

Twenty-seventh Sunday in Ordinary Time

The vineyard and its fruit

Roman Missal, Third Edition — United States, Year A

4 October 2026

The vineyard and its fruit

God's vineyard has been cared for, yet its fruit is a disappointment. Isaiah gives that disappointment a concrete name: injustice. Jesus brings the vineyard image into a confrontation with stewards who try to possess what was entrusted to them. Between the accusation and the parable, the assembly speaks as the damaged vine, asking God to return and give it life. The Sunday therefore brings a difficult conjunction into prayer: the people who owe God fruit also need God to make them live.

Two readings of this conjunction unfold here. The first follows the priority of gift: God gives, chooses, nourishes, and therefore calls forth a response that takes the form of justice and charity. Augustine's account of Christ's choosing in John and Chrysostom's account of the vineyard's prepared abundance illuminate that order. The second listens to a wounded people's appeal for restoration. Augustine and Robert Bellarmine read the psalm's vine as perfected in Christ; Chrysostom's Eucharistic exposition presses that restoration toward the difficult unity of actual neighbors.

The readings meet in Christ, the rejected Son and cornerstone. Their emphases remain different. One asks how fruit becomes possible; the other asks what becomes of a people whose life is damaged. Both must face judgment, and neither can turn divine generosity into indifference to what people do. The petition after Communion brings each toward a changed life: the sacrament is received so that its gift may shape the receiver.

The apostolic reading adds its own voice. Philippians moves from petition and thanksgiving to disciplined attention and practiced virtue. Its counsel of peace belongs to Paul's continuing address to the Philippians. Isaiah and the Gospel form the Sunday's vineyard pairing; Philippians is part of the semi-continuous apostolic course. The common Missal prayers and antiphons serve this Sunday in all three cycles. Their contribution here arises through their words and ritual places, without making every text say the same thing.¹

The two Communion antiphons give alternative conclusions to this movement. Lamentations places the communicant among those who seek and wait for the good Lord. The alternative based on First Corinthians makes the many and the one body explicit. Waiting and incorporation are compatible Christian realities, but these are alternatives, not two successive antiphons in one prescribed sequence.

Textual unit	Text / citation
Introductory Rites	
Entrance	<i>In voluntate tua, Domine</i> ; cf. Esther 4:17 (Mordecai's prayer; Douay–Rheims basis 13:9–11). Missal-antiphon route.
Collect	<i>Omnipotens sempiternus Deus, qui abundantia.</i>
Liturgy of the Word	
First reading	Isaiah 5:1–7.
Responsorial Psalm	Psalm 80:9,12,13–14,15–16,19–20 (Vulgate / Douay–Rheims 79); response Isaiah 5:7a.
Second reading	Philippians 4:6–9.
Acclamation	Alleluia; cf. John 15:16 (adaptation).
Gospel	Matthew 21:33–43.

¹*General Introduction to the Lectionary*, nos. 66–68, 106–107; U.S. Lectionary 139.

Textual unit	Text / citation
Liturgy of the Eucharist and Communion	
Prayer over the Offerings	<i>Suscipe, quaesumus, Domine.</i>
Communion	Lamentations 3:25; or cf. 1 Corinthians 10:17 (adaptation, with chalice language). Neither alternative is selected here.
Prayer after Communion	<i>Concede nobis, omnipotens Deus.</i>

The Missal identifies no unique Week 27 Preface, proper Offertory antiphon, Sequence, special Eucharistic Prayer insertion, or distinctive concluding formula in the inspected formulary. Permitted chant, Preface and Eucharistic Prayer selections remain open; the terminal liturgical appendix distinguishes them from the appointed texts above.

The appointed elements in context

Entrance: power invoked by the vulnerable

Mordecai's prayer begins from a position of danger, not control. In Esther's court narrative, the people face destruction; appeal to the king must be made amid real peril. The prayer in the additions names God's power over everything and recalls creation. Its argument is that the empire's present threat does not exhaust reality. The visible authority capable of issuing a destructive command remains beneath the Creator's sovereignty.²

This corporate danger matters to the antiphon's voice. Trust in divine power is not a claim to possess power over others. Mordecai intercedes for a people who cannot preserve themselves by willing security into existence. The creation language enlarges the horizon of petition: the same Lord who made heaven and earth can hear the people within them. The ensuing vineyard readings likewise concern a people whose existence begins in divine action. Yet the Entrance is an intercession amid danger, not an accusation that every endangered person deserves disaster.

The biblical prayer's continuation includes memory of deliverance and an appeal against destruction. Esther's own prayer adds the loneliness of one who must act within the court. Prayer and action therefore coexist in the larger narrative. The liturgical adaptation does not appoint every surrounding verse; those verses help explain why sovereignty is invoked. No securely checked direct patristic exposition of these precise Entrance verses supplies an additional identification here.

Collect: petition under a greater generosity

The Collect's generosity exceeds both the petitioner's merit and the reach of petition itself. Its three movements—divine abundance, mercy toward the guilty, and gifts beyond what can confidently be asked—make dependence more searching than a request for assistance with an otherwise self-sufficient life. The petitioner does not first produce an adequate claim and then receive its equivalent. God's bounty is the horizon within which the Church can ask.³

The petition for forgiveness also prevents generosity from becoming a refusal to name wrong. A person who needs mercy cannot make religious belonging a certificate of innocence. Beside Isaiah's disappointment and Matthew's violent tenants, the Collect gives the assembly a fitting posture: neither self-acquittal nor the despair that makes asking pointless. Augustine's account of being chosen so as to become good will

²Esther 4; 13:8–18; 14, Douay–Rheims Challoner. The Missal's reference cf. Esther 4:17 identifies the adapted Entrance in another numbering arrangement; Douay–Rheims 4:17 is not its text.

³Week 27 Collect, identified by *Omnipotens sempiterna Deus, qui abundantia*; FDLC, *Mystagogical Reflections*, Ordinary Time 24–30 (2016), p. 12. The historical excerpt has an older conclusion; no approved prayer body is reproduced here.

deepen this relation in the first reading of the whole formulary. It is his account of John 15, rather than a commentary by him on this Collect.

Isaiah: the love song becomes an indictment

Isaiah 5 begins with the beloved and his vineyard. Its slope, cultivation, selected vine, tower and winepress establish attentive preparation. The poem invites its hearers to enter the situation sympathetically before it names them. The owner's question then asks Jerusalem and Judah to judge between him and the vineyard. The hearers who could readily recognize the injustice of disappointing such care discover that the case concerns their own life.⁴

The final verse interprets the image: the vineyard is Israel and the chosen planting Judah. The expected fruit is judgment and justice; what arrives is iniquity and an outcry. The metaphor cannot be reduced to generic achievement, efficiency or successful institutions. Its fruit is the right ordering of life together. A vineyard can look substantial while the vulnerable cry out within it. The rest of Isaiah 5 makes the accusation socially concrete through its woes against acquisitiveness, self-indulgence and the corruption of judgment. Those woes are the chapter's explanatory context, not additional verses of the appointed reading.

The threatened removal of hedge and wall reverses the initial care. The place is to become exposed, uncultivated and dry. God has not been an indifferent owner discovering too late that his investment failed. The question is what more could have been done. The withdrawal of protection gives judgment a frightening form: a planting that refused its purpose loses the conditions within which it flourished. The passage holds divine love and accountability together, and its grief over failed fruit is part of its severity.

Chrysostom attends to precisely this image when explaining Matthew. He recognizes the prior care and the demand for works, but distinguishes the accused parties: Isaiah reproaches the vineyard, while Jesus' parable particularly reproaches the rulers responsible for it. That distinction changes the comparison. It allows the two texts to illuminate each other without identifying every vine with a violent tenant or assigning equal responsibility to everyone within the community.

The psalm: the vine asks to live

Psalm 80 in Hebrew numbering, 79 in the Vulgate and Douay-Rheims, recalls a vine brought out of Egypt and planted. The appointed verses move from that remembered gift to broken protection and devastation, then to petition for visitation and life. The assembly's answer is not merely assent to Isaiah's sentence. It becomes the prayer of those within the vineyard. Repeating the response from Isaiah 5:7a identifies the people, while the psalm lets that people lament.⁵

Memory does work within the prayer. The vine once crossed from Egypt into a place prepared for it; its present wound is measured against that earlier care. Asking why the hedge is broken is therefore more than complaint about a bad season. It addresses the planter concerning his own work. The plea to look, see and visit seeks personal divine attention, while the appeal for life recognizes that even renewed invocation depends upon God's quickening.

The psalm also resists a simple historical illustration. The sea, river and ravaging beast invite identification, and the received commentators make different ones. Augustine understands the river as Jordan and the ravager through Roman power; Bellarmine understands the river as Euphrates and considers Assyrian and Babylonian devastation. Their Christian expositions agree more strongly on restoration than on the

⁴Isaiah 5:1–7; John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Matthew* 68.1–2, NPNF1, vol. 10.

⁵Psalm 79:9,12–16,19–20, Douay-Rheims; Isaiah 5:7a. Augustine, *Exposition of Psalm 79*, §§6–11 (NPNF heading Psalm 80); Robert Bellarmine, *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, Psalm 79, trans. John O'Sullivan (1866).

disaster's geography. Neither historical identification settles the composition date of the poem. The second interpretation develops their agreement and difference together.

Philippians: prayer, attention and action

Paul addresses a community, not an isolated mind learning to suppress discomfort. In the chapter's immediate context he calls Euodia and Syntyche to agreement in the Lord; afterward he speaks of the community's renewed material concern for him. Prayer, peace and practice belong within that web of common life. The appointed verses lead through three connected activities: bring requests with thanksgiving, attend to what is worthy, and do what has been received through apostolic teaching and example.⁶

Chrysostom begins his homily by asking how joy can coexist with Christ's blessing of those who mourn. His answer permits grief over sin and rejoicing in Christ together. Later, the peace surpassing understanding receives a theological explanation: God reconciles those who were hostile to him through the gift of his Son. Peace is not simply a sensation produced by choosing pleasant thoughts. It rests in a divine act whose generosity surpasses human expectation.

Paul's list then reaches conduct. Truth, purity, justice and what deserves praise are objects of attention because actions grow from thoughts. Chrysostom insists that the apostolic pattern includes what the hearers saw as well as what they heard: behavior teaches. He also distinguishes doing praiseworthy acts from acting for the sake of praise. The direction of the will matters as much as its public appearance. Applied beside Isaiah, this makes fruit something more demanding than a good reputation.

The exhortation against anxiety does not diagnose every anxious person as unfaithful. The text supplies a movement toward prayer, thanksgiving and practice within suffering; Chrysostom's own opening names affliction. His later strong language about the safety of virtue belongs to this moral exhortation. It cannot erase the suffering with which the homily begins or turn God's peace into a promise that no painful event will occur.

The acclamation: chosen for lasting fruit

John 15 belongs to Jesus' farewell discourse. The vine and branches, abiding, the command to love, and the giving of one's life for friends explain the fruit of which verse 16 speaks. The appointed acclamation is an adaptation identified by that verse, not an appointment of every clause of the biblical sentence. Its force within the Mass is to turn attention toward Christ's initiative and the enduring outcome of discipleship.⁷

Augustine reads the order rigorously. Jesus does not choose people because they have already produced the fruit that makes them attractive candidates; he chooses them so that they may bear it. The next command, to love one another, names that fruit. The connection matters because "fruit" could otherwise become a blank into which ambition inserts its preferred success. Mutual charity gives the image a determinate Christian content. Augustine further orders petition in Christ's name toward salvation, excluding the idea that this name guarantees whatever desire happens to demand.

The Gospel: entrusted land and a rejected Son

Matthew 21 places the parable within Jerusalem's temple controversy. The leaders question Jesus' authority; the parables turn the question back upon their response to God. The vineyard is planted and equipped, then leased. The tenants' relation to it is therefore derivative from the beginning. When the owner sends for fruit, they answer with injury and murder. The sending of the son exposes their ambition most plainly: they try to seize inheritance by killing its heir.⁸

⁶Philippians 4:2–3, 6–9, 10–20; Chrysostom, *Homilies on Philippians* 14, NPNF1, vol. 13. Verses 2–3 and 10–20 are context.

⁷John 15:1–17; Augustine, *Tractates on John* 86.2–3 and 87.1, NPNF1, vol. 7.

⁸Matthew 21:23–46, especially the appointed 33–43; Chrysostom, *Homilies on Matthew* 68.1–2.

The parable's question brings a judgment from the hearers. They can identify the injustice when it is narrated about others. Jesus' citation of the rejected stone then discloses a divine reversal: the builders' assessment does not decide the stone's future. In the Christian reading the rejected Son is the cornerstone. The kingdom is given to a people bringing forth its fruits. The ending therefore answers seizure with responsibility, not with another group's entitlement to unaccountable possession.

Chrysostom finds providence in the prepared vineyard and longsuffering in repeated sending. He reads the owner's absence as patience and the expectation of respect for the son as the response that ought to have occurred, not ignorance in God. His homily includes fierce generalizations about Jews; these must be read alongside its own identification of the rulers and its statement that believing Jews and Gentiles become one. Matthew's following verses identify the chief priests and Pharisees as recognizing themselves in the parable. The accusation cannot honestly become hereditary blame attaching to every Jewish person.

The Church hears a parable about stewardship while receiving entrusted goods herself. Fruit remains required of the people to whom the vineyard is given. A reading that ends by congratulating its present hearers has lost the criterion by which the parable judges possession. The question is whether the owner receives the fruit of his gift, and whether the Son is received rather than displaced by the desire to rule.

Offerings: obedience within sanctifying action

The Prayer over the Offerings joins the Church's duty of worship to the sanctifying accomplishment of redemption. The inspected Latin witness supports that relation; an exact approved-English exemplar has not been established for this prayer. Its identifier and analysis therefore stand here without an English substitute prayer.⁹

The ritual place is significant. The Word's demand for fruit is followed by an offering that looks to God's sanctifying action. The worshipper does not leave divine gift behind in order to perform an independent act that forces a return. Aquinas explains Eucharistic efficacy from Christ and his Passion, then from the sacrament's nourishment and sign of unity. That theological account illuminates why an obedient offering and dependence on redemption belong together.¹⁰

Communion: waiting or incorporation

Lamentations 3:25 speaks of the Lord's goodness to those who hope in him and seek him. The wider chapter has already spoken of lost peace and failed strength. Hope emerges within that speech of pain; it is not the report of someone untouched by ruin. The surrounding verses commend patience, but the chapter also rejects the crushing of prisoners and the perversion of justice. Waiting for God cannot be used to sanctify another person's oppression.¹¹

The alternative derived from First Corinthians 10:17 places common participation in the foreground. Verse 16's chalice and bread supply its scriptural setting; the Missal antiphon adapts the wording and includes chalice language. Paul's chapter warns against idolatry and closes by directing conduct toward others' good and God's glory. Communion is therefore a real belonging that makes rival allegiances and selfish conduct consequential. Chrysostom's explanation of many grains and one bread intensifies this claim: the same Christ feeds each person, so refusal of the neighbor contradicts the received communion.¹²

⁹*Suscipe, quaesumus, Domine*, Week 27; *Missale Romanum*, third typical edition (2002), secondary digital reproduction, physical pp. 290–291. This witness does not establish exact wording of the 2008 emended altar book or U.S. 2011 edition.

¹⁰Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 79, a. 1, body and replies.

¹¹Lamentations 3:17–36, 40–58; the appointed first Communion locus is 3:25.

¹²1 Corinthians 10:14–24, 31–33; Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians* 24.4, NPNF1, vol. 12.

After Communion: a life shaped by reception

The Prayer after Communion seeks transformation through the nourishment received. The Church asks for an effect extending into life, rather than treating reception as the end of a transaction. Aquinas describes charity as aroused to action through the sacrament, and the body's members as serving justice now while awaiting future incorruption. His explanation joins moral action, sacramental gift and bodily hope.¹³

Leo's Passion sermon supplies a further Eucharistic parallel: the receivers bear the crucified and risen Christ in body and spirit. The phrase about becoming what is received belongs to section VII's discussion of participation in Christ's body and blood; the preceding section discusses baptism. Leo's argument makes the Paschal identity of the gift explicit. Its resemblance to the final prayer supports theological understanding without supplying a newly established history of the modern prayer's composition.¹⁴

Study Scripture and liturgical locators

The Scripture printed here is the public-domain Douay–Rheims Bible, Challoner revision, in the retained Project Gutenberg 1581 witness. It is **study English, not the approved English proclaimed at this celebration**. The U.S. Lectionary for Mass, no. 139, controls the proclaimed readings. Original spelling is retained. A biblical basis printed for an adaptation does not reconstruct the Missal antiphon or the adapted acclamation. The orations are identified without substitute translations.

Entrance

Cf. Esther 4:17; identified Douay–Rheims basis 13:9–11.

The biblical prayer below is the basis of the adaptation, not its exact appointed wording. Missal identifier: *In voluntate tua, Domine*.

DOUAY–RHEIMS CHALLONER

⁹ And said: O Lord, Lord, almighty king, for all things are in thy power, and there is none that can resist thy will, if thou determine to save Israel.

¹⁰ Thou hast made heaven and earth and all things that are under the cope of heaven.

¹¹ Thou art Lord of all, and there is none that can resist thy majesty.

Collect

Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui abundantia.

Roman Missal, Twenty-seventh Sunday in Ordinary Time, Collect. The approved English and full Latin prayer are not reproduced. The prayer's petition is discussed above; this locator supplies no replacement text.

First reading

Isaiah 5:1–7.

DOUAY–RHEIMS CHALLONER

¹ I will sing to my beloved the canticle of my cousin concerning his vineyard. My beloved had a vineyard on a hill in a fruitful place.

¹³Week 27, *Concede nobis, omnipotens Deus*; FDLC, *Mystagogical Reflections*, p. 13; Aquinas, III, q. 79, a. 1, replies 2–3.

¹⁴Leo the Great, Sermon 63, *On the Passion XII*, VII and note 1063, trans. Charles Lett Feltoe, NPNF2, vol. 12.

² And he fenced it in, and picked the stones out of it, and planted it with the choicest vines, and built a tower in the midst thereof, and set up a winepress therein: and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes.

³ And now, O ye inhabitants of Jerusalem, and ye men of Juda, judge between me and my vineyard.

⁴ What is there that I ought to do more to my vineyard, that I have not done to it? was it that I looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it hath brought forth wild grapes?

⁵ And now I will shew you what I will do to my vineyard. I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be wasted: I will break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down.

⁶ And I will make it desolate: it shall not be pruned, and it shall not be digged: but briers and thorns shall come up: and I will command the clouds to rain no rain upon it.

⁷ For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel: and the man of Juda, his pleasant plant: and I looked that he should do judgment, and behold iniquity: and do justice, and behold a cry.

Responsorial Psalm

Psalm 80:9,12,13–14,15–16,19–20; Douay–Rheims / Vulgate Psalm 79.

The response is Isaiah 5:7a, whose full verse appears in the first reading above. Its appointed clause identifies the vineyard as the house of Israel; the full verse is not repeated as a response. The following are the selected psalm verses in study English.

DOUAY–RHEIMS CHALLONER

⁹ Thou hast brought a vineyard out of Egypt: thou hast cast out the Gentiles and planted it.

¹² It stretched forth its branches unto the sea, and its boughs unto the river.

¹³ Why hast thou broken down the hedge thereof, so that all they who pass by the way do pluck it?

¹⁴ The boar out of the wood hath laid it waste: and a singular wild beast hath devoured it.

¹⁵ Turn again, O God of hosts, look down from heaven, and see, and visit this vineyard:

¹⁶ And perfect the same which thy right hand hath planted: and upon the son of man whom thou hast confirmed for thyself.

¹⁹ And we depart not from thee, thou shalt quicken us: and we will call upon thy name.

²⁰ O Lord God of hosts, convert us and shew thy face, and we shall be saved.

Second reading

Philippians 4:6–9.

DOUAY–RHEIMS CHALLONER

⁶ Be nothing solicitous: but in every thing, by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your petitions be made known to God.

⁷ And the peace of God, which surpasseth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in Christ Jesus.

⁸ For the rest, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever modest, whatsoever just, whatsoever holy, whatsoever lovely, whatsoever of good fame, if there be any virtue, if any praise of discipline: think on these things.

⁹ The things which you have both learned and received and heard and seen in me, these do ye: and the God of peace shall be with you.

Gospel acclamation

Alleluia; cf. John 15:16.

This is the full source verse for study. The Lectionary acclamation adapts it and does not appoint every clause of the verse.

DOUAY–RHEIMS CHALLONER

¹⁶ You have not chosen me: but I have chosen you; and have appointed you, that you should go and should bring forth fruit; and your fruit should remain: that whatsoever you shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you.

Gospel

Matthew 21:33–43.

DOUAY–RHEIMS CHALLONER

³³ Hear ye another parable. There was a man, an householder, who planted a vineyard and made a hedge round about it and dug in it a press and built a tower and let it out to husbandmen and went into a strange country.

³⁴ And when the time of the fruits drew nigh, he sent his servants to the husbandmen that they might receive the fruits thereof.

³⁵ And the husbandmen laying hands on his servants, beat one and killed another and stoned another.

³⁶ Again he sent other servants, more than the former; and they did to them in like manner.

³⁷ And last of all he sent to them his son, saying: They will reverence my son.

³⁸ But the husbandmen seeing the son, said among themselves: This is the heir: come, let us kill him, and we shall have his inheritance.

³⁹ And taking him, they cast him forth out of the vineyard and killed him.

⁴⁰ When therefore the lord of the vineyard shall come, what will he do to those husbandmen?

⁴¹ They say to him: He will bring those evil men to an evil end and will let out his vineyard to other husbandmen that shall render him the fruit in due season.

⁴² Jesus saith to them: Have you never read in the Scriptures: The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner? By the Lord this has been done; and it is wonderful in our eyes.

⁴³ Therefore I say to you that the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and shall be given to a nation yielding the fruits thereof.

Prayer over the Offerings

Suscipe, quaesumus, Domine.

Roman Missal, Twenty-seventh Sunday in Ordinary Time, Prayer over the Offerings. The exact approved-English exemplar remains uncollated. The analysis uses the identified 2002 Latin digital reproduction; neither that prayer body nor a reconstructed English version is printed.

Communion: Lamentations alternative

Lamentations 3:25.

First appointed Missal alternative. The retained Bible witness includes its alphabetic stanza marker, Teth; this is study Scripture, not an instruction to recite that marker in the antiphon.

DOUAY–RHEIMS CHALLONER

²⁵ Teth. The Lord is good to them that hope in him, to the soul that seeketh him.

Communion: Corinthians alternative

Cf. 1 Corinthians 10:17; 10:16 supplies the chalice context.

Second appointed Missal alternative. The biblical verses explain its basis; the Missal adaptation is not identical with this two-verse extract. This alternative and the preceding one are not combined into one enacted antiphon.

DOUAY–RHEIMS CHALLONER

¹⁶ The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?
And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?

¹⁷ For we, being many, are one bread, one body: all that partake of one bread.

Prayer after Communion

Concede nobis, omnipotens Deus.

Roman Missal, Twenty-seventh Sunday in Ordinary Time, Prayer after Communion. The approved English and full Latin are not reproduced. Its petition for a life transformed through reception is explained in the commentary.

The fruit of a gift

God's demand for fruit begins with what he has given. The vineyard exists because someone planted it; the disciples bear fruit because Christ chose and appointed them; the communicants receive nourishment because Christ gives himself. Yet gift does not make response optional. Isaiah's accusation and the tenants' judgment show how seriously the giver regards the life made possible by his generosity. The first reading of the whole formulary holds these two truths together: obedience is not the purchase price of God's initiative, and grace does not make injustice harmless.

Before the harvest there is a planting

Chrysostom starts his exposition of the tenants with the actions of the householder. Planting, enclosure, winepress and tower show that the owner has taken care of the vineyard before demanding its produce. The work has a history prior to the tenants' arrival. They enter an already prepared place, and their task is to care for what they received. For Chrysostom these provisions recall God's care in bringing the people from Egypt and giving them law, city, temple and altar. The image records an inheritance of benefits, not an isolated contract between equally independent parties.¹⁵

This is why the violence is so serious. The messengers do not demand something alien to the tenancy; they ask for the fruit toward which the preparation was directed. Chrysostom identifies it as obedience

¹⁵Chrysostom, *Homilies on Matthew* 68.1, NPNF1, vol. 10.

evidenced by works. The tenants turn the relationship inside out. Rather than acknowledge a debt of grateful service, they punish the people who name it. Their cruelty protects a false picture of themselves as possessors answerable to nobody. The final attack upon the heir is the fullest expression of that picture.

The owner's patience then reveals both his generosity and their culpability. He sends again after injury. Finally he sends his son. Chrysostom reads the expectation that they will respect the son as what they ought to do, preserving both God's knowledge and the reality of their refusal. Knowledge of a sinful act does not make the command to receive the son meaningless. The account therefore offers no comfortable determinism in which everyone simply acts out an unavoidable role. The hearer is asked to recognize a gift and answer it.

Isaiah begins still earlier in the image: the vineyard itself fails to yield the expected grapes. Its final identification of fruit with justice supplies a concrete test of that failure. Chrysostom's distinction between vineyard and husbandmen keeps the two accusations from collapsing into each other. In Isaiah, the planting names Israel and Judah; in Matthew the immediate accusation focuses upon their rulers. Together the passages expose both a people's unjust life and the violence of stewards who resist correction. Neither layer can be repaired by the mere continuation of religious appearances.

The Entrance reaches this same dependence through a different experience. Mordecai invokes the Creator from within a threat he cannot master. The danger does not prove a failure of merit; it occasions intercession. This opening voice gives the vineyard image its proper scale. Even a richly cultivated people does not own the world, and even a powerless people remains able to turn toward its Maker. Divine sovereignty is not an attribute the tenants can appropriate for themselves. It is the ground on which the endangered can pray.

Chosen so as to become good

Augustine's exposition of John 15:16 asks what Christ found in those he chose. Could their prior goodness have supplied the reason for his choice? Augustine answers by following the order of the saying. If people had first turned to Christ in such a way as to establish their worthiness, their choice would have come first. Christ says instead that his choice precedes theirs. Augustine therefore understands mercy as producing the goodness it does not merely discover.¹⁶

His next step is just as necessary. Chosen people are appointed to go and bear fruit. The priority of grace is not an exemption from goodness; it is its enabling source. Augustine recalls the branch's inability to bear apart from the vine, making continued dependence part of the very act of fruitfulness. A branch does not graduate from receiving life into producing independently. Christ is also the way in which those appointed are to go. The gift reaches beyond an initial moment to sustain the journey it begins.

This argument changes the way the Sunday can be heard. Isaiah's owner asks why good care has not yielded good fruit; the Gospel threatens unfruitful stewardship; the acclamation directs the listener to Christ's appointment. If these demands were heard without the prior gift, they could become an anxious effort to establish a claim upon God. Augustine forbids that inversion. The Christian acts because Christ has given life and a calling, not in order to make a first gift owed. The seriousness of action survives, while boasting loses its basis.

The Collect gives a corresponding form to the Church's petition. Divine generosity exceeds merit and the measure of asking. Even the prayer's confidence comes from God rather than from a calculation that the applicant has qualified. Forgiveness and unearned abundance stand together. The Collect can thus accompany the vineyard's severe accusation without allowing either evasion or hopelessness: wrongdoing is real enough to require mercy, and mercy is generous enough to be sought by the guilty.

Chrysostom's exhortation in the Philippians homily has a different accent. Near its end he urges the hearers to make a beginning and cease fighting. He is summoning people to act; Augustine is explaining

¹⁶Augustine, *Tractates on John* 86.2–3, trans. John Gibb and James Innes, NPNF1, vol. 7.

why prior goodness cannot be the cause of Christ's election. Chrysostom has already grounded peace in God's astonishing beneficence toward enemies. The compatible claim is that divine generosity calls forth active response. Their different questions should remain audible, rather than being fused into one technical account of every relation between grace and human initiative.¹⁷

The fruit has a name

The command following John 15:16 tells Augustine what the fruit is: love of one another. His argument does not stop with an attractive image of growth. He reads the next sentence as an explanation of the previous one. The branch's fruit is charity, and charity includes love of God together with rightly ordered love of neighbor. The several virtues cannot replace charity as isolated achievements. They arise within it: patience continues in a loved good, kindness aids a loved person, and peace belongs with those one truly loves.¹⁸

That identification brings the Gospel's demand into practical contact with Isaiah's justice. The outcry of someone wronged cannot be dismissed by pointing to impressive religious activity elsewhere. Charity seeks the person's good; justice names what is owed. In this reading they expose the inadequacy of fruit understood as quantities alone. A person can increase possessions, influence or work accomplished while remaining unwilling to receive correction or serve a neighbor. The tenants' desire to acquire the inheritance is the parable's most obvious example of growth that is actually ruin.

Philippians supplies the ordinary practices in which an opposite life develops. Requests are accompanied by thanksgiving, which remembers that petitioners already live amid gifts. Attention is turned toward truth, justice, purity and what deserves praise. Teaching becomes action through the example of a life seen and heard. Chrysostom treats the transition from thought to deed as essential: evil actions have sources in the things a person entertains, while the apostolic example gives the hearer a pattern to practice. Fruit is cultivated in repeated acts rather than secured by one statement of good intention.

The peace Paul promises is also more than the reward of having managed oneself efficiently. Chrysostom relates it to God's reconciliation of those who were hostile to him through the Son. The gift supplies the measure of conduct toward other people. If God did not restrict his generosity to those who had earned his friendship, the hearer cannot make personal grievance the supreme rule of action. Thanksgiving and forgiveness both acknowledge that the self is not the original source of the goods it receives.

A prayer for life rather than self-sufficiency

The psalm turns demand into petition without withdrawing the demand. The people ask God to give life, and then they will invoke his name. In Augustine's closing exposition, quickening changes what the heart loves: the Creator is no longer valued merely as a supplier of earthly benefits. The living relation to God becomes itself the good sought. This gives the vineyard's fruit a deeper horizon than visible prosperity.¹⁹

Augustine asks what created thing could rightly be loved more than its Creator. His answer proceeds through the beauty of the world rather than contempt for it. Created beauty invites love of the one who made it. The danger comes when a gift becomes the preferred object that displaces the giver. His examples of wealth, health and honor sharpen the point: those goods are also possessed by people who do not worship God. If they become the sole reason for worship, the worshipper will judge God by the prosperity of others and lose the purpose of love.

Lamentations' Communion option holds this dependence within grief. Seeking the good Lord does not presuppose that all consolation has returned. The surrounding chapter allows brokenness, memory, waiting

¹⁷Chrysostom, *Homilies on Philippians* 14, especially the exposition of 4:7 and the final exhortation to peace.

¹⁸Augustine, *Tractates on John* 87.1.

¹⁹Augustine, *Exposition of Psalm 79*, §11, NPNF1, vol. 8, heading Psalm 80.

and hope to occupy the same human life. Fruit may therefore include a fidelity whose full outcome is not yet seen. Such waiting is not passive approval of injustice; the same chapter protests violated rights and calls for examination and return. It directs hope toward God without making present pain unreal.

The Corinthians alternative draws out a different consequence. If the many share one bread and become one body, the neighbor is not merely another independent worker attempting to deliver a separate crop. Charity bears fruit within a shared sacramental life. Chrysostom's question is whether those nourished by the same Christ actually show the same love. The sacrament reveals both the source of unity and the contradiction of behavior that divides its recipients.²⁰

The gift nourishes the response

Aquinas explains the Eucharist's gift by beginning with Christ, whom the sacrament contains, and with the Passion it represents. The spiritual benefit is not inferred merely from bread as a useful illustration. Christ gives life, and his Passion is the source of the sacrament's efficacy. Nourishment then explains how that life is sustained, increased, restored and delighted. The outward species also signify unity: many grains and grapes are gathered into one.²¹

The Prayer over the Offerings and Prayer after Communion occupy distinct places within that action. The former joins obedient worship to redemption's sanctifying effect. The latter seeks the shaping of the receiver by the gift received. Neither is a promise that ritual performance purchases an unrestricted favor. In Aquinas's reply to the second objection, charity is not only bestowed as a disposition but stirred into action. The sacrament strengthens precisely the love that Augustine has identified as fruit. The demand and the nourishment meet without becoming identical acts.

This account also answers a difficulty in the language of gift. If everything begins with God, does the person disappear into passivity? Aquinas's description is the opposite: charity is moved to work. The grace received reaches embodied action, and the body is offered in the service of justice. The point is not to replace action with a claim that God will act instead. It is to understand action as the living expression of a gift whose source remains Christ.²²

Fruit that remains

The harvest image could suggest only one season's results. John speaks of fruit remaining, and Augustine relates present love to desire for a fulfillment not yet possessed. His exposition of the psalm makes God himself the reward of the justified. Aquinas adds the body's future participation in incorruption and glory. Together these accounts prevent the moral reading from closing around successful management of present life.

Judgment remains part of that horizon. The tenants cannot make the inheritance theirs by excluding the Son, and fruit remains the criterion after their removal. Hope is therefore not confidence that present membership makes perseverance unnecessary. It is trust in the giver who can sustain the response he asks, joined to the willingness to receive his correction. The Church prays as a vineyard in need of life while seeking the charity that will remain.

Literal.

Distinct speakers and situations express dependence and responsibility: endangered Israel appeals to its Creator; Isaiah names injustice; the devastated vine asks for life; Paul teaches thankful prayer and practice; Jesus judges violent stewardship. The prayers place need and response before divine generosity.

²⁰Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians* 24.4.

²¹Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 79, a. 1, body. Historical English translation by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province.

²²Aquinas, III, q. 79, a. 1, replies 2–3.

Allegorical.

The rejected Son is the cornerstone, and the disciples' fruit grows through abiding in Christ. Augustine's charity and Chrysostom's one body disclose the unity of giver, nourishment and fruitful life in Christ and his members.

Moral.

Gifts are received as a call to justice, truth, thanksgiving and mutual service. Works answer Christ's initiative; they do not purchase his initial choice. Repentance receives correction where possessiveness has withheld fruit.

Anagogical.

Lasting charity tends toward enjoyment of God himself and the body's future incorruption. The harvest's judgment makes perseverance serious; the giver's faithfulness makes hope possible beyond the measure of one visible season.

The wounded vineyard made one

The vineyard's wound calls forth more than an account of failure. It calls forth a plea that God visit what he planted. This second reading follows that plea toward Christ and toward the common life of his body. Augustine and Bellarmine understand the vineyard's restoration through Christ without making it a wholly unrelated planting. Chrysostom's Eucharistic exposition then asks whether people who receive the same Christ will live as members of one another. The governing question is how a wounded people is renewed, not how it can congratulate itself on surviving.

The voice inside the broken enclosure

Isaiah speaks the owner's accusation; the psalm speaks from within the damaged vineyard. The change of voice matters. In the reading, the hearer is brought to recognize the seriousness of unjust fruit. In the response, the assembly addresses the planter and asks him to act. The same people can need both judgment and mercy. Yet these voices do not authorize a universal diagnosis that every sufferer's wound measures personal guilt. The texts give particular accusations and particular laments, not a formula assigning blame to every injured person.

Mordecai's Entrance prayer adds corporate intercession before the vineyard is named. The threatened people appeal to a sovereignty greater than the court's power. Their hope does not depend on having become socially invulnerable. It depends on the Creator's ability to hear and preserve. The Collect likewise names need before merit and divine abundance beyond the requester's reach. Together these opening elements establish that restoration can be sought by those who do not command its means.

The psalm remembers Egypt, planting and expansion before describing broken defenses. Memory keeps the damaged community from understanding itself solely through the latest disaster. The ruin is real, but it does not abolish the identity of the one who planted or the history of his gift. Petition asks him to return to his work. Its verbs—look, visit, give life—express dependence upon an attention the people cannot manufacture for themselves.²³

²³Psalm 79:9,12–16,19–20, Douay–Rheims; Augustine, *Exposition of Psalm 79*, §§6–11; Bellarmine, *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, Psalm 79.

Augustine: the same vine perfected in Christ

Augustine moves between the vine's Israelite beginning and its fulfillment in Christ. He first acknowledges the people brought from Egypt and the territory they occupied. When he considers the vine's eventual reach, he reads its expansion through the way opened in Christ. The poem's images thus carry both the remembered planting and a perfection extending beyond its earlier borders. His exposition does not require the planter to discard one people and invent an unrelated origin.²⁴

At the request that God perfect what his right hand planted, Augustine makes that continuity explicit. He corrects the suggestion of a second vineyard into the same vineyard, and connects the seed of Abraham with the promise of blessing to the nations. Gentile incorporation is described through grafting into an existing root. The Son of Man is the place of perfection: Christ is the foundation upon which the building stands. The vine's renewal therefore has a Christological center, rather than resting on an undifferentiated confidence in communal endurance.²⁵

The Gospel's violence does not defeat this account. Augustine recalls the tenants and the heir in his psalm exposition. The heir cast out of the vineyard nevertheless possesses it more fully. Rejection does not strip the Son of his relation to the Father's work. That paradox corresponds to Matthew's movement from murdered heir to rejected cornerstone: the act intended to eliminate him becomes unable to control the outcome. The people's renewal is founded upon the one whom grasping stewards attempted to remove.²⁶

This is a Christian interpretation of the psalm's prayer, and Augustine gives it in the language of fulfillment. The literal vine remains the people brought from Egypt. Christological perfection deepens the reading of their prayer; it does not make their history an empty shell. Nor can the nations receiving the promise claim an independent right to the root into which they are grafted. The image itself requires gratitude for an inheritance that precedes their arrival.

Bellarmino: reform, not total destruction

Bellarmino gives an independent argument at the same psalmic turn. In his explanation of the plea for visitation, he distinguishes a reform of the vineyard from its complete destruction. He names the apostles as belonging to Israel and recalls the many who respond to Peter's preaching. The Gentiles enter through grafting, as in Paul's olive-tree image. These particulars matter because they make continuity concrete: the renewed people is not produced by erasing its Jewish members and beginning again elsewhere.²⁷

For Bellarmine, Christ perfects the planting and governs it. Restoration is consequently more than repair of national prosperity. His conclusion distinguishes life of grace here from life of glory hereafter. The vine's final good cannot be measured simply by recovering an earlier political position or external splendor. A community can seek God's face amid diminished circumstances and still be called toward a perfection that exceeds its former success.

Bellarmino's account carries the polemical vocabulary of its own time, and his assertion that all agree on a Christological identification is his assertion, not a survey of every interpreter. The argument retained here is his specific account of continuity through apostles, converts and grafted Gentiles, with Christ as the vineyard's perfection. Augustine's corresponding account establishes genuine agreement on this point without turning the two expositions into a single voice.

²⁴Augustine, *Exposition of Psalm 79*, §6, NPNF1, vol. 8, heading Psalm 80.

²⁵Augustine, Psalm 79, §9.

²⁶Augustine, Psalm 79, §7; Matthew 21:38–43.

²⁷Bellarmino, *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, Psalm 79, explanation at vv. 14–18 in the retained O'Sullivan translation (1866). The translation is abridged; the lemma numbering in the exposition does not supply a new numbering for the appointed psalm.

Their historical interpretations also differ. Augustine understands the river as Jordan and the beast in relation to Roman devastation; Bellarmine extends the image to Euphrates and discusses Assyrian and Babylonian ravagers. These are materially different readings of the poem's geography and disaster. The shared Christian hope does not settle them. A reader can affirm their theological convergence while recognizing that neither exposition alone supplies a demonstrated date or event for every image.²⁸

Restoration must answer the outcry

The word "restoration" can conceal a danger: a community may want its old strength back without wanting its old injustices exposed. Isaiah prevents that evasion. The failed fruit is not smallness or vulnerability, but injustice. To restore the vineyard cannot mean giving oppressors a safer enclosure within which to continue. God's visitation must be sought as renewal of the life he planted, including a changed relation to those whose cries indict it.

Augustine makes an interior turn when explaining the poem's images of burning and digging. He distinguishes desire and fear as sources of sin. A person may be drawn into wrongdoing by an attractive reward or driven into it by a threat. He then sets good love and good fear against those distorted powers. Repentance and holy love turn the heart toward the good rather than simply preserving its former desires under religious protection.²⁹

This moral turn deepens the corporate account. Unjust institutions are sustained by actual desires and fears: the wish to gain, the dread of losing standing, the refusal to accept correction. Matthew's tenants display both attachment to possession and hostility to the messenger who questions it. A community renewed in Christ must learn a different form of strength. It can confess wrongdoing without concluding that truth will destroy every possibility of common life, because its foundation is the rejected Son rather than its own unblemished reputation.

The Gospel's new stewardship remains stewardship. Chrysostom identifies the stone with Christ and the builders with the teachers who reject him. His exposition also describes believing Jews and Gentiles made one. These claims are more precise than a collective indictment of an ethnicity, and they leave the Christian hearer subject to the same demand for fruit. Restoration cannot transfer the tenants' possessive attitude unchanged to a new group. It must change the relation to the owner and his Son.³⁰

A common life learns peace

Philippians contributes a practical grammar of renewal. Paul has named a disagreement between Euodia and Syntyche and called for agreement in the Lord. The appointed counsel about prayer and thought then reaches a command to practice what has been learned, received, heard and seen. Peace belongs within this shared life, not outside it as a private refuge from responsibility. The community needs forms of attention and conduct that make reconciliation possible.³¹

Chrysostom's exposition joins peace with the absence of revenge. God's gift of the Son to enemies reveals a generosity beyond human calculation. Toward the close of the homily, he calls the hearer to stop fighting and to do good rather than retaliate. His concern is not merely the avoidance of visible conflict. He names the remembrance of injuries and the motives of covetousness, envy and vainglory that feed enmity. These habits can make a community incapable of receiving the peace it professes to want.

²⁸Augustine, Psalm 79, §§6–8; Bellarmine, Psalm 79, explanation at vv. 10–13.

²⁹Augustine, Psalm 79, §10. The moral exposition is Augustine's; it is distinct from the psalm's literal account of a ravaged planting.

³⁰Chrysostom, *Homilies on Matthew* 68.2. The homily's broader anti-Jewish rhetoric does not license collective ethnic guilt.

³¹Philippians 4:2–9; Chrysostom, *Homilies on Philippians* 14.

The reading's truth and justice remain alongside that exhortation. Peace cannot require concealing harm, leaving the wronged without remedy, or praising what is false. Isaiah's outcry still sounds within the Sunday. Paul's directions toward worthy thought and action give reconciliation substance: a restored community is accountable to what is true and just. The promise of the God of peace is not a warrant to remove difficult people from view so that the surface looks calm.

John's acclamation further identifies the people's calling as lasting fruit. Augustine's account of charity makes election incompatible with superiority toward the neighbor. The disciples are chosen into love, not into a status that dispenses them from it. In his next tractate Augustine even distinguishes the creature made by God from the vice that harms it: love of enemies seeks the good of the person while refusing the evil. A restored people can therefore resist wrongdoing without making hatred its principle of unity.³²

The one bread judges division

Chrysostom's explanation of First Corinthians 10:16–17 follows the intensity of Paul's language. Participation is communion, and communion leads to the declaration that the many are one body. The preacher uses the many grains in one bread to explain how those who receive Christ are joined both to him and to one another. There is not one Christ for the hearer and a different Christ for the neighbor. Their common nourishment is the ground of their mutual obligation.³³

He immediately tests that claim against conduct. Why do people who are nourished by the same gift fail to show the same love? His rebuke of actual divisions is inseparable from his strong sacramental teaching. The one body is not merely a pleasant description of a group that already behaves well. It reveals what the gift makes possible and what lovelessness contradicts. The Eucharist thus contributes a criterion of communal life more searching than shared affiliation.

Aquinas begins from the same Christological center when explaining Eucharistic grace. Christ and his Passion cause the gift; nourishment describes its sustaining effect; the species' unity from many elements signifies charity and incorporation. This prevents restoration from becoming a merely organizational project. Better arrangements may serve common life, but the unity sought in Communion has its source in Christ. The Prayer over the Offerings asks for redemption's sanctifying action, and the Prayer after Communion carries the sacramental gift toward the life of its recipients.³⁴

The Corinthians antiphon is an appointed alternative, however, not the compulsory ending of this Sunday. If the Lamentations antiphon is used, the immediate accent is seeking and waiting. The wounded people may still be unable to see the repair for which they long. This option protects hope from becoming a demand that pain promptly resolve into a harmonious picture. Both alternatives belong to Eucharistic participation, but only one makes the one-body language explicit at that moment.

Waiting without surrendering hope

Lamentations speaks hope amid a sustained account of suffering. The speaker recalls bitterness, yet turns toward the Lord's mercies. The chosen verse joins goodness with seeking and patient expectation. It does not pretend that the city's wound has vanished. The full chapter's protest against injustice and its later appeal for vindication forbid interpreting patience as consent to whatever a stronger person does. Hope seeks the good Lord, not the preservation of oppression.³⁵

For a wounded community this is a demanding form of truthfulness. It can ask for life before it knows how restored life will look. It can refuse to treat the present ruin as the whole meaning of its history. It can

³²Augustine, *Tractates on John* 87.1,4.

³³Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians* 24.4, NPNF1, vol. 12.

³⁴Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 79, a. 1, body and reply 2.

³⁵Lamentations 3:17–36,40–58.

also repent without claiming that every injured member is equally responsible for the wrong. The psalm's corporate petition makes room for a common plea while Isaiah and the Gospel retain their particular accusations. Communion nourishes this people in its need, not a fictional people whose conflicts are already resolved.

The final prayer's transformation therefore includes a task as well as consolation. Leo's Eucharistic account describes receivers carrying the crucified and risen Christ in body and spirit. Aquinas's reply about the body gives this an immediate and future horizon: bodily members serve justice in the present, and the body shares incorruption in the life to come. The restored vineyard is called into embodied charity now while still awaiting its consummation.³⁶

The reward is more than recovery

Augustine's psalm exposition closes by refusing to make created benefits the final reason for worship. God himself is the reward. Bellarmine distinguishes grace from glory. Their convergence keeps restoration open toward a good that no return to former security can exhaust. A people may be renewed in faith and charity while still carrying scars, losses and unresolved grief. Its hope rests in God rather than in a guaranteed restoration of every earthly arrangement.

This also places a limit upon triumph. The Church cannot identify its present condition without remainder with the completed vineyard. Matthew's fruit criterion continues to judge its stewardship; Isaiah's justice continues to expose its failures; Paul's practiced peace continues to require action. The promise is neither that the wounded will remain abandoned nor that the renewed are beyond correction. Christ gathers, nourishes and perfects a people who still pray for his face to shine upon them.

Literal.

Israel's planting is accused and its broken condition lamented; Jesus confronts the stewards who resist God's messengers; Paul calls a real community toward prayer and practiced peace. The voices of guilt, injury and hope remain distinct within common life.

Allegorical.

Augustine and Bellarmine read the vine's perfection in Christ, the rejected Son and cornerstone. Jewish apostles and converts, together with grafted Gentiles, express continuity in the renewed people; the one bread joins the many to Christ and one another.

Moral.

Renewal requires justice, truthful repentance, reconciliation and service of those who share the gift. Unity cannot conceal wrongdoing or silence its victims. Patient hope can name pain while refusing hatred and despair.

Anagogical.

Grace tends toward glory, God's visitation toward unhindered fellowship, and sacramental nourishment toward bodily resurrection. The final good is God himself; no earthly community's prosperity exhausts that promise.

Charity received and a people renewed

The two readings meet in the priority of God and the seriousness of fruit. Each begins from gifts the people did not create, faces judgment where those gifts have been misused, and reaches Communion as a source of transformed life. Each refuses to make the neighbor dispensable. Augustine's charity and Chrysostom's one body give the word "fruit" a personal and communal measure.

³⁶Leo, Sermon 63, VII; Aquinas, III, q. 79, a. 1, reply 3.

Their differences help locate the difficulty a hearer faces. The first answers the anxious or possessive attempt to turn goodness into a purchase price. Its central sequence is gift, response and nourishment: Christ chooses so that disciples may bear fruit, and the Eucharist stirs charity into action. The second answers despair over a damaged people, or the wish to restore its power without reforming its life. Its sequence is wound, visitation and renewed communion: the same planting is perfected in Christ, and common reception demands common love.

The psalm and Epistle consequently carry different weight. In the first, quickening and thanksgiving explain how response depends on gift. In the second, lament and practiced peace explain how a people asks for and inhabits renewal. The difference is an emphasis, not a quarrel between Augustine and Bellarmine or a claim that Chrysostom taught only one side. Their actual disagreement over the psalm's historical imagery remains a separate question.

Neither Communion option cancels either reading. Lamentations keeps fruitfulness and restoration patient before the Lord whose goodness is sought amid grief. First Corinthians makes their communal consequence explicit: charity is fruit within one body, and restoration is incorporation that obliges the members to love. The prayer after Communion gathers both concerns into the effect of reception upon life. The giver is not finished with his vineyard; the vineyard is not released from bearing his fruit.

Appendix: Scriptural Date and Location

The dates below distinguish composition, traditional attribution and narrated event. The Catholic Encyclopedia proposals are dated historical judgments, not a present scholarly consensus. Book-level dates do not establish the age of a liturgical adaptation or every constituent passage. The entries follow canonical order; Isaiah's response is consolidated with its first-reading locus. The composed orations have no biblical dates.

Proper	Citation	Location	Date
Entrance	Esther 13:9–11; Missal cf. 4:17	Persian court narrative at Susan; exact prayer setting not independently dated.	Composition: B.C. 465–425.
McMahon's traditional book-level proposal is concessive and calls authorship conjectural. It does not date the exact wording of Mordecai's addition. The court narrative's location and the book's composition remain different questions.			
Psalm	Psalm 80 (Vulgate 79), selected verses; response Isaiah 5:7a	Israel recalled from Egypt; sea and river in the poem.	Composition – No single date applies across every cited locus.
The psalm's broad pre-Maccabean composition limit in the NABRE introduction does not securely date this individual psalm; the response has Isaiah's different attribution horizon. Augustine's Jordan and Bellarmine's Euphrates are distinct interpretations, not an agreed composition location.			
First reading and response	Isaiah 5:1–7; 5:7a	Jerusalem and Judah addressed; Israel named as vineyard.	Traditional attribution: Isaias (ministry in Souvay's traditional account), B.C. 740–701.
Souvay dates Isaiah's ministry in the traditional account. This is neither the composition date of chapter 5 nor the date of a particular performance of the song. His endpoint is the apparent last prophecy, not a known date of death.			
Communion alternative	Lamentations 3:25	Jerusalem's ruin is the communal horizon; the speaker's precise identity is not established.	Composition: Responses to Jerusalem's destruction in 587 B.C.
The critical fallback in the NABRE introduction gives a lower composition boundary after the destruction, not a date for this verse. Traditional Jeremiah attribution differs from that introduction's judgment that the poems are anonymous. Separate poems may have been grouped later at an unknown time.			
Gospel	Matthew 21:33–43	Jesus' controversy in Jerusalem's temple (21:23); composition setting distinct.	Event – No narrated-event date in the chronology corpus. Composition – disputed: c. A.D. 38–45; c. A.D. 40–42; A.D. 40–45; c. A.D. 60–68; c. A.D. 64–67; c. A.D. 50.

Proper	Citation	Location	Date
Jacquier’s proposals depend upon differing testimonies: the early dispersal premise is unreliable, the Eusebian reckoning conditional, and the Irenaean evidence inconclusive. Durand’s proposal concerns an Aramaic original and leaves the Greek rendering undated. These are not six secure dates for the same Greek text.			
Acclamation	Cf. John 15:16	Farewell discourse to the disciples; proposed Gospel composition at Ephesus is a different location.	Event – disputed: 01-14. Composition – disputed: c. A.D. 90–100; A.D. 96–100.
<i>Narrated event: 01-14 means 14 Nisan, not 14 January; no year is supplied. Maas’s disputed Supper reconstruction binds John 13–17 broadly and does not locate each sentence in an exact room.</i>			
Durand and Fonck supply separate late-first-century composition proposals. Fonck’s Ephesus concerns composition, not the place where Jesus speaks. The event date belongs to Maas’s complete Passion reconstruction and cannot be spliced into a different reconstruction.			
Communion alternative	Cf. 1 Corinthians 10:17; context 10:16	Corinth is the audience; Aherne locates Paul’s correspondence in his Ephesian mission.	Composition – disputed: A.D. 56; A.D. 57.
Prat’s Pauline table and Aherne’s approximate Easter dating differ. They date the epistle, not the institution of the Eucharist or the antiphon’s compilation.			
Second reading	Philippians 4:6–9	Philippi is the audience; the historical sources locate composition in Roman imprisonment.	Composition – disputed: A.D. 61; A.D. 62–64.
Prat and Vander Heeren give different imprisonment chronologies. Vander Heeren’s confident language is his 1911 position, not current unanimity. The place of writing is not the recipients’ city or an exact prison room.			

Appendix: Liturgical Resolution

This is the Twenty-seventh Sunday in Ordinary Time, Year A, 4 October 2026, for the dioceses of the United States under the General Roman Calendar and U.S. national proper: a Sunday in Ordinary Time, green, Lectionary 139. The governing Missal is the *Roman Missal, Third Edition*, U.S. English edition implemented in 2011, with the 2008 emended Latin third typical edition as base. The U.S. *Lectionary for Mass*, second typical edition (1998/2001), Volume I, controls the readings. The ordinary Sunday cycle is A; the independently resolved adjacent weekday cycle II does not supply this Sunday’s lessons.³⁷

The national calendar assigns this Sunday rather than the occurring memorial of Francis of Assisi. No local dedication, titular solemnity, patronal observance or religious calendar has been resolved. The permanent formula is PC-S53-A, parent PC-S53. The common Missal evidence belongs to the edition’s Week 27 owner; the Year A leaf owns this reading composition. Neither another cycle nor another Missal supplies an additional proper.

Branch ID	Authority and trigger	Status	Units affected	Resolution
entrance-missal-or-permitted-chant	GIRM 48; singing and no-singing routes	permitted	Entrance	Missal antiphon studied; no concrete chant selected. Its recitation is required when there is no entrance singing.
psalm-lectionary-or-permitted-sung-form	GIRM 61	permitted	Psalm	Appointed psalm and Isaiah response studied; sung alternatives unselected.
acclamation-sung-or-omitted	GIRM 62–64	conditional	Acclamation	Appointed adapted verse studied. GIRM 63(c)’s one-reading condition does not authorize its omission at this three-reading Sunday.

³⁷USCCB, *Liturgical Calendar for the Dioceses of the United States of America 2026*, printed pp. 5,40; dated readings for 4 October 2026, Lectionary 139.

Branch ID	Authority and trigger	Status	Units affected	Resolution
communion-lamentations-or-corinthians	Week 27 Missal's explicit alternative	appointed alternative	Communion	Both studied; neither a local selection.
communion-missal-or-permitted-chant	GIRM 87–88	permitted	Communion	Chant classes remain open; no additional concrete chant selected.
preface-eucharistic-prayer	GIRM 364–365	permitted	Eucharistic Prayer	No unique Week 27 choice. Any selection must retain the applicable Preface coupling; Eucharistic Prayer IV has its own invariable Preface.

Sprinkling in place of the Penitential Act (GIRM 51), a preparation chant (74), and any optional concluding blessing remain unselected. Gloria, Creed, homily and Universal Prayer belong to the Sunday's ordinary requirements (53,65–71); they do not create additional closed proper texts. No local musical enactment is asserted.

Appendix: Scope and Qualifications

This study develops two complementary readings of this formulary from its biblical contexts and the specified patristic and saintly loci. Their connections across the whole Mass are editorial synthesis. Isaiah's relation to the Gospel belongs to the Lectionary's correlated selection; Philippians follows its semi-continuous course, and the common prayers recur across cycles. No ancient writer is credited with an exposition of this entire modern formulary.

The English Scripture is public-domain Douay–Rheims Challoner study text, not the approved proclaimed U.S. English. Protected Lectionary and ICEL wording, full restricted Latin prayers, and newly composed prayer translations are not reproduced. The canonical Week 27 evidence rests on an identified 2002 digital Latin reproduction, official ICEL antiphon excerpt and approved FDLC prayer excerpts, with the limited evidence of the 2008 variation list in *Notitiae* 44, pp. 367–372. A complete U.S. altar-book and 2008 page collation remain absent; the exact offerings English remains uncollated. The FDLC Collect's older conclusion is not adopted.

Reception rests on the specified historical translations and digital witnesses. Augustine's psalm exposition and O'Sullivan's Bellarmine are abridged; neither licenses claims about omitted Latin passages. No fresh Greek or Latin critical collation is claimed. Direct, securely attributed saintly commentary on the exact Esther and Lamentations loci was not established in the bounded research. Their biblical contexts carry the exposition; an uncertainly attributed Lamentations commentary is not cited as secure Aquinas. Aquinas's *Summa* and Leo's sermon illuminate sacramental meaning, rather than interpreting the modern prayers as such.

The Catholic Encyclopedia chronology witnesses are historical reference judgments; the generated dates preserve relation types, competing proposals and unresolved states. The study does not claim universal reception coverage, ecclesiastical approval, exact liturgical enactment, or authority to replace the governing books. Source bindings, the interpretation audit, chronology record and shared-owner audit retain the detailed evidence and its limits. Research and author verification are distinct from the subsequent independent reviews of the rendered publications.

References

- *Holy Bible*, Douay–Rheims, Challoner revision; Project Gutenberg 1581 witness. Esther 4,13–14; Isaiah 5; Psalm 79; Lamentations 3; Matthew 21; John 15; 1 Corinthians 10; Philippians 4. Public-domain study English.
- Augustine, *Tractates on John* 86–87, trans. John Gibb and James Innes, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, first series, vol. 7 (NPNF1-7); and *Exposition of Psalm 79*, §§1–11, NPNF1-8, English heading Psalm 80. Historical English in CCEL witnesses; the psalm exposition is abridged.
- John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Matthew* 68.1–2, NPNF1-10; *Homilies on First Corinthians* 24.1–5, especially 24.4, NPNF1-12; *Homilies on Philippians* 14, NPNF1-13. Historical English CCEL witnesses.
- Robert Bellarmine, *A Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, trans. John O’Sullivan (Dublin, 1866), Psalm 79. Abridged historical English, retained e-Catholic 2000 witness.
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 79, a. 1, body and replies; trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Project Gutenberg 19950 witness.
- Leo the Great, Sermon 63, *On the Passion XII*, VII and note 1063, trans. Charles Lett Feltoe, NPNF2-12, CCEL witness.
- *Ordo lectionum Missae*, second typical edition (1981), General Introduction 23,66–68,106–107; approved English hosted by the Liturgy Office of England and Wales.
- USCCB, *Liturgical Calendar for the Dioceses of the United States of America 2026*, printed pp. 5,40; readings for 4 October 2026, Lectionary 139. Official dated witnesses inspected 28 September 2026.
- *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, U.S. English, chapters II and VII, nos. 48,51,53–54,61–71,74,87–90,364–365; official USCCB states inspected 28 September 2026.
- *Missale Romanum*, third typical edition (2002), secondary digital reproduction, physical pp. 290–291; ICEL *Antiphonary* (2010), official CBCEW excerpt, printed p. 80; FDLIC, *Mystagogical Reflections*, Ordinary Time 24–30 (2016), pp. 12–13. Exact-text and rights limits are stated in the scope appendix.
- *Notitiae* 44, nos. 503–504 (2008), pp. 367–372, especially p. 371: bounded variation notice, not proof of complete edition identity.
- *Catholic Encyclopedia*: Arthur McMahon, “Esther” (1909); Charles Souvay, “Isaias” (1910); Ferdinand Prat, “St. Paul” (1911); Achille Vander Heeren, “Epistle to the Philippians” (1911); Cornelius Aherne, “Epistles to the Corinthians” (1908); Leopold Fonck, “Gospel of St. John” (1910); Anthony Maas, “Chronology of the Life of Jesus Christ” (1910); Alfred Durand, “The New Testament” (1912); E. Jacquier, “Gospel of St. Matthew” (1911). Chronological discussions identified in the canonical chronology record.
- NABRE introductions to Psalms and Lamentations, official USCCB witnesses: broad psalm composition limits and the setting, authorship and grouping of Lamentations. Used for chronology and orientation; protected Bible translation not reproduced.

Last revised (UTC): 2026-10-01T22:25:03Z

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.