasion to compare two antiphons’ stopping points. Together they show the same word twice left just outside the sung text.

Controlling limit: The strongest limit is that these extents are inherited chant tradition and nothing establishes that anything was cut in order to leave it out. Duller explanations stand available and untested — the metrical length of an antiphon, the ordinary bounds of the genre — and whether these extents are stable across the tradition is beyond the AMS 188 evidence above, which is a modern database’s index of Hesbert’s numbering and not a chant book, a printing of Hesbert or a manuscript of the six antiphonaries. **The material past each cut belongs to the source psalms and never to the appointed chants,** and a reader must not be left with the impression that the Mass suppressed it. **And the material past the Alleluia’s cut is not one text:** the Clementine reads *Salvavit sibi dextera ejus*, Augustine’s lemma *Sanavit ei* and Cassiodorus’s *salvavit eum*, so a proposal that quotes the continuation is quoting one psalter and not the tradition.

Editorial proposal — P6. Poverty and plenitude, distributed by element

Anchors: Introit (*Int.*), the psalm verse *quóniam inops et pauper sum ego* and the antiphon’s *copiosus in misericórdia*; Epistle (*Ep.*), *secúndum divítias glóriæ suæ, ut impleámini in omnem plenitúdinem Dei, qui potens est ómnia fácere superabundánter quam pétimus, aut intellégimus*; Gospel (*Gosp.*), *recúmbe in novíssimo loco*

Mechanism: The Mass’s one confession of poverty is sung, and abundance is predicated twice and of two different subjects. *Inops et pauper* stands in the Introit’s psalm verse; the antiphon over it sings God’s mercy as *copiosus in misericórdia*, and the Epistle reads what God gives and does as riches, fullness and superabundance; and the Gospel’s remedy for the poor man’s problem is a place rather than a possession. **What is distributed is God’s abundance in both registers against the singer’s poverty in one.**

Fruit: The Introit’s formula stops being a conventional opening. Set against the Epistle it is the Mass’s own statement of the condition the Epistle answers, and the Gospel then declines to answer it with anything the guest can hold.

What the element-by-element reading misses: *Inops et pauper* reads as a psalm’s habitual self-description until the Epistle piles up riches in the same Mass; and the distribution of the two magnitudes across chant and reading is invisible at any single element. *Superabundánter* occurs nowhere else in the whole Clementine.

Controlling limit: The strongest form of this rests on the Introit’s psalm verse rather than on its antiphon. The verse is appointed text: it is printed inside marginal no. 1592 under the formulary’s own rubric *Ps. ibid., 1*, which is what settles the boundary question here — but a psalm verse is not sung in the same way an antiphon is, and a reader who counts only antiphons will not find the poverty. **And this formulary’s poverty language is mostly in the context of the appointed texts and not in them:** only Ps. 85:1 is actually sung, *Oratio pauperis* is Ps. 101’s unappointed title, *mendicus sum et pauper* is Ps. 39’s unappointed v. 18, and the Gospel’s *pauperes, debiles, claudos, et cæcos* falls two verses past the end of the pericope. A theme built from that context is built from around the appointed text, and the difference has to stay visible. **And the poverty word the proposal turns on is not the word a second Latin witness lemmatizes:** Cassiodorus reads *quoniam egenus et pauper sum ego* at Ps. 85:1, so a commentator quoted in support may be expounding *egenus* where the chant sings *inops*.

Appendix: Scope and Qualifications

This appendix carries the work-wide bounds. Claim-local qualifications stand beside their claims above; retrieval mechanics, checksums, query detail, discarded leads and the operational audit are in `propers/verified.md` and `research/scope.md`, which are tracked beside this guide and are not repeated here.

Which edition this is. This is the *canonical full edition*. After the map, the dossier sheet and the thematic movement it prints the complete appointed formulary — the Latin of the 1962 Vatican *editio typica* beside the English of the registered public-domain witnesses — and then the element-by-element commentary, the synthesis sections and this apparatus, all from one source leaf. A mechanical *synthesis companion* is compiled from the same source at the same identity with a `-synthesis` suffix; it omits the appointed texts and replaces the element-by-element sweep with a single integrated cross-proper commentary, and it owns no prose, research record or source audit of its own.

Edition, formulary identity and text-verification state

The controlling text is the *Missale Romanum*, editio typica (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1962), printed pp. 397–398, the ten appointed elements carrying marginal reference numbers 1592–1601. The formulary is bounded by no. 1591, the Fifteenth Sunday’s Postcommunion, and by the heading of the Seventeenth Sunday at no. 1602; nothing between those boundaries is omitted here. Rank *II classis*; *Credo*; Preface of the Most Holy Trinity. **Green follows the general rubrics and is not printed at the formulary**, being recorded as an inference from RG 127 b rather than as a reading of pp. 397–398. **No page of the 1,088-page facsimile carries a running head naming this Sunday**, so a finding aid that locates a formulary by its running head reports this one absent.

Text-verification state. Every published Latin form, rubric, citation, marginal number and boundary was read as page images rendered from the identified facsimile of the typical edition at 200 dpi and again at 400 dpi, with the Secret’s conclusion and the Communion antiphon re-read at the images’ native 500 ppi. No transcription, no optical layer and no web text supplied a reading. **The facsimile’s own embedded text layer misled once in this formulary**, giving *extranet* for *extrahet* at Luke 14:5, and the page image settles it. Collated 2026-09-05; no unresolved reading remains in the controlling edition.

The second 1962 witness was read on page images too, and is recorded and never adopted. The Benziger *editio iuxta typicam* differs from the typical edition at eight places, two of them substantive — a repetition cue after the Introit’s doxology, and a longer conclusion to the Secret — and six of pointing, abbreviation or paging. Where the two books differ the difference is an edition difference and never an uncertain reading in the typical edition; nothing is blended and no Benziger form is substituted.

The two books that carry the century chain back from 1962 stand at a weaker state than either. The 1920 typical edition and the pre-1955 Benziger were opened at this formulary in uncorrected optical layers of small-type altar books, with no page image of either behind them, and those layers damage the formulary’s own numerals: the 1920 gives the Gospel’s reference as *huc. 24, 2-22* and the Offertory’s as *Ps. 39, 24 et 15*. The stability claimed of the century before 1962 is therefore claimed of the ten texts and their order, and is an inference and not a collation at the psalm citations.

The controlling facsimile is bitonal. The 1962 typical edition is printed in red and black; the scan carries one bit per component and no colour plane, so the colour of no mark on these two pages can be read from it. Where this guide calls something a rubric it names its function and its type, never its ink.

English, and the translations of the witnesses

Scriptural elements take the Douay–Rheims as revised by Bishop Challoner (1749–1752), the English of the Clementine Vulgate the missal prints. The three orations take 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), cited by formulary rather than by page; all three were collated against that book’s page images at printed pp. 429 and 431 and stand there character for character, including the abbreviated conclusion “Thro.” **That English is a free devotional rendering and not a construe of the Latin**, and the book names no translator, so the edition is cited and no translator is. **The 1861’s own English of the scriptural elements is not used:** it prints free renderings of the Introit, Offertory and Communion and its own Epistle and Gospel, and the profile appoints the Douay–Rheims

for those. **Nothing of the appointed text is composed, translated, adapted or paraphrased here**, and no element of this formulary lacks public-domain English. Neither witness is an official liturgical translation and neither is the text of the 1962 books.

Translations of the reception witnesses. Augustine's *Enarrationes*, *Epistula* 55, the *Tractatus* on John, Chrysostom's Homily 7 on Ephesians, and Gregory's *Regula pastoralis* are read in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* English; that English is named at each use and is not the Father's own words. Cyril of Alexandria is read in R. Payne Smith's 1859 English of the Syriac, **so his argument is used and his wording is not**. Augustine's Latin, Ambrose, Bede, Benedict's *Regula*, Augustine's *Quaestiones euangeliorum* and Aquinas are read in web transcriptions of Migne and of the Corpus Thomisticum, not in critical editions: **CSEL, CCSL and the Leonine were opened for none of them**, no Migne column was verified against a facsimile, and every Augustinian locus here is cited by enarratio, sermo and section or by chapter for that reason. The *Quaestiones euangeliorum* transcription carries optical damage in the paragraph on this pericope, so its sense is reported and its wording is not quoted.

The three psalm commentators added beside Augustine each carry a limit that reaches their wording. Cassiodorus is read in a Migne-derived web transcription of the *Expositio psalmorum*, not in Adriaen's CCSL 98 and not at a PL 70 column; the section numbers are the host's, and **the four lemmata on which his agreement with the chant turns — *maiestate, in auxilium meum respice, suavis ac mitis es ... copiosus in misericordia, quia mirabilia fecit Dominus* — were not collated against a critical text**, so his loci are cited by lemma and never by the page's verse number, which runs three ahead of the missal at Ps. 39 and one ahead at Ps. 97. Theodoret is Migne's reprint of Schulze's recension with a facing Latin version and not a critical Greek text; the two do not always agree in tense, and every quotation above is Migne's Latin, his Greek being named where the two part and quoted nowhere — his lemma at the Gradual, the Offertory's petition, the Alleluia's word for a polity that Migne flattens to *religionem*, and the Communion's genitive. **Two of the column stretches quoted above stand on the PG facsimile's uncorrected optical layer and on no page image**: cols. 1553–1554, which open his Ps. 85 at the Introit, and cols. 1423–1424, which open his Ps. 70 at the Communion. The other six ranges — cols. 1159–1160, 1425–1426, 1555–1556, 1657–1658, 1679–1680 and 1681–1682 — were read on rendered page images. Bellarmine is **reception in English only**: O'Sullivan's 1866 translation is an abridgement its own translator declares, so nothing here is Bellarmine's Latin and no argument rests on something being absent from these pages; his printed verse numbers run one below the Vulgate at Ps. 39 and Ps. 101 and level at the other three, and the argument line and psalm text above each exposition are the Douay's and not his. **His pages stand at the same two states**: printed pp. 212–213 (the Communion), 259 (the first page of the Introit's exposition) and 306 (the Alleluia) were read on his own facsimile's uncorrected optical layer, and printed pp. 122 (the Offertory), 260 (the second page of that Introit exposition) and 317 (the Gradual) on rendered page images. For printed p. 261, the tail of the Ps. 85 span, no state is recorded. Jerome's *Epistula* 106 is held only in a 1937 English whose copyright is unestablished, so the Latin lemmata and the words at issue are quoted above and the translator's English is not. Dom Lucien Fromage, who continued Guéranger's *The Liturgical Year*, is a nineteenth-century liturgist writing devotionally and is cited as that, never in place of patristic testimony.

Dates, and the psalm numbering

Every biblical date printed in this guide comes from the Scripture chronology corpus and from nowhere else, carried in `research/chronology.toml` and printed through the generated projection in the Date column of page 2. Seven appointed Scriptures each have one cell, and what stands in it is the deterministic concise projection of the corpus's own structured date, each source's raw wording and profile being kept in the generated file's audit form rather than on the page. **The Gospel's narrated event has no date in the corpus** — the sabbath dinner is dated nowhere — and the cell states that absence. **Composition place and audience remain unresolved for the psalms and Gospel; the Epistle's dossier gives Ladeuze's alternatives**: the three *Catholic Encyclopedia* articles the corpus cites for those two elements — vol. V, article 05485a and vol. XI, article 11567b for the Epistle, and vol. XIV, article 14530a for the Gospel — and the Biblical Commission responsa beside them supply the chronology labels; Ladeuze's article on Ephesians also supplies the Epistle's place and audience discussion. Nothing comparable was identified for the five psalms, whose only composition claim is a boundary shared by the whole Psalter. **Some of the psalm commentaries quoted above give a psalm a speaker and an occasion** — Theodoret's Assyrian assault on Jerusalem at Ps. 85 and Babylonian captives at Ps. 101, Bellarmine's David with the bear and the lion at Ps. 70, Cassiodorus's Christ in the assumed humanity at Ps. 85 — and each stands above as what that source says, never as the date or setting of the passage.

Psalms are cited by the Vulgate numbering the missal prints, with the modern number in parentheses on page 2 and the convention named where the two modern English series part. Ps. 39 and Ps. 101 carry their titles as numbered first verses, so an English Bible runs one verse behind at the Offertory and the Gradual; Ps. 70, 85 and 97 fold their titles into verse one, so the Introit, the Alleluia and the Communion agree in both series. The same offset governs the marginal verse figures on the New Advent pages of the *Enarrationes*, and that series titles each exposition by the Hebrew psalm number.

Source scope, and what was not reached

Languages: Latin, Greek and English, with two Greek authors read in translation and one at his own text. No Greek New Testament and no Septuagint is tracked in this repository, so the Gospel's shorter clause at 14:3 is not settled against the Greek; and no Old Latin, Roman, Ambrosian or Mozarabic psalter is tracked, so no chant reading above is traced to an older psalter. Chrysostom is read in English and Cyril in an English of a Syriac version; Theodoret is read in Migne's Greek with Migne's own facing Latin beside it.

Four commentators stand at each of the five appointed psalms. Augustine, Cassiodorus, Theodoret and Bellarmine expound all five; Aquinas reaches the Offertory's alone, his *Postilla super Psalmos* breaking off inside Psalm 54; and Jerome adjudicates the wording at the Offertory and the Communion. **What is not established is whether the psalm works of Chrysostom, Jerome and Hilary reach these five at all:** their *Expositiones in psalmos*, *Tractatus in psalmos* and *Tractatus super psalmos* were not opened and no extent record for them is tracked, so nothing above rests on their silence. The Latin original of Bellarmine's *Explanatio in Psalmos* was not opened, and Theodoret is the one Greek psalm voice held. Ambrosiaster, Jerome on Ephesians, Marius Victorinus and Gregory of Nyssa were not opened at the Epistle; Theophylact, the Basilian ascetica and Gregory's *Moralia* were not opened at the Gospel. The Second Council of Orange, the other conciliar place the Collect's doctrine stands, was not opened.

No patristic or saintly reception of the Secret or the Postcommunion was found. The search ran over the Latin corpora retrieved for this formulary — Augustine's *Enarrationes* on Pss. 31–40, 61–70, 81–90, 91–100 and 101–110 and his *Quaestiones euangeliorum*, Ambrose's *Expositio* VII–IX, Bede's *In Lucam* entire, Benedict's *Regula* entire, Aquinas's *Catena in Lucam* 14–18, *Super Ephesios* entire and *Super Psalmos* 31–40, and the Tridentine text — for *sacrificii praesentis, mereamur esse participes, caelestibus sacramentis* with its *coelestibus* spelling, and *Munda nos*, and returned no hit. It is not a search of the patristic corpus at large, and a phrase search cannot find a Father who paraphrases an oration without quoting it. The medieval *expositores missae*, where such reception would show up if anywhere, were not walked, and nothing from Amalarius, Honorius Augustodunensis, Sicardus or Durandus is cited in the commentary.

One formulary-level commentator reads this Mass as a whole, and he carries no liturgical history. Fromage's chapter stands at printed pp. 356–371 of vol. XI, and the chapter heading, the printed folio, the opening sentence and the Introit were read on a rendered page image of the registered facsimile at printed p. 356. **The chapter is quoted above at printed pp. 357, 358–360, 363, 365, 367–368 and 370–371, and those pages stand at two states:** pp. 357, 359, 363, 365, 367–368 and 370–371 were read on rendered images too, while the sentence quoted from p. 360 and the observation reported from p. 358 — the Epistle's grace and the Church's borrowing from Ephesians — rest on the volume's own extracted text layer and on no page image. A search of the whole chapter for *antiphonar*, *gradual*, *ancient*, *primitive*, *manuscript*, *Thomasi*, *liturgist*, *Ember*, *station*, *century*, *Amalarius*, *Rupert*, *Honorius*, *Durand* and *sacramentar* returns no historical statement at all, so he stands above for reception and not for history. Schuster carries the chant history and does not read the Mass as one action. **That Ambrose is the Breviary's appointed homilist for this Sunday is Fromage's own statement and rests on him alone.**

No chant repertory was reached. No printed *Graduale*, no *Antiphonale*, no Hesbert: the antiphonary results above are a modern database's report of Hesbert's numbering, taken from the 1985 reprint that database cites. His 1935 Vromant printing is a different book and a different record: it is registered in this repository at catalog level only, with no artifact, no passage, and no affirmative United States redistribution basis established for its exact bytes. The siglum key behind its manuscript columns was reconstructed by cross-tabulation and is not printed by that database. Nothing here bears on melody, on whether the Introit of this Sunday shares a melody with any other, or on whether the Offertory's printed repetition is peculiar to that antiphon.

Every sacramentary reading above except Gerbert's is from an uncorrected optical layer with no page image behind it. The numbering is Wilson's own and Gerbert's own; Mohlberg's and Deshusses's critical editions were opened by nobody, so no *Ha*, *GeV* or Supplement number is claimed anywhere. **Gerbert is the exception:** his printed pp. 146, 178, 180 and 184 were read on the page images of two independently produced

scans of the 1777 printing, the first of which clips the outer margin of p. 184, so every quoted line-end comes from the second — and page images of a 1777 book establish what Gerbert printed and not what any manuscript reads, his principal manuscript being the one Wilson elsewhere warns cannot now be traced. The *Liber Comitis* headings were likewise read at high zoom on page images, because the optical text mangles the numerals there. Klauser’s *Capitulare Evangeliorum* and the Würzburg comes are registered nowhere here. **The 1955 decree stands on one witness:** the Holy See’s own optical transcription of its own *Acta* at pp. 218–224, with no facsimile of the 1955 printing collated and neither the decree nor that volume of the *Acta* registered here. **The Sarum reading is an uncorrected optical layer too:** Dickinson’s cols. 506, 509–510 and 512, from which the split itself and its two alleluias are quoted, were read with no page image opened. **The descent of the Sarum split into the English books rests on two scholarly synopses,** Brightman’s and Blunt’s, both on optical layers, and on no printing of the Book of Common Prayer itself.

Four questions stand open above and are named rather than settled. The 1759 attribution of the Sunday Trinity preface to Clement XIII is a checked report of an unchecked act: the encyclopedia article names no *Acta* locus, and Fortescue’s own *The Mass* carries neither the rule nor the date. Where the Ottobonianus cue block attaches turns on the footnote reference marks of Wilson’s printed page, and no page image of Wilson was opened, so the two readings of it stand side by side. Whether Theodoret’s Greek at Ps. 70:16 construes *alone* with *thy* rather than with *justice* needs a reader competent in the Greek at a better text than a facsimile. And a critical text — CCSL 98 or PL 70 at a column — would settle the four Cassiodorus lemmata on which four of the agreements above rest.

The gallery and the exploratory proposals

The five entries of *The Propers: Notable and Quotable* are documented reuses of wording from the Epistle and the Gospel. **The five psalm chants produced none over a corpus of ninety volumes and a newspaper collection,** and three obstacles explain some of those negative results: the Alleluia’s clause is not distinctive to its verse, *Miserere mihi* is not the famous *Miserere*, and the Offertory’s petition is too near the versicle that opens every Hour. **The corpora were English and Latin, with German and Spanish opened once each because a named candidate led there,** so a French or Italian afterlife would not have been found, and musical settings were not counted — a real exclusion, all five chants of this Mass having substantial chant and polyphonic afterlives. Two hosts could not be opened. **Eight further candidates were reached and set aside,** and the reasons are of five kinds: four of them turn on Eph. 3:21’s “world without end,” a clause that also closes the *Gloria Patri* this same formulary cues at its own Introit, so no entry on it could show the Epistle rather than the doxology as the channel; one turns Luke 14:10 from inside the tradition rather than out of it, where the gallery prefers the secular or ironic turn; one is the Spanish proverbial form of Luke 14:11 and not the appointed clause — Cervantes at *Don Quijote* I cap. XI, whose *Dios le ensalza* adds an agent the Vulgate and the Douay have not; one stands in a 1958 newspaper that names no author and is under ninety-five years old; and one was by 1889 an ordinary English idiom carrying no sign of quotation. The remark above about Luther’s German at Luke 18:14 rests on the standing Luther text: no public-domain German Bible could be opened here.

The six proposals of *The Propers: Interpretive Possibilities* are exploratory editorial and AI proposals. The precedent search behind them swept the repository’s own published guides and research records, the tracked 1962 calendar registry, and twelve full-text missal payloads; **it did not reach the chant repertories, the pre-Tridentine Latin commentary tradition, the sacramentary editions themselves, or any page image. No guide to this formulary stands anywhere else in this collection,** so the control a companion guide to the same formulary would give was unavailable, and every precedent result rests on neighbouring identities and on the appointed-text registry, which is a weaker control.

Rights, and the state of this guide

The Latin. All ten elements are publishable, and none of them on any property of the 1962 typical edition. The route is settled once for this repository at `src/sources/inventories/missale-romanum-1962-facsimile-rights-v1.toml`: 17 U.S.C. 103(b) together with a public-domain witness. The three orations stand as preexisting material corroborated word for word in the tracked public-domain *Missale Romanum* (Ratisbon: Pustet, 1862), whose pp. 340–341 carry them, **and the one gap in that argument — the conjunction *et* before *rénova*, absent from the 1862 optical layer at a line break — is closed on the 1862 page image, where it is printed.** The seven scriptural

elements are the Vulgate. The facsimile's pagination, marginal numbering and arrangement as such are not reproduced; its numbers and page locations are facts and are cited freely.

The English of both witnesses is public domain by age. No translation under copyright is used, quoted or consulted: not the ICEL Missal, the Knox Bible, the Jerusalem or New Jerusalem Bibles, the RSV or NRSV, the NABRE, or the Grail psalms. **Unresolved rights questions for any text of this formulary: none.**

The witnesses. New Advent's presentation of the public-domain *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* translations is registered with its rights unresolved, so quotations are short and attributed to the translation and never to the host's presentation; the same holds of the monumenta.ch presentation of the Migne-derived Cassiodorus. The Tertullian Project's delivery of Payne Smith's 1859 English, which modernises the printing's wording, stands registered public domain on that host's own dedication of its transcriptions. Migne's PG 80 and O'Sullivan's 1866 Bellarmine are public domain by age. **Two translations of witnesses quoted above are under copyright or unestablished, and neither is reproduced:** R. C. Hill's English of Theodoret, which is in copyright and was not used at all, Migne's Greek and facing Latin standing above in its place; and the 1937 English of Jerome's *Epistula* 106, whose copyright the source record marks unestablished, from which only the Latin lemmata and the words at issue are taken. **One registered edition was left unread on rights grounds:** Adriaen's CCSL 98 Cassiodorus, from which nothing may be redistributed. Two gallery sources carry a bound — J. S. Phillipson's 1962 note, in copyright, served openly by the Ohio State University Libraries and quoted short and attributed; and Helen Zimmern's 1910 English of Nietzsche, public domain in the United States and, her death falling in 1934, in life-plus-seventy jurisdictions, of which one sentence is quoted.

Four items in this guide's own source records were carried forward for repair; three of them now stand repaired and none of the four blocks a claim above. The two 1862 leaf images and the two 1861 leaf images read here are registered on their editions. The registered 1861 passage whose notes cited marginal number 1575 for this Collect now cites no. 1593, the number the typical edition prints, with the 1575 reading recorded there as the error it was; 1575 is the Fourteenth Sunday's Gradual. The two 1861 orations page-collated here stand registered **verified** as of 2026-09-05, and the Postcommunion's recorded provenance confidence was raised the same day from medium to high on the 1862 page image. **One item stands open:** the Communion's citation form is flattened to a range in two generated records, where the loci are identical.

Review state. This is a study companion for use beside a hand missal, not an official liturgical book, a critical edition, a homily or a substitute for the cited sources. It has had no specialist, clerical, physical-use or ecclesiastical review, and none is claimed.

References

Only sources actually used above, with loci sufficient to check the claims made from them. Evidence state is given where it limits what the source can support.

Liturgical witnesses

- *Missale Romanum*, editio typica (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1962), printed pp. 397–398, marginal nos. 1592–1601, with p. 396 for the preceding Postcommunion and the head of p. 398 for the following heading; and its *Rubricae generales*, cited for RG 127 b, 434 b, 475 a and 494 b. Facsimile: <https://media.churchmusicassociation.org/pdf/missale62.pdf>, PDF pp. 478–479. Source-library identity `edition.catholic-church.missale-romanum.vatican-typica-1962`, artifact `artifact.catholic-church.missale-romanum.vatican-typica-1962.cmaa-facsimile-pdf`. *Controlling text for every Latin form printed above, read as page images at 200, 400 and 500 dpi.*
- *Missale Romanum*, editio iuxta typicam (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1962), printed pp. 392–393, in the Internet Archive item `MissaleRomanum1962RomanMissalColorLatin`. *Second 1962 edition, read on that item's page images at leaves n468 and n469 and, for locating, in its optical text layer. Recorded as a collation of two books; nothing is blended and no Benziger form is adopted.*
- *Missale Romanum* (Ratisbon: Pustet, 1862), printed pp. 339–341, and the page images at leaves n425 and n426 of Internet Archive item `bub_gb_E7sPAAAAIAAJ`. *The tracked public-domain antecedent on which the three orations are published, and the witness that closes the conjunction et before rénova. Also the witness for the pre-1955 seasonal orations at this Sunday, and an independent confirmation of éxtrahet.*
- *Missale Romanum* (Vatican typical edition of 1604) and *Missale Romanum* (Venice, 1570). *Tracked full text. Both carry the conjunction et before rénova at the Postcommunion; the 1604 is also the witness at the Postcommunion's pointing and at the pre-1955 alia Secreta. Optical layers only: usable for positives here and not for negatives, the 1604 layer returning nothing for post pentecosten while demonstrably carrying this Sunday's whole formulary.*
- *Missale Romanum*, editio typica Vaticana of 1920, and *Missale Romanum*, editio IV iuxta typicam Vaticanam (New York: Benziger Brothers), the pre-1955 witness whose approval leaf is dated 8 December 1942. Both opened at this formulary. *The two books that print Orationes pro diversitate Temporum assignatae, ut supra inside this Sunday's formulary, with Aliae Secretae and Aliae Postcommuniones, and that already carry the direction Præfatio de Ssm̃a Trinitate. here; they head the day semiduplex. Both were read in uncorrected optical layers of altar books in small type, with no page image of either book behind them, and the layers damage numerals: the 1920 gives this Gospel's reference as huc. 24, 2-22 and the Offertory's as Ps. 39, 24 et 15, both plainly corrupt, so their agreement with the psalm citations of the 1862 and 1962 books is an inference and not a collation.*
- *Missale Ambrosianum* (Milan: de Sirturis, 1712), the window headed *sabbato in albis missa pro baptizatis*. *Eph. 3:13–21 entire with the same liturgical incipit adaptation the Roman book makes, read as the baptismal lesson of Easter Saturday. Optical layer only; an eighteenth-century printing is evidence about that book and not about the medieval Ambrosian lectionary.*
- `src/sources/calendars/roman-1962/propers.yaml`, this repository's tracked registry of the 1962 Mass formulae and their proper elements, parsed as data. *A repository derivative of the 1962 book's own text layer and not a collation of its pages, and the instrument behind every statement above that an element of this Mass is, or is not, appointed at some other formulary. At the chants: the Gradual at the Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Sundays after the Epiphany and as the Eighteenth Sunday's Alleluia verse, the Offertory at the Friday after Lent II, the Communion at the Thursday after Lent IV, and Ps. 97:1 as the Introit antiphon of the Fourth Sunday after Easter and as the psalm verse standing at the Introits of Easter Thursday, of the Assumption, of the Maternity of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the Octave of the Nativity. At the Epistle: the other two appointments of Ephesians 3, at the Sacred Heart and at St Margaret Mary Alacoque, and the doxology Eph. 3:20–21 standing in it at this Mass and at no other. At the Gospel: Luke 14 in three separated blocks, with vv. 12–15 and v. 25 appointed nowhere in it. It holds no votive Masses at all, so the Communion's votive appointment above rests on the 1962 book's own text layer and not on it. No page image controls any of them.*
- *The 1962 Roman Calendar: Rules, Ranks, and Reckoning*, this repository's own reference guide, at `src/claude/liturgy/roman-rite/1962/reference/liturgical-calendar/sections/50-resumed-sundays.tex`. *The rule that a resumed Epiphany Sunday keeps its own orations, Epistle and Gospel and borrows the Twenty-third Sunday's chants, printed there from Rubricae generales n. 18 and Missal rubric 298.*

Those two numbers reach the commentary above through that guide and not through the 1962 Missal entry, whose cited *Rubricae generales loci* are the four named with it.

- Gerbert, M., *Monumenta veteris liturgiae Alemannicae*, Pars I (St Blasien, 1777), printed pp. 146, 178, 180 and 184, read on the page images of two independently produced Internet Archive scans. *The Frankish Gelasian's Mass carrying all three of this Sunday's orations, with Gerbert's per-oration sigla and his own footnotes stating the numbering arithmetic; the September Ember Sunday at p. 178 and the Dominica vacat printed as a Mass at p. 180. The first scan clips the outer margin of p. 184, so quoted line-ends come from the second. The page images establish what Gerbert printed, not what any manuscript reads.*
- Sacred Congregation of Rites, general decree *De rubricis ad simpliciore formam redigendis*, 23 March 1955, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 47 (1955) 218–224, Tit. II n. 1, Tit. V a) n. 1 and Tit. V b) n. 7. *Read in the Holy See's own optical transcription of its own Acta at vatican.va, and at 200 dpi of that transcription rather than of a facsimile. One witness only: no printing of 1955 was collated, and neither the decree nor this volume of the Acta is registered in this repository's sources.*
- Brightman, F. E., *The English Rite*, vol. II (London: Rivingtons, 1915), printed pp. 520–521; and Blunt, J. H., *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1866), at the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Sundays after Trinity. *The two synopses that carry the Sarum arrangement of this formulary into the English books of 1549, 1552 and 1661. Optical layers, no page image, and no printing of the Book of Common Prayer itself was collated; they tag the Collect (Greg. 172) and Greg. Orationes Quotidianae respectively, neither expanded.*
- Wilson, H. A., ed., *The Gelasian Sacramentary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1894). Book III sect. XII no. 693, printed p. 231 (the Secret and the Postcommunion, under *ITEM ALIA MISSA*); no. 692, p. 230 (the Fifteenth Sunday's oration set); the Appendix at p. 358 for *Gerb. Hebdomada post Pentecosten* and for *Gerb. Dominica Vacat*; and Wilson's footnote to no. 693 for Pamelius. *Read in an uncorrected optical layer; no page image opened; the numbering is Wilson's own.*
- Wilson, H. A., ed., *The Gregorian Sacramentary under Charles the Great*, Henry Bradshaw Society XLIX (1915), sect. XXXV, printed p. 174, with sects. XXXIII and XXXVIII for the two preceding Sundays and the marginal antiphony cues of Cod. Ottobonianus lat. 313 at sect. XXXIII, p. 173. *Optical layer only. Where the cue block attaches is disputed and no page image was opened.*
- *Sacramentarium Leonianum*, ed. C. L. Feltoe (Cambridge, 1896), searched whole. *Feltoe's own title for the sacramentary the prose above calls the Veronense. None of this Sunday's three orations is in it; the one near miss, tua nos semper gratia praeveniens laetificatur, is a different prayer.*
- Dickinson, F. H., ed., *Missale ad usum insignis et praeclaræ ecclesiæ Sarum* (Burntisland, 1861–1883), printed cols. 506, 509–510, 512. *The split of this formulary across Trinity XVI and XVII, and the two Sarum alleluias that differ from the Roman. Read in an uncorrected optical layer of that scan; no page image opened.*
- *Liber Comitis*, in J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 30, col. 522, read on the page image of leaf n264, one of seven page images of leaves n261–n267 of the Internet Archive digitisation. *The Gospel under Dominica mensis viii paired with Ephesians 4:1–6; the headings read at high zoom because the optical text mangles the numerals.*
- Schuster, I., *The Sacramentary (Liber Sacramentorum)*, vol. III, English of Arthur Levelis-Marke (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1927), printed pp. 142–144. *The older title Prima post natale Sancti Cypriani, the stations of the surrounding days, the course of Ephesians, and three of the four second appointments of the chants. Read in an optical layer of the registered item; no page image opened, and the title is a reported title and not a collated manuscript reading.*
- Fromage, L., continuation of P. Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year*, vol. XI, English of Dom Laurence Shepherd (Stanbrook Abbey; London: Burns & Oates, 1909), the chapter for this Sunday at printed pp. 356–371, quoted above at pp. 357 (the Collect), 358–360 (the Epistle and the four measures), 363 (the Gradual), 365 and 367–368 (the Gospel, the wedding and Ecclus. 3:20–21), 370 (the Offertory and the Secret) and 370–371 (the Communion and the Postcommunion). *The chapter heading, the printed folio and the opening sentence were read on a rendered page image at printed p. 356, and pp. 357, 359, 363, 365, 367–368 and 370–371 were rendered likewise; the sentence quoted from p. 360 and the observation reported from p. 358 rest on the volume's own extracted text layer, with no page image behind them. A nineteenth-century liturgist writing devotionally, cited as that; a search of the whole chapter for the vocabulary of liturgical history returns nothing.*
- Fortescue, A., “Preface,” in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. XII (New York: Robert Appleton, 1911); and Fortescue, A., *The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy* (London: Longmans, 1922), searched whole. *The encyclopedia article carries the 1759 attribution of the Sunday Trinity preface to Clement XIII and names no Acta locus; the book by the same author carries neither the rule nor the date, so the two do not corroborate each other.*

- gregorien.info, the chant database’s index of R.-J. Hesbert, *Antiphonale Missarum Sextuplex*, cited by that database in its 1985 reprint: the day pages for AMS 188 and its neighbours, five chant records, six per-manuscript indexes and the manuscript index. *The 1985 reprint is the printing behind every AMS number reported above, and it is the book a reader checks them in. Hesbert’s own 1935 Vromant printing is a different object: the source records of this repository carry a catalog entry for it and no artifact, and no page of it stands behind anything here. Every AMS result above is this database’s report of Hesbert’s numbering and not his page. The siglum key was reconstructed by cross-tabulation and is not printed by the site; the whole-calendar view is capped by the host at 500 rows.*
- Lasance, F. X., *The New Roman Missal* (New York: Benziger, 1945), optical layer. *Corroborates at optical state that the Thursday after Lent IV carries this Sunday’s Communion and the Fifteenth Sunday’s Gospel.*

Scripture and its English

- *Vulgata Clementina*, the Clementine Vulgate, tracked at `src/sources/bibles/clementine-vulgate`. *The comparison text for every divergence tabulated above, and the corpus behind the exhaustive lists of mitis, canticum novum and Amice.*
- *The Holy Bible, Douay–Rheims*, revised by Bishop Richard Challoner (1749–1752), Project Gutenberg e-text, tracked at `src/sources/bibles/douay-rheims`. *The registered public-domain English of all seven scriptural elements, printed whole where a chant sings part of a verse. The three per-book artifacts it is quoted from, at Psalms, Ephesians and Luke, are named in `research/source-bindings.toml`.*
- *The Roman Missal translated into the English language for the use of the laity*, first revised edition (Philadelphia: Eugene Cumiskey, 1861), formulary XVI. *SUNDAY after PENTECOST*, printed pp. 429 and 431, read on the page images at leaves n437 and n439 of Internet Archive item `romanmissaltran00churgoog`; passage `passage.eugene-cumiskey.roman-missal-english-laity.philadelphia-1861.post-pentecosten-16`. *The registered public-domain English of the three orations, a free devotional rendering reproduced with the book’s own spelling. Its English of the scriptural elements is not used.*
- *The Authorized Version of the Bible*, Project Gutenberg eBook 10. *The English the gallery’s later users quote, and the corpus in which “inner man” and “lowest room” were counted.*
- *The Revised Version* (1895), tracked here. *The English against which the shorter Latin clause at Luke 14:3 was noticed; no Greek New Testament is tracked, so the manuscript question is not settled.*

Patristic, medieval and conciliar witnesses

- Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*: on Ps. 85 §§1–3, 5, 7; on Ps. 101 sermo I §§16–19; on Ps. 97 §1; on Ps. 39 §§23–25; on Ps. 70 sermo II §§1–5. Latin from the Migne transcriptions served by la.wikisource and from the augustinus.it texts; English from the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, first series, vol. 8, as New Advent delivers it. The fifteen exact artifacts, three per psalm, are named in `research/source-bindings.toml`. *Web transcriptions of Migne, not critical editions; cited by enarratio, sermo and section because no Migne column was verified against a facsimile.*
- Augustine, *Enchiridion ad Laurentium* 32; *De gratia et libero arbitrio* 17.33. *The Collect’s doctrine stated outside any commentary on the Collect.*
- Augustine, *Sermo* 165, §§1.1, 2.2, 3.3–5.5, 7.9; *Epistula* 55.14.25; *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus* 118.5. *The three cross-readings of Eph. 3:18, with three different sets of virtues; and the defence of altitudo against the missal’s sublimitas.*
- Augustine, *Quaestiones euangeliorum* II q. 29. *The dropsical man compared to the animal in the well and to the covetous rich man. The retrieved transcription carries optical damage in that paragraph, so the sense is reported above and the wording is not quoted.*
- Ambrose, *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* VII.195–196, with books VIII and IX read whole for the negative, in the same Migne transcription served by la.wikisource.
- Bede, *In Lucae euangelium expositio*, PL 92 cols. 510D–513A, with the prefatory letter to Acca. *The fullest continuous Latin exposition of this pericope. Bede states there that he marked his borrowings with their authors’ initials; the transcription read here carries no such marks.*

- John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, Homily 7 (with 6 and 8 as boundary witnesses), in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, first series, vol. 13, as New Advent delivers it. *Read in English; the Greek of PG 62 was not opened, so no argument above rests on his wording.*
- Cyril of Alexandria, *A Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke*, Sermons 101 and 102, English of R. Payne Smith (Oxford, 1859), pp. 471–479. *The commentary survives entire only in Syriac and no Greek or Syriac witness was opened, so Cyril’s argument is used above and his wording is not quoted. His lemma at Luke 14:5 reads “son . . . or ox” and does not answer the missal’s ásinus.*
- Benedict of Nursia, *Regula* 7, *De humilitate*, opening sentences. *Quotes the Gospel’s last verse as the voice of Scripture and names no chapter.*
- Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis* III.18 and III.21, in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, second series, vol. 12. *Its editors refer the sentence at III.18 to Luke 18:14, and Gregory’s nearest citation of Luke 14 is at III.21 and is of vv. 12–14, which the Missal does not appoint.*
- Thomas Aquinas, *Super Epistolam ad Ephesios lectura* cap. 3 lect. 4–5, *Corpus Thomisticum*, Marietti text; *Catena aurea in Lucam* cap. 14 lect. 1–2, Turin 1953; *Postilla super Psalmos* in ps. 39 nn. 6–7. *The Catena names eight authorities at this pericope, of which four — Theophylact, Gregory’s Moralia, Basil and a Chrysostom excerpt — were verified at no locus and are not quoted above.*
- Cassiodorus, *Expositio psalmorum*, in Ps. XXXIX §§21–24; in Ps. LXX §§4, 21–23, 32–33; in Ps. LXXXV §§2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 18, 23–24; in Ps. XCVII §§2, 4, 6–7, 14; in Ps. CI §§2–3, 22–23. *Read in the Corpus Corporum text as monumenta.ch delivers it, per psalm. A Migne-derived web transcription, not Adriaen’s CCSL 98 and not PL 70 at a column; the section numbers are the host’s, and the loci above are cited by lemma because the page’s verse numerals run three ahead of the missal at Ps. 39 and one ahead at Ps. 97. His lemma stands with the missal against the Clementine at four of the five chants, and no critical text was collated at those four lemmata.*
- Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, in J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 80: cols. 1159–1160 (Ps. 39), 1423–1426 (Ps. 70), 1553–1556 (Ps. 85), 1657–1658 (Ps. 97) and 1679–1682 (Ps. 101). *Migne’s reprint of Schulze’s Halle recension with a facing Latin version, not a critical Greek text; every quotation above is Migne’s Latin, his Greek named where the two part and quoted nowhere, and the two differ in tense at Ps. 101:17. Cols. 1423–1424 and 1553–1554 — the openings of his Ps. 70 and his Ps. 85 — were read on the facsimile’s uncorrected optical layer; the other six ranges, cols. 1159–1160, 1425–1426, 1555–1556, 1657–1658, 1679–1680 and 1681–1682, on rendered page images. The stable locus in this facsimile is the column and not the artifact’s page, pp. 878–879 reprinting the opening of pp. 876–877. R. C. Hill’s English is in copyright and was not used.*
- Bellarmine, R., *Explanatio in Psalmos*, in the English of John O’Sullivan as *A Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (Dublin: Duffy, 1866), printed pp. 122 (Ps. 39), 212–213 (Ps. 70), 259–261 (Ps. 85), 306 (Ps. 97) and 317 (Ps. 101). *Reception in English only: the translator declares the abridgement, so nothing above is Bellarmine’s Latin and no argument rests on an absence from these pages. Printed pp. 212–213, 259 and 306 (artifact PDF pp. 222–223, 269 and 316) were read on the facsimile’s uncorrected optical layer; printed pp. 122, 260 and 317 (PDF pp. 132, 270 and 327) on rendered page images; for printed p. 261, the tail of the Ps. 85 span, no state is recorded. His printed verse numbers run one below the Vulgate at Ps. 39 and Ps. 101 and level at the other three, and the argument line and psalm text printed above each exposition are the Douay–Rheims and not his.*
- Jerome, *Epistula* 106 (*Ad Sunniam et Fretelam*) §§23 and 43. *His ruling for respice against a reported festina at the Offertory’s clause, and his two rulings on the Communion’s wording. The registered witness is a 1937 English translation whose copyright the source record marks unestablished: the Latin lemmata and the words at issue are quoted above and the translator’s English is not, and the Latin original of the letter was not opened.*
- Cornelius a Lapide, *Commentaria in omnes D. Pauli Epistolas* (Antwerp, 1614), in the Internet Archive facsimile of that printing, whose optical layer of 97,832 lines was searched whole. *Used above for the printing’s extent and for nothing else. Its last running heads are COMMENT. IN EPIST. AD GALAT., no ad Ephesios running head stands anywhere in it, and the 54 hits on Ephes variants are cross-references inside commentary on other epistles. An uncorrected optical layer; no page image was opened.*
- Council of Trent, Session VI, cap. X, cap. XVI and can. 32, from the Tauchnitz 1887 printing of the *Canones et decreta*, page-verified in this repository. *Cap. X quotes a Sunday collect of this series, which the printing’s own footnote identifies as the Thirteenth Sunday’s, and quotes it altered.*

Sources of the page-2 chronology

- *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: Robert Appleton, 1908–1912), identified by volume and by New Advent article number, which is what the Scripture chronology corpus records: vol. V, article 05485a and vol. XI, article 11567b for the Epistle’s two labels; vol. XIV, article 14530a for the Gospel’s; vol. III, articles 03738a and 03731a for the two Nativity labels; and vol. IV, article 04642b for the reign four of the psalm dossiers attribute to David. *The date labels come through the chronology corpus. P. Ladeuze, “Epistle to the Ephesians” (05485a), sections “To whom addressed” and “Date and place of composition; occasion”, also supplies the Epistle’s disputed place and audience. Article 14530a is “The New Testament”.*
- Pontifical Biblical Commission, *De auctore, tempore et veritate evangeliorum Marci et Lucae*, responsa, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 4 (1912). *Fixes the writing of Luke relative to Acts and to the Roman imprisonment rather than by a year.*
- *New American Bible Revised Edition*, the introduction to the Psalms, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. *The source of the whole-Psalter composition boundary the corpus returns for all five appointed psalms. Its bytes are registered restricted and nothing of it is reproduced here: what the Date column prints for that boundary is the generated projection of the corpus’s structured date, not the introduction’s own wording.*
- Haydock, G. L., *Douay Rheims Bible with Haydock Commentary*, at Ps. 70. *The Ussher-attributed marginal year of the world the corpus carries as a reported figure, excluded from its own basis.*

Later users, in the gallery

- Jerome, Jerome K., *Three Men in a Boat (To Say Nothing of the Dog)* (London: J. W. Arrowsmith, 1889), chapter XIX. Project Gutenberg eBook 308.
- Trollope, Anthony, *Barchester Towers* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1857), chapter VII. Project Gutenberg eBook 3409.
- *San Antonio Daily Light* (San Antonio, Tex.), 7 October 1897, p. 8, “THE EMERGENCY MET”; and *Evening Star* (Washington, D.C.), 26 September 1942, image 21, set aside as a sermon title. Library of Congress, *Chronicling America*; the phrase search for “ox is in the ditch” returns 324 pages, of which the first page of ten records was retrieved.
- Johnson, Clifton, *Highways and Byways of the South* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904), p. 169.
- Rossetti, Christina G., “Sit Down in the Lowest Room.”, *Macmillan’s Magazine*, no. 53, vol. IX (London: Macmillan, March 1864), pp. 436–439; and *The Poetical Works of Christina Georgina Rossetti*, ed. William Michael Rossetti (London: Macmillan, 1904), pp. 16–19 with the editor’s note at pp. 460–461.
- Barrett Browning, Elizabeth, *Sonnets from the Portuguese*, Sonnet XLIII, in *Poems* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1850). Project Gutenberg eBook 2002.
- Phillipson, John S., “‘How Do I Love Thee?’ — an Echo of St. Paul,” *The Victorian Newsletter*, no. 22 (Fall 1962), p. 22, note 7. *In copyright; served openly by the Ohio State University Libraries and quoted short and attributed.*
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches: Ein Buch für freie Geister*, Erster Band, Zweites Hauptstück, aphorism 87, Project Gutenberg eBook 7207; and *Human, All-Too-Human: A Book for Free Spirits*, Part I, translated by Helen Zimmern (Edinburgh and London: T. N. Foulis, 1910), printed p. 88, the page fixed by the running heads that bracket it. *The aphorism is not in Jenseits von Gut und Böse, Also sprach Zarathustra, Götzen-Dämmerung, Ecce homo or Der Wille zur Macht, all searched.*
- Herbert, Henry William, “The Yorkshire Moors,” in *Life and Writings of Frank Forester*, ed. David W. Judd, vol. 2 (New York: Orange Judd Company, 1882), p. 35, the page fixed by its running head. *The gastric sense of “inner man” in a checked witness of 1882, seven years before Jerome K. Jerome.*
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de, *Don Quijote*, Primera parte, cap. XI, Project Gutenberg eBook 2000; and John Ormsby’s English, Project Gutenberg eBook 996. *The Spanish proverbial form of Luke 14:11 set aside in the appendix above, read in those two e-texts and in no printed edition.*

- Negative corpora for the gallery: E. C. Brewer, *Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*; John Camden Hotten, *The Slang Dictionary*; Francis Grose, *A Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue*; Webster's Unabridged of 1913; and a ninety-volume Project Gutenberg sample of English and American literature, including seven novels of Dickens and Scott's *Waverley* and *Rob Roy*. Searched without result for "inner man".

Last revised (UTC): 2026-10-01T22:33:32Z

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.