

after the first, yet in fact happening some time afterwards. Thus in Lk. iv, 14, we get the impression that Jesus went back to Galilee at once after his fast in the desert, though from Jn. i, 35 ff we know that many things happened before He returned to Galilee (Jn. iv, 3). So also in the Old Testament it is stated that Sennacherib, king of Assyria, returned to Nineveh after his disastrous expedition against Judah "And as he was worshipping in the Temple of Nesroch, his god, Adramelech and Sarasar, his sons, slew him with the sword" (IV Kings xix, 37). Yet we know from secular sources that about twenty years elapsed between his return and his death. The Biblical writers composed religious history and did not hesitate to leave out events which had no special bearing on their theme or which had already been related elsewhere.

J. P. ARENDZEN.

*What is the meaning of "Let no temptation take hold of you but such as is human" ?* I Cor. x, 13.

In this passage there is a divergence between the Latin text of which our English is a translation and the Greek original. In the latter we read: "No temptation *has befallen* you which goes beyond human strength," which reminds the Corinthians that thus far they have not encountered the severest trials. Some writers, who comment on the passage, think that St. Paul is here encouraging the Corinthians by promising them that as God has so far sustained them in adversity so too He will in the future, no matter how severe the difficulties they may encounter. Others however maintain that he is warning them that they must not be too confident of not falling in the future from the fact that they have not fallen in the past because they have not yet been sorely tried. Mgr. Knox writes: "The Corinthians have not yet come up against persecution; what if they did? These Christians who are so very broad-minded about eating things offered to idols, when they have nothing worse to fear than a little chaffing from their neighbours—how bold a front would they show, if they were offered the choice, 'Diana or Christ'? A useful lesson for all of us, in broad-minded days." *Epistles and Gospels with Notes*, p. 201. The questioner might well refer to this work, where the whole passage and difficulty is fully treated.

R. J. FOSTER.

*If the Vulgate text of I Cor. xv, 51 is a faulty translation, how far does it diverge from the true meaning of the original Greek; and how is this divergence to be reconciled with the decree of the Council of Trent declaring the Vulgate authentic?*

The difficulty is twofold—textual and doctrinal.

I. *Textual*. There are three main divergent readings:

(i) We shall not all indeed sleep, but we shall all be changed (*Original Greek*).

(ii) We shall all indeed sleep, but we shall not all be changed (*Some Greek MSS.*).

(iii) We shall all indeed rise, but we shall not all be changed (*Vulgate*).

*Note.* For convenience, we shall refer to these readings by letters which designate their contents. Thus D="all die" (equivalent to "all sleep"), C="all be changed", R="all rise". A+or-sign will be added according as the phrase referred to is positive or negative. Thus, the phrase "we shall not all sleep" is referred to as -D.

The first reading (-D+C) is rightly chosen as the correct reading by all modern editors on the preponderating evidence of the codices, versions and Greek Fathers. The second reading (+D-C) has three uncial codices in its favour, but is the result of a deliberate (?) transposition of the negative (cf. Brandhuber, *Biblica*, 18 1937, 437). The third reading (+R-C) which is that of the Vulgate and of the Old Latin Versions did not remain confined to the West, (cf. Vaccari, *Biblica*, 13 1932, 73 f).

It is freely admitted therefore that the Vulgate contains a textual error, and in a passage which is "dogmatic" or doctrinal. Is such an admission excluded by Trent's declaration of the Vulgate's authenticity (Sess. IV. cf. Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, no. 785)? Such was the opinion of certain Roman theologians who objected to the decree, but the Council's mind on the matter was made clear by the reply of the legates who freely granted the presence of textual errors (cf. Vosté, *Biblica*, 27 1946, 312). Vega, one of the theologians of the Council agrees "This is the limit of the Council's intention (eatenus voluisse Concilium) when declaring the authenticity of the Vulgate, namely that all might be certain that the Vulgate is disfigured by no (textual) error *from which might be gathered a doctrine false in faith or morals*" (A Vega, *De Justif.* 15, 9). It remains to be seen therefore whether we may reasonably gather a false doctrine from the Vulgate text of I Cor. xv, 51. It goes without saying that such would be the case if the Vulgate text truly contradicted the original text of the inspired Apostle.

II. *Doctrinal.* The Vulgate reading (+R-C) apparently teaches a universal resurrection from the dead and denies a universal change. It seems therefore to contradict the original reading (-D+C), implicitly in the first member (+R as against -D), as it does explicitly in the second (-C as against +C).

The solution offered by Prat (*La Théologie de St. Paul*, ed. 18, 1930, Vol. I, p. 166; and cf. *Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures*, NT, Vol. III, Appendix I), takes the original reading in its accepted sense ("not all shall die, but all, both dead and living, shall be changed") and explains the Vulgate reading (+R -C) which seems to imply that all shall die, as a general statement which "takes no account of the

relatively small number of those alive at the Last Day." As for the apparently flat contradiction of the second member (-C, +C) this is solved by supposing that the Vulgate (-C) intends to exclude the wicked from this (glorious) change, whereas the original Greek (+C) spoke only of the just. This solution is difficult to accept. Other obstacles apart, it is conceded by those who propose this explanation that the text thus interpreted is alien to the context. Certainly the introduction of a distinction between wicked and just is out of place here. Nor does it seem necessary. Let us see if it is possible to vindicate the Vulgate text *in its context*.

We suggest the following paraphrase of the Vulgate (+R-C): "We shall all at the Last Day 'rise' to a *glorious life*, whether we be dead or still alive, but only those still alive shall be changed *in the way I am about to describe* (in vv. 53 ff), i.e., by 'putting on' immortality as a garment." It is clear that such an interpretation, far from contradicting the original reading, gives practically the same meaning, despite the wide verbal difference. But can this interpretation be justified?

i. *We shall all rise*. Our suggested interpretation of the Vulgate text stands or falls by our explanation of the word "rise." Our conjecture is that the Vulgate term in this context is designed to include a rising not only from actual death but also from a *state* of mortality. The "all" who rise are therefore not only the actually dead but also those of us mortals who live to see the Last Day. The "rising" of these survivors is a "putting on" of immortality. Taken in this sense, the Vulgate phrase does not imply that we shall all die and is not therefore opposed to the original ("we shall not all die"). But we have not concocted this interpretation for our convenience; it is suggested by Paul himself. His notion of "resurrection" is already a complex one because the term expresses for him all the consequences of belonging to the mystical body of the risen Christ. He uses the term to indicate the glorious bodily resurrection from the dead (e.g., I Cor. xv, 42), but he also uses it in a sense which, formally speaking, involves no such resurrection—namely, of a rising to a life of Christian perfection here on earth (Rom. vi, 3-6). The term "rise" is therefore a wide one and not unsuitable for describing the glorious change in the bodies of the survivors at the Last Day. Indeed, given the whole context of Pauline soteriology, it would be very strange for Paul to deny to any (even to the few "survivors") a full share in the bodily resurrection of Christ. The hope of being himself a "survivor" (II Cor. v, 1-5; cf. Prat, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 445 f.) does not for him conflict with the confident expectation "that he who raised up the Lord will *raise us* up also by his power" (I Cor. vi, 14). "Rising" and "surviving" are plainly not contradictory terms for Paul. Paul certainly wrote "we shall not all sleep" (-D) but he surely would never have written "we shall not all rise" (-R). The Vulgate phrase (+R) is not Paul's but it is Pauline.

ii. *We shall not all be changed.* This Vulgate text excludes some men from the change. Which? The wicked? There is no trace of these in the context. The Vulgate itself suggests the necessary distinction: "and the dead shall rise again incorruptible, and we shall be changed" (I Cor. xv, 52). "We" (the hypothetical survivors) "shall be changed." Hence those whom the Vulgate excludes (-C) from this "change" are the dead who rise. The Vulgate evidently considers the term "change" less suitable for application to a rising from the grave—a new condition of being (cf. verses 42-4) for which the Vulgate perhaps thinks the term "change" too mild. In the original reading, on the other hand (+C) the term has a more general sense and includes not only the "putting on" of immortality but the rising from the tomb itself. This difference in the use of the same word is explained by the respective difference in the first members of the phrases (i.e., +R, -D). In the original text, St. Paul, having denied the absolute universality of actual death and thereby appeared to restrict the prospect of universal restoration (-D), was forced to make the universal restoration clear (+C). The Vulgate reading approaches the question from the opposite direction. Having, at first sight, implied the absolute universality of actual death (+R), it was forced to draw a distinction (-C). The Vulgate phrase, "We shall not all be changed" does not therefore contradict the original statement "We shall all be changed," because the two statements use the word "change" in a somewhat different sense. The meaning in each case is determined by the preceding phrase. In the original Greek, St. Paul says: "Though not everyone shall die, nevertheless all will be changed from this mortal condition to a glorious state of immortality." In the Vulgate, we have "Though we shall all rise—whether dead or alive—to a glorious life, nevertheless this will not come about in the same way for all men; not all will undergo the precise change experienced by the survivors at the Last Day."

A. JONES.

*The Holy Trinity is nowhere mentioned explicitly in the Old Testament, being a Christian revelation. Yet the Introit for the Mass of Trinity Sunday in the Roman Missal refers to a chapter of Tobias apparently mentioning the Trinity. How is this explained?*

The passage referred to in Tobias (Vulgate Version) may be translated thus:—"Bless ye the God of heaven; give glory to him in the sight of all that live; because he hath shown his mercy to you" (Tob. xii, 6). This approximates to the meaning of the Greek version. The original text of the book is not extant.

It will be seen at once that the Introit for Trinity Sunday, like so many antiphons, is not a quotation from Scripture. Modern missals give a reference to Tobias in order to indicate whence the antiphon drew its inspiration.