

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.</i> 85:3, 5, with v. 1)	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.</i> 3:13–21)	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.</i> 101:16–17)	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.</i> 97:1)	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</i> 14:1–11)	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.</i> 39:14 and 15)	A petition to be looked at	Printed twice; its <i>in auxílium meum respice</i> stands verbatim at <i>Ps.</i> 70:12, 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.</i> 70:16–17 et 18)	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 senectam 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 Propers: Detailed Commentary

1. Four expositors of one pericope, and the one who comes nearest this formulary

Four commentators expound Luke 14:1–11 directly, and they divide over what its first half is even about. **Cyril of Alexandria spends a whole sermon on the sabbath**, the first of two that break the pericope where it breaks internally: the law was a shadow set to wait upon the truth, to keep the day reasonably is to rest from sin and not from mercy, the lawyers say nothing out of malice — and he presses it to sarcasm, that on such reasoning a man would do better to lay his own child joyfully in the grave than to break the sabbath. His second sermon reads the seating parable as a plain virtue of the modest mind, where an honour seized is a theft with the goods still to be given back. **Ambrose leaves the controversy alone.** He gives the whole pericope one paragraph: the sick man is one *in quo fluxus carnis exuberans, animae gravabat officia, spiritus exstinguebat ardorem*, and from there the lesson is humility, forbidden the appetite for the higher place and taught *ut humanitas persuasionis coercionis asperitatem excluderet*, and then hospitality, which is the Lord’s kind only when it is spent on the poor. Augustine, at *Quaestiones evangeliorum* II q. 29, compares the dropsical man to the animal fallen into the well because he laboured under a humour, and then to the covetous rich man. **Bede argues the sequence itself**, from the body’s sickness to the heart’s — *per huius aegritudinem corporis, in illis exprimeretur aegritudo cordis* — and takes the ox and the ass for the wise and the slow, or else for the two peoples, every one of them found in the pit of concupiscence and hauled out *iustificati gratis per gratiam ipsius*.

Bede comes nearest this formulary in the matter he names. His name for the first place at table is a glorying in one’s own merits — *non se, de meritis gloriando, quasi caeteris sublimior extollat* — which is the doctrine this Mass’s Collect and Communion state, grace that goes before merit and a justice that is God’s alone; and it belongs with his argument that the closing sentence is a rule about God and not about men. He is also the one who declines to close the parable’s promise. **At *Tunc erit tibi glória* he holds two readings at once and will not choose:** the last things, *ne nunc quaerere incipias quod tibi servatur in fine*, and every day, *Potest autem et in hac vita intelligi . . . quia quotidie Dominus suas nuptias intrat*.

Not one of the four reads this Gospel together with any other element of this Mass. Fromage does: he carries the closing axiom straight into the doctrine of grace by way of Ecclus. 3:20–21 — “The greater thou art, the more humble thyself in all things, and thou shalt find grace before God” — and **no other witness on this formulary as a whole joins two of its elements outright.** He also names Ambrose the homilist the Church has chosen for this Sunday, which is his own statement and rests on him alone, and reads the wedding through Matt. 22:2 rather than through Luke. Benedict’s use of the sentence is of another kind. He sets it at the head of *Regula* 7, quoting it as the voice of Scripture and naming no chapter — but **the words are not this pericope’s alone**, standing at Luke 18:14 and at Matt. 23:12 besides, so what the Rule attests is the reception of the sentence and not, demonstrably, of the Gospel this Mass reads.

Cyril’s commentary survives entire only in Syriac, and the English quoted is R. Payne Smith’s 1859 rendering of that Syriac, two removes from the Greek he preached; his lemma at 14:5 reads “whose son of yours, or whose ox,” on which his whole appeal to a father’s endangered child turns, where the missal sings *ásinus*. Bede tells Acca, in the letter prefixed to the work, that he drew it from Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory and Jerome and set each author’s initial in the margin beside the borrowed words; **no such initials survive in the Migne transmission**, and his dropsy-and-miser comparison stands almost word for word in Augustine’s *Quaestiones*. And of the eight authorities the *Catena aurea* names at this pericope, four are the four above at their own works, while the remaining four — Theophylact, Gregory’s *Moralia*, Basil on the order of places at table, and a Chrysostom excerpt — **rest on the Catena’s attribution alone**, in its medieval Latin, which for the three Greek Fathers is not their Greek.

The appointed words themselves stand in two relations. *Amíce* stands in five verses of the Clementine, and in only two of them does a host at a wedding feast use it of his guest: this Gospel’s v. 10, and Matt. 22:12, where the man so addressed is thrown out. And the closing logion keeps company with Matt. 23:12, Luke 1:52, Jas. 4:10 and 1 Pet. 5:6, and with the sapiential pair Prov. 25:6–7 and Ecclus. 3:20–21, of which Prov. 25:7’s *Ascende huc* comes nearest to *Amíce*, *ascénde supérius*, and comes nearest in the same situation. **The pericope halves one continuous sabbath meal:** the healing and the parable of places are read, the instruction to invite the poor and the parable of the great supper are not, and the bread that opens the scene at v. 1 returns at v. 15, outside what is appointed.

2. Four measures of a love said to surpass knowledge, and the answers standing over the verse

The lesson begins one verse before the sentence it completes and stops where the letter's doctrinal half stops. Eph. 3:1 opens *Huius rei gratia* and breaks off into a digression; v. 14 takes up the same three words again, and the liturgical incipit erases even that trace of the join by putting *Fratres: Obsecro vos* where the Clementine has *Propter quod peto*. At the far end the exhortation begins at 4:1 with *Obsecro itaque vos*, the very verb the incipit set at the front — **two Latin texts falling together on one verb**. Every petition inside the reading is addressed to God for a gift, and the nouns those petitions turn on are words the letter has used already. In the calendar registry named in the References the doxology of vv. 20–21 stands at this Mass and at no other, while the two remaining appointments of Ephesians 3 both cut v. 13 out.

Chrysostom's Homily 7 runs from 3:8 to the doxology, so the whole appointed pericope lies inside a single homily. At v. 13 he answers the difficulty in the Apostle's own words, making the tribulations the readers' own glory, since it was God's love for them that let his servants be afflicted on their account; at vv. 14–15 he takes the bent knees for the mark of a prayer meant in earnest, and *omnis paternitas* for the reckoning of the tribes by their Creator where they had been reckoned "according to the number of Angels." **The four measures he does not read as the Cross at all**: what they measure is the immensity of God's love "and how it extends every where," drawn for the eye by the 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*, with no Greek text behind them, and so the translator's.

Augustine reads the measures as the four members of the Cross in three works, and distributes the virtues differently in every one. *Epistula* 55.14.25 and *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus* 118.5 each name Eph. 3:18 as the text under exposition, so neither attribution is an inferred echo; between them they disagree on two of the four and exchange height for length; and *Sermo* 165 gives a third set — breadth to the charity that alone works well, length to perseverance, height to the *sursum cor* and to loving God *gratis*, depth to the judgments of God that cannot be searched. Aquinas lays out three readings and adopts none: the Dionysian, which takes the dimensions of God metaphorically and rests on Job 11:8–9; the reading from charity; and the Cross, whose hidden depth he names **predestination** — and **Augustine's name appears nowhere in his cross-reading**. Fromage measures neither the love nor the Cross but the indwelling: "God alone . . . can strengthen in us the inward man enough to make us understand, as the saints do, the dimensions . . . of the great mystery of Christ dwelling in man." **So the cruciform reading is a development inside one author and one position among at least three, and not the reading of the verse.**

The last of Augustine's three ties the lesson to the day's own prayers. Headed *deque gratia et libera voluntate, contra Pelagianos*, *Sermo* 165 divides at §1.1 precisely where the Collect divides grace — *Peto enim a vobis, propter arbitrium voluntatis: rogo det vobis, propter auxilium maiestatis*, and *auxilium* is the word this Mass's Offertory and Postcommunion both use — and it ends at §7.9 on *unde gratiam tuam meritum meum praecedat? Non*. The sermon itself runs only to 3:18 and stops three verses before the doxology; and where it opens by remarking that the day's Apostle, psalm and Gospel were of one mind, the day is Augustine's own in Africa, whose psalm was Ps. 56:2, and the remark settles nothing about this Roman formulary.

At two words the appointed Latin and the texts beside it part, once in the word and once only in its spelling. At §2.2 Augustine stops to defend *altitudo*, the reading his African text carries where the missal and the Clementine alike print *sublimitas* — **so what he says of *altitudo* he has not said of the missal's noun**; and the missal's *intelligimus* beside the Clementine's *intelligimus* is one word received two ways and not two words. Outside the pericope two Pauline places carry the reading's own vocabulary: 2 Cor. 4:16–17 gathers *non deficimus*, the renewal within, tribulation and a weight of glory into one movement, and Col. 1:24 states most nearly what Eph. 3:13 trades between an apostle's affliction and his hearers' glory.

3. What the chants did to the psalter, and what that does to every Father quoted at them

Fifteen divergences stand between the appointed text and the Clementine Vulgate, the Latin behind the Douay–Rheims Challoner English of the scriptural elements. The two books differ besides in consonantal *i* and *j*, in the *æ* and *œ* ligatures and in stress accents, and those are the same words, spelled as each book spells them. The Introit departs at five places — *Miserere mihi* for *Miserere mei*, *quia* for *Quoniam*, *suavis ac mitis es* for *suavis et mitis*, *copiosus in misericordia* for *multæ misericordiæ*, and the dative added at the psalm verse. The Gradual departs at three, of

which *maiestate* for *gloria* is the substantive one. The Alleluia names *Dóminus*, whom the psalter leaves implicit, and stops before the Lord's arm. The Offertory sings *in auxilium meum respice* for *ad adjuvandum me respice*, drops *simul*, and prints its opening clause a second time as a refrain the psalm has not. **The Communion departs at no word at all:** every syllable of it is the Clementine's, and its whole distance from the psalter lies in where it begins and ends. The two readings depart only in liturgical formulae — *Fratres: Obsecro vos* and *In illo témpore*, neither of which stands in any Bible — with the missal running Luke 14:8–9 into one sentence.

The consequence for reception is two rules and not one. At four of the five chants the sixth-century lemma of Cassiodorus sides with the missal and against the Clementine — *suavis ac mitis es . . . copiosus in misericordia, videbitur in maiestate sua, quia mirabilia fecit Dominus, Domine, in auxilium meum respice* — and against the Introit's clause and the Offertory's, Migne's apparatus records no manuscript variant at all; at the Communion his text and the Clementine agree with the antiphon alike. **None of that is a critical text.** Migne's transcription stands behind every one of the four agreements, so each of them hangs on one lemma of a single printing. Theodoret's Greek supplies the Alleluia's subject as the chant does, and turns against the chant at two of the same four: at Ps. 101:17 his lemma is a future whose noun is the Clementine's, and at Ps. 39:14 he has the Septuagint, which Migne's facing Latin puts back into the Clementine's words.

Augustine's lemma differs at three places where the difference carries what he says. At the Gradual it reads *in gloria sua*, so no sentence of his is about *maiestate*. At the Alleluia's unsung half-verse it reads *Sanavit ei dextera eius* — “healed,” and “for him” — and on those two words he builds a distinction, *Multi enim sanantur sibi, non ei*, against the Clementine's *Salvavit sibi* and a third form again in Cassiodorus, *salvavit eum*. At the Offertory his clause is a third form too, *in adiuvandum mihi respice*. Jerome, ruling on that same clause at *Epistula* 106 against a reported *festina*, carries a fourth Latin form, *in adiutorium meum respice*, and **settles the verb the chant sings while leaving its noun untouched**; the reading he corrects is what Ps. 69:2 has, the verse this psalm doubles.

One departure moves toward another verse instead of away from one. The added dative turns Ps. 85:1 into the petition-form *inclina aurem tuam mihi*, which that psalter carries once and once only, at Ps. 16:6. The three places that come nearest — Ps. 30:3, Ps. 70:2 and Ps. 101:3, two of them the psalms this Mass sings at the Communion and at the Gradual — all read *inclina ad me aurem tuam*, and not one of them has *mihi*. **What the Introit and Ps. 16:6 hold in common is that four-word petition and the *et exáudi* standing beside it, and nothing wider:** Ps. 16:6 has *Deus* in its opening clause, asks a hearing for *verba mea*, and opens on a clause the psalm verse does not carry. *Oratio* opens four psalms in the whole Clementine, of which this Mass appoints two, Ps. 85 and Ps. 101, and a third, Ps. 16, is the psalm whose v. 6 that dative reproduces — and neither appointed title is sung.

Where the chants stop sets two of them beside a further text each. *Canticum novum* occurs at nine places in the Clementine and four of them carry the Alleluia's full incipit; **two of those four touch other elements of this formulary.** Ps. 95:1 carries the title *quando domus aedificabatur post captivitatem*, a building after captivity where the Gradual has *aedificávit Dóminus Sion*; Ps. 149:1 runs on into *laus eius in ecclesia sanctorum*, and the Epistle has both of those nouns, at *cum ómnibus sanctis* and at *glória in Ecclésia*; and a third of the nine, Ps. 39:4, belongs to the Offertory's own psalm. Cassiodorus makes the first of those joins himself, two verses past the Gradual's cut, where he quotes the Alleluia outright: *Hic laudabit Dominum, novo scilicet cantico, sicut in alio psalmo dictum est: Cantate Domino canticum novum*. And the Offertory's petition is verbatim Ps. 70:12, a verse of this Mass's Communion psalm, under another name for God.

4. Where the four psalm commentators agree, and where their divisions fall

Augustine expounds all five appointed psalms, and at each of them three others stand beside him: Cassiodorus in Latin, Theodoret in Migne's Greek with its facing Latin, and Bellarmine in O'Sullivan's 1866 English. Aquinas reaches one of the five, his *Postilla super Psalmos* breaking off inside Psalm 54, and Jerome adjudicates the wording at the Offertory. **Where they agree they agree about the man who prays; where they divide they divide about the referent.**

Their agreements are what make the divisions real ones. **All four take the Introit's *inops et pauper* for the confession of a man with nothing of his own, and not one of them for a statement about money:** Cassiodorus and Bellarmine volunteer that the rich are not shut out, and Augustine arrives at the same place by asking who the poor man is and answering that a rich man may be *in Deo pauperes*. **All four measure the Communion's youth-to-old-age as the reach of God's teaching, and none of them as a life's ordinary length.** And **no one of the five witnesses at the Offertory hears *confundántur et reveréántur* as a wish that the**

enemies be destroyed: Augustine and Bellarmine find a prophecy already fulfilled at the Resurrection, Cassiodorus a prayer for the persecutors' conversion, Theodoret a petition that historical enemies be routed, and Aquinas lets the penitential and the punitive confusion stand together.

The divisions run at every psalm, and every one of them is a division about who speaks or what is meant. **Who speaks.** At the Gradual Augustine gives the psalm to Christ; Cassiodorus records that reading and declines it, since Christ is nowhere said to have been *anxius*, and hands the psalm instead to an afflicted penitent left nameless on purpose, *ut cum uni datur, omnes sibi pauperes Christi cognoscerent attributum*; Theodoret gives it to the people in the Babylonian captivity. At the Offertory Theodoret supplies a speaker no Latin offers — the Church herself, who lays what befalls her to her own sins and holds the slack along with the perfect, *quoniam unum est corpus, tanquam ex una persona*. **What is seen.** Augustine sets the Judgment against the first coming, where the builder appeared *in infirmitate sua* and, as the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* render that exposition, “had no form nor comeliness”; Cassiodorus and Bellarmine keep the Judgment with him; Theodoret takes *videbitur* of Jerusalem rebuilt; and Fromage takes it of the majesty God shows now, in the Church.

What the wonders are. For Augustine, a whole world raised out of everlasting death by the Lord's holy arm; for Cassiodorus, regeneration and the Incarnation, the Gospel healings named and then put aside as things the saints did too, *Sed ista fecerunt et sancti eius*, so that the new thing is the Resurrection; for Bellarmine, an enumeration gathering both; for Theodoret, simply whatever exceeds nature and expectation. **How long a day is.** Augustine's *tota die* is the whole duration of the Body, *corpus Christi tota die clamat, sibi decedentibus et succedentibus membris*; Cassiodorus's is one human life crying by its works; Bellarmine's is perseverance in prayer; Theodoret's is Symmachus's “on each day” and nothing beyond it. **And what solius does.** For Augustine it shuts out every righteousness the singer might call his own; for Bellarmine, human counsel and his own strength; for Theodoret it names the just sentence God passed in the speaker's favour — and for Cassiodorus it excludes nothing of the singer's at all, carrying the remembering forward to the Judgment instead.

The exposition standing over the Communion is an exposition of exactly its three verses. *Enarratio in Ps. 70* sermo II §§1, 2 and 4 are Ps. 70:16, 17 and 18, and §3 of the same discourse reaches for Ps. 85:11, the psalm of this Mass's own Introit. At v. 16 Augustine fastens on the single word — *O solius! Quid addidit, solius? ... Justitia tua sola me liberat* — and at v. 18 he marks the Greek pair standing under the Latin doublet *senéctam et sénium* and draws two senses from it: for one man, that nothing of his is his own merit to the end; for the Church, *vox est enim Ecclesiae*, whose youth was the apostles' age. **So the grace-alone sense of this antiphon is Augustine's, with Bellarmine beside him in another key, and not the tradition's single voice.** His most quotable formula on the doctrine, *sua dona coronabit, non merita tua*, falls at §5 on v. 19, one verse past where the antiphon stops. And in Theodoret's Greek the word for *alone* is a genitive that may hang on *thy* as readily as on *justice*, where the Latin fastens it to the justice, so Augustine's whole reading of the clause rests on the Latin.

One commentator makes two elements of this Mass name one thing. Cassiodorus glosses the Communion's Judgment with the sheep-and-goats formula he had already used at Ps. 101:17 over the Gradual's *videbitur in maiestate sua*, so in his hands the Gradual's second half and the Communion's first clause are one event. **At two other elements it is two commentators who reach one verse:** Aquinas, at the Offertory's *cor meum dereliquit me*, reads the distraction of fervour by venial sins and cites 2 Kings (2 Samuel) 7:27, the same verse Augustine reaches for at this Mass's Introit, for the same fugitive heart. **Two readings stand outside that consensus.** Bellarmine carries the Communion's petition on to the finishing of the psalter — “until I shall have finished the book of Psalms, through which I will shew forth thy arm to all posterity” — which is a startling thing over a Communion antiphon, and the clause bearing it lies outside the appointed text. And Fromage, who is not of the exegetical tradition at all, keeps the Offertory's enemies as enemies, hearing the antiphon as the Church's prayer against the efforts of hell, and turns the Communion into her thank-offering, a promise to keep the justice that is God's law.

5. Three prayers no Father expounds, and the one witness who reads them

No Father expounds the Collect, and there is nothing unusual in that: the orations of the Roman sacramentaries have no commentator who works through a Sunday's own prayers, and the single witness who reads this one as this Mass's own is a nineteenth-century liturgist writing to feed devotion rather than to argue. Above the Collect Fromage puts what the two verbs divide, 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 ... we shall never be able to pass from the simple thought to the act of any virtue whatsoever.” **Fromage testifies that the prayer is read so; the distinction itself belongs to Augustine and to Trent** — and the

English is Shepherd's: *prevent* is his word in the exposition, while his English of the Collect gives *prævéniat* as "ever go before us"; and "persevering continuity of this most precious aid" is a phrase of Fromage's that renders nothing in *iúgiter*.

Where the doctrine itself stands is outside any commentary on the prayer. Augustine states it at *Enchiridion* 32, and again at *De gratia et libero arbitrio* 17.33 with the same pair put as *operatur* and *cooperatur*. **Its scriptural substratum is Ps. 58:11**, which stands verbatim in the Clementine, and the clause that follows answers Ps. 22:6, which the Clementine gives as *miserecordia tua subsequetur me* where Augustine has *eius*. Cassiodorus reaches the same half of the doctrine at the Offertory's own psalm, making God's very looking our protection: *aliter enim liberari non possumus, nisi nos Divinitas propitiata respiciat*.

Neither the Secret nor the Postcommunion has a patristic or saintly reception. The Latin corpora behind the reception of this Mass's other elements hold neither *sacrificiî præsentis* nor *mereamur esse participes* nor *Munda nos*. **The Veronese has none of the three orations**, its one near miss — *tua nos semper gratia praeveniens laetificatur* — being a different prayer altogether.

What the two prayers leave open, one witness closes, and only he. The Secret asks that the effect of the sacrifice now being offered cleanse us, and the Postcommunion asks for renewal by the sacrament just received; how offered sacrifice stands to received sacrament neither text says. Fromage gives the direction: the Sacrifice 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," so that the two orations are two moments of one movement. He reads *præsens páriter et futúrum* temporally as well, of the body "both in this and in the next life." **One thing in the Latin he does not take up:** whether the Secret's *eius* belongs to the sacrifice or to its effect.

In the Collect *bonis opéribus* and in the Postcommunion *rénova . . . mentes nostras* have their vocabulary in common with Eph. 2:10 and Eph. 4:23, verses of the appointed letter this Mass does not read; those are verbal echoes and no more, and **the three orations of this Mass quote no Scripture at all.**

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 observabant 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 *observabant* 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: *Observabant* 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** — *observabant*, *inténdens*, *réspice* — so the series is a series of acts and not of a lexeme. Aquinas's *Respectus Dei est auxilium 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 *copiósus 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 *copiósus 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 *synthesis companion*. It carries the propers map, the date-and-location sheet, the two-page thematic movement, an integrated cross-proper commentary, the source-grounded and exploratory synthesis, the notable-and-quotable gallery and this apparatus. It deliberately omits two things the canonical full edition prints: the complete appointed Latin with its English, and the element-by-element reception sweep. It is compiled mechanically from the same source leaf and 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; the complete text between those boundaries is printed in the canonical full edition and not in this one, the ten elements reaching this edition through the map and the page-2 dossier sheet. 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 *éxtrahet* 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 have their registered English in the anonymous rendering of *The Roman Missal translated into the English language for the use of the laity*, first revised edition (Philadelphia: Eugene Cumiskey, 1861), which this edition reports on and does not print; it is cited by formulary rather than by page, and all three orations 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 and Chrysostom's Homily 7 on Ephesians 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 evangeliorum* 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 evangeliorum* 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, and the Communion's genitive. **Two of the eight column stretches behind the Theodoret material this edition uses 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. **Where a psalm commentator quoted above gives a psalm a speaker and an occasion — Theodoret's Babylonian captives at Ps. 101 — it 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. **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 p. 357, at one place within pp. 358–360, and at pp. 368, 370 and 371,** and the References entry for the volume records what was read on a rendered image and what on the volume's own extracted text layer. 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 Comitatus* 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 *renova*, 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*, 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 Ssma 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 formularies 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. 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.*
- 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 XXXIII for the two preceding Sundays and the marginal antiphonary 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 praeueniens 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 p. 357 (the Collect), at p. 359 (the four measures), at p. 368 (Ecclus. 3:20–21 joined to the Gospel's closing axiom), at p. 370 (the Secret) and at p. 371 (the Postcommunion), with his readings of the Gradual at p. 363, of the parable's wedding at p. 365, of Ambrose as the homilist the Church has chosen for this Sunday at pp. 367–368, of the Offertory at p. 370 and of the Communion at pp. 370–371 reported and not quoted. *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; two passages of the chapter not quoted in this edition, at printed pp. 358 and 360, 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.*

Scripture and its English

- *Vulgata Clementina*, the Clementine Vulgate, tracked at `src/sources/bibles/clementine-vulgate`. *The comparison text for every divergence recorded 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 the seven scriptural elements, and the English this edition quotes its scriptural wording from. 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 this edition reports on and does not reproduce. 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.*

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.*
- Thomas Aquinas, *Super Epistolam ad Ephesios lectura* cap. 3 lect. 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. *His ruling for respice against a reported festina at the Offertory’s clause. 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.*
- Council of Trent, Session VI, cap. X and cap. XVI, 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.