

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.

It is of course most appropriate that these words should be referred to the undivided divinity and glory belonging to the Three Divine Persons.

An antiphon is not of its nature a Scripture lesson, but rather a short phrase set to music to indicate the tone and general ideas either of the feast or of the psalm which follows. It might be useful to add that the Church does sometimes quote passages from the Old Testament which are believed to be foreshadowings of the New Testament revealed doctrine. But that is not the case here.

H. F. DAVIS.

*The Prayer of Manasses appears in editions of the Latin Vulgate Bible, together with the Third and Fourth Books of Esdras. Does this mean that these books were once regarded as canonical Scripture? And if not so regarded today why are they included in the Vulgate? When and by whom was the Prayer of Manasses written?*

These books are among those which were once thought by some Fathers, but never by the Church, to be canonical Scripture. They were excluded from the official lists of the Scriptures, and are hence to be reckoned among the apocryphal writings. The Prayer of Manasses, which we have in Greek, was probably written in that language originally and appears to be based on the account of the king's repentance recorded in II Paralipomenon (Chronicles), xxxiii, 12 f. It is not however the actual prayer which (the author of Par. states) was to be found "in the words of the kings of Israel" (verse 18). Nothing is known of the Prayer referred to by the Chronicler and it appears to have been lost early. But the repentance of the most infamous King of Juda clearly made a profound impression on the Jewish people, and what more natural than that a devout Jew should compose a prayer based on the theme and put it in the king's mouth?

The work appears first in extant literature in the *Didascalia*, an early Christian writing of the first half of the third century, A.D.; and it must have been composed an appreciable time before that. It never formed part of the Septuagint Greek Old Testament. It was used as a Canticle in the liturgy of the Eastern Church and is found appended to the Psalter in certain uncial and many cursive manuscripts. As it was never part of the Hebrew or Greek Bibles, St. Jerome did not translate it. We do not know when the Latin translation of it was made, but it was probably after the time of St. Jerome. The Prayer, however, is found in many mediaeval manuscripts of the Vulgate, immediately after II Par. and under the title *Oratio Manassae*. The earliest of these manuscripts dates from the thirteenth century, so far as is known. The Prayer was printed in the Latin Bible of R. Stephanus (1540). The Vulgate issued by Pope Sixtus the Fifth did not contain it, but the