ON CELTIS 'A CHISEL': A FURTHER NOTE.

In the Journal of Theological Studies for July 1916 (vol. xvii pp. 389-397) I examined at length the then available evidence for the Latin Vulgate text of Job xix 24, and showed that both in the Bible text and in the Liturgical Service called Dirige all the evidence down to the end of the twelfth century supports *uel certe*, the earliest witness to *uel celte* (the reading of the Clementine printed Vulgate) being Cardinal Hugo de Sancto Charo, who died in 1263.

There was, however, one gap in my attestation, to fill up which is the main object of this Note. St. Jerome himself quoted Job xix 23 ff from his own new rendering of the Hebrew in his work against John of Jerusalem (Migne P.L. xxiii 381 C). Here Vallarsi prints *uel celte*, and his note seems to say that neither of his MSS has anything else. The only MS I had access to in 1916 (*CUL* Dd vii 2, fifteenth century) read *uel celte* also.

I have now been able to fill up this omission. MSS of this little-read tract of Jerome are not common, though the work exists in two forms, viz. the full text found in printed editions, beginning *Si iuxta*, and an epitome beginning *De religuis quae ad fidem pertinunt* (see Migne, col. 367, l. 11). Codex 445 (formerly 416) in the Cambrai Library, of the twelfth century, contains the full text (*C*), and codex 281 in the Tours Library (*T*), of the tenth century, contains the Epitome. Both *C* and *T* read *uel certe*, though in other respects they differ considerably, as will be seen below. There can be therefore no doubt that *uel certe* is the true reading in this passage of the *adversus Joh. Hierosolymitanum* and that the presence of *uel celte* in the printed text and in the fifteenth-century Cambridge MS is only due to the tendencies of late mediaeval copyists.

Job xix 23-25 according to the Clementine Vulgate, with the variants of Cod. Amiatinus (*Am*), together with the quotation of Jerome *adu. Joh. Hierosolymitanum* from the Cambrai MS 445, fol. 158 v, col 2 (*C*), the Tours MS 281, fol. 108 v (*T*), and the printed text (Migne).

23 Quis mihi tribuat ut scribantur sermones mei? Quis mihi det ut exarentur in libro 24 stylo ferreo et plumbi lamina uel celte sculpantur in silice? 25 Scio enim quod Redemptor meus uiuit ...


Since my former article was published Mr. E. J. Thomas, in a note upon *celtis* (Proc. of Camb. Phil. Soc., January 24, 1918), has pointed out that Albertus Magnus read *uel celte*, for he says ‘Celte nomen indeclinabile est et est instrumentum cementarii quo durissimi sculpuntur lapides’. Albertus died at Cologne in 1280, so that he is as early a witness for *uel celte* in Job as Cardinal Hugo. Mr. Thomas also

pointed out that the word was in use in Cologne in Albert's day, but in
the sense of chip or bit of stone, for a noble proprietor from the
Drachenfels in giving the authorities of Cologne Cathedral certain
powers over his quarries specifies *celtes seu fracmina lapidum* (A.D. 1267).\(^1\)
Mr Thomas further compares this with the Welsh *maen celit*, 'a flint
stone', but the familiar Office for the Dead, in which *celte* had definitely
ensconced itself by the end of the thirteenth century, seems to me
a more likely source for the supposed meaning. I cannot think that
any evidence from the thirteenth century can invalidate the unanimous
testimony of all the earlier witnesses to *uel certe* in Job xix 24, especially
now that it is found that the earlier MSS of the tract against John of
Jerusalem read *uel certe* also.

As a bibliographical curiosity it may be mentioned that the famous
42-line Bible, printed at Mainz before 1455 and commonly believed to
be the first printed book, reads *uel certe*.

F. C. Burkitt.

---

**PSALM XXXII 3.**

יִכְו הַחֲרִישֵה יָבִל עַעַם
בֵּאְשָׁפִיִּים לְלֵיָהוֹם

'When I kept silence, my bones wasted away
Through my groaning all the day long.' (R.V.)

Filled with the pleasure and profit of reading this Psalm as a whole,
one is apt to overlook a serious difficulty in this verse, as received,
 arising from the inconsistency between one part and the other; for,
how is it possible to keep silence and yet be continually groaning? All
versions substantially agree in their respective renderings; even the
venerable Septuagint attests the inconsistency as existent in the Hebrew
when this translation was made. But what solution can be discovered
now? Our only hope seems derivable from careful examination and
emendation of the Masoretic Text itself. For want of anything better
the following course is suggested.

Let the first part of the verse remain as it has been received, but
recast the remainder by substituting resemblants, thus:

יִכְו נַשׁ מֹתֵי יָבִל תִּיָּם

What are the results of such a change? Briefly these:

First, inconsistency in meaning between one part of the verse and
the remainder completely disappears.

---

\(^1\) Lacomblet *Urkundenbuch f. d. Gesch. des Niederrheins* ii 331. On p. 382 the
Drachenfels Baron's successor in 1319 gives a similar privilege and speaks of *celtes
seu alia fragmenta*. 