Quoddam notabile vel ridiculum:
An Unnoticed Version of the Cena Cypriani
(Ms. Uppsala, UL C 178)

The medieval reception of an obscure Latin opuscule Cena Cypriani (CC) written probably in the fourth century C.E. is a long, complex, and exciting story. The text describing a wedding feast where the guests are various characters from the Bible was obviously very popular: there are four known medieval re-writings – adaptations of the text. Two of them come from the ninth century and were copied throughout the Middle Ages: Cena Nuptialis (CHM) by Raban Maur, and the cena by John the Deacon (CID). The two other, later versions, Cena Azelini (CAZ) and the cena of Arras (CAR), survive both only in fragments. To my knowledge, there are 103 medieval manuscripts of the different versions of the CC, and it is noted in a number of medieval manuscript catalogues.

Each of the versions reflects a specific approach to the original work. Raban Maur dealt with his model as a teacher – he purified it of non-Biblical characters, added clear new allusions connected to the Vulgate rather than the Vetus Latina, and provided a prologue (dedicatory letter to King Lothar) in which he states that cena provides both utilitas and delectatio. John the Deacon (unaware of Raban’s work) transformed CC into a rhythmical poem (his changes are primarily for the sake of the rhythm), and added a rhymed prologue and an epilogue. CAZ is a work of Azelinus, an otherwise unknown monk of Reims. Azelinus made significant changes to his model: he transformed the cena into 8-syllable rhythmical verse and stretched each allusion into a whole 4-line

---


2 Ms. Paris BNF lat. 5609 (XI?), f. 1r-2r + 67r-68v.

3 Ms. Arras, BM 557 (XII), f. 145v-148r.

4 All the versions are edited and commented on by Christine Modesto, see footnote 1.

5 So far, I have found 14 medieval catalogue mentions of CC. As the text is very short, it is rarely mentioned in both medieval and recent catalogues. It is certain that there are still more surviving medieval manuscripts of CC to be found.
strophe in which he described the Biblical character and explained the reasons for the attribution. He introduced many new Biblical characters to the feast, omitted the non-Biblical, and linked his allusions directly to the Vulgate. The anonymous author of CAR knew and used C1D and CAZ. He reorganized the text more substantially, using allegory and creating many new Biblical parallels. His cena was actually a sequence of three feasts (before the Law, under it, and under Modern Grace) but the fragment ends in the middle of the second feast. As in CAZ, many new characters appear, the Biblical chronology is kept and the whole is in verse (but, unlike in CAZ, each strophe usually includes three or four Biblical allusions).

Although an overview of the provenance of the cena manuscripts shows that almost every area had ‘its own cena’ (CHM spread primarily in England and Germany, CID in Italy, CC, CAR, and CAZ in France), several manuscripts combine the different versions (most frequently CC and CID). A very specific case is the version of CC transmitted in ms. Uppsala, University Library C 178, on folios 118v-119v, which seems to be the only surviving evidence of the reception of CAZ and CAR. The manuscript has not much been studied. It consists of 128 paper sheets in three distinct parts. Part I (f. 2-89, 295×200 mm), written at the beginning of the fifteenth century, contains Matthew of Cracow’s Lectura super “Beati Immaculati”; part II (f. 90-119, 220×145 mm), written in 1360, includes the Speculum felicitatis humanae (f. 90v-118r) and the cena. Part III (f. 120-128, 210×140 mm), written in 1410, contains Alan of Lille’s Expositio prosae de Angelis (120r-126v) and

6 E.g., Montecassino 204 (XI), London Harley 2773 (XII), or Jerusalem San Salvatore lat. 3A (XII) (studied in detail by Carla Maria Monti, “La Cena Cypriani interpolata in un codice di Gerusalemme,” Italia medioevale e umanistica 36 (1993): 235-248). But there are also interpolations of CC and CHM (e.g., a creative version probably written by Gallus Kemli, a wandering monk originally of St. Gall in the second half of the fifteenth century, as surviving in ms. St. Gall 692 [XV] p. 13-19).

7 Mattheus de Cracovia (ca. 1335-1410), a Polish philosopher and theologian, active at the University of Prague, in Heidelberg, in Rome, bishop of Worms (1405) and legate of Pope Gregory XII at the council of Pisa; author of a number of Biblical commentaries and other works (De consolatione theologiae, De modo confitendi, De puritate conscientiae, De corpore Christi, De celebratione Missae). The text was edited by: W. Bucichowski, Matthaei de Cracovia Lectura super Beati immaculati, Textus et Studia 19.1-2 (Warsaw, 1984). The edition is based on this ms. as well as two Gdansk mss. (Mar. F. 139 and Mar. F. 268).

8 Dated on f. 118r: Scriptus sub anno domini MCCCLX.

9 The text inc.: Amor hominis in hac vita si dulcis sit aut amarus... This one is mentioned in Bloomfield as the only ms. (Morton W. Bloomfield, ed., Incipits of Latin works on the virtues and vices, 1100-1500 A.D. [Cambridge, MA, 1979], no. 405 – by a mistake, wrong folia [f.120-129] are indicated in this book). It does not seem to have been edited yet.

10 The dating colophon on f. 118r is in a distinctly different hand from both the preceding text and the following cena. In addition, the cena is written with a different ink. Thus the cena could easily be later that 1360, but how much later I do not dare to say.

pseudo-Aristotle’s *Epistula ad Alexandrum de conservatione sanitatis* (127r-128r). This manuscript belonged to the monastery of Vadstena (it had the shelfmark A VI 7). The table of contents at the beginning was written by the last librarian of the monastery, Michael Nicolai (monk 1487-1516).

The *cena* of Vadstena (CV) does not have a title in the manuscript. In the table of contents it is entitled unlike any of the other *cenae*: *Quoddam notabile de senioribus veteris testamenti, vel ridiculum*. The title reminds of Raban’s dedicatory letter by pointing out both the usefulness and amusement the text offers, as well as by mentioning only the Old Testament as the *cena* source (while many New Testament characters appear too). As for the text itself, CV is of all the versions closest to CC. There are other influences, though, but while the links to CHM and CID are loose and could be accidental, the use of CAZ and CAR seems manifest. It is clear, however, that neither CAZ nor CAR must have served as a direct model for CV. A closer look at the way CV is constructed suggests quite strongly that there were several steps of interpolating in between these versions – it is hard to imagine the CV author combining three versions, inserting, changing the order, omitting items, etc. to such a degree. Yet, there is only the surviving evidence to be referred to.

The CAZ interpolations in CV can be studied only at the beginning – after line 64, which reflects the last fully surviving strophe of CAZ (still concerned with the seating of the guests), its influence can only be guessed. CV borrows almost all the new characters with their new attributions from CAZ while keeping the original structure. Thus, Azelinus’ elaborated strophes with clear identifications of the guests and their roles in the Bible are reduced back to the riddle-like lists of characters and their attributions. Yet, here they are not so mysterious and the whole is more easily accessible to the reader. Thus, e.g., strophe 15 of CAZ:

\[
\begin{align*}
Loth & \text{ sedet, frater Abrahe,} \\
& \text{Qui fugit ignem Sodomae,} \\
& \text{Super salis materiem,} \\
& \text{Quae deficit per pluviam.}
\end{align*}
\]

becomes simply *Loth super salem* (line 23) in CV.

---


14 That is probably the main reason why (although indicated in Friedrich Stegmüller, *Repertorium Bibliicum Medii Aevi* 7, no. 11403, p. 376) the *cena* in this manuscript has escaped the attention of scholars.

15 In the dedicatory letter to CHM: *percurri paginas veteris scripturae, et recurrens ad veteris instrumenti paginas*. However, most CHM manuscripts except the three oldest ones add *et novi, ac novi or vel novi.*
Only three of the 53 surviving CAZ strophes are omitted in CV.\textsuperscript{16} Two attributions are not taken over from CAZ but are kept in CV the same as they are in CC.\textsuperscript{17} The order of the allusions in CV sometimes differs from CAZ (e.g., the CV lines 17-24), or allusions from CC and CAR are inserted amidst CAZ allusions, but CV seems to follow CAZ more closely than it does any of the other versions.\textsuperscript{18} There are 17 lines of CV which can (judging from the surviving evidence) be attributed only to CAZ.

Neither the prologue nor the first feast of CAR are used in CV. The second book (beginning on strophe 42) opens with the catalogue of the seating (strophes 44-70). The order of CAR is rarely followed closely in CV, and more than half of the allusions are changed.\textsuperscript{19} The link is weak. Yet, there is a reason for arguing the possible influence of CAR on CV: lines 41-45 of CV can only be traced back to CAR, and, at the same time, are unlikely to have been included in the lost part of CAZ. (Because, as mentioned above, CAZ can be followed until line 64 of CV and does not tend to change the order.) The part after line 64 includes many semantic and order changes, too (with the exception of lines 84-86 which reflect strophe 65 of CAR).

Thus, it is impossible to decide whether the 'new' CV allusions after line 64 are based on the lost part of CAZ, directly on CAR, on a completely different version, or whether the CV author invented them himself. A specific feature of CV is that the 'new' allusions and changes in attributions appear in a larger number only up to line 159, then they are much fewer (except the more intensively corrupt passage of lines 297-324), and CC is followed much more closely. There might be several reasons for this:

1. the author of CAZ (and/or CAR) stopped inserting new characters and creating new connections after the first few catalogues and imitated CC more closely;
2. CAZ (and/or CAR) were never finished by their authors (or the CV author only had fragments of them);
3. it was the author of CV who abandoned the difficult strategy of combining many versions and used only CC afterwards.

I am inclined to see the first possibility as the most likely. In the first 64 lines of CV, very little is untraceable to either CAZ or CAR. In my opinion, this is a sign that the author of CV (and/or the authors of the versions between CAZ, CAR and CV) did not make too significant changes to his model. I assume that the same would be valid for the following part — and thus the other changes,

\textsuperscript{16} That is, strophes 27-29, concerning Gad, Aser, and Neptalim.
\textsuperscript{17} They are strophe 9: Adam is sitting ‘on the fig leaves’ in CAZ while in CC and CV (line 13) he is sitting ‘in the middle’, and strophe 20: Rachel sitting ‘on the idols’ in CAZ, while in CC and CV (line 26) ‘on the load’.
\textsuperscript{18} The sections of the CV lines which follow the order of CAZ are: 4-9, 14-17 (20 and 21 are in CAZ but their order is different), 24-25, 27-32 (then 3 strophes omitted) 33-40, 48-60, 62-64 (and perhaps 65 — the character, Tobias, is the same, but the CAZ attribution does not survive).
\textsuperscript{19} E.g., the CAR strophes 51 and 52 refer to the CV lines: 40 (changed), 43, 41, 42, 44 (changed), 47, 45, 46 (changed).
although fewer, should be attributed to the lost part of CAZ, CAR (and/or lost interpolations based on them).

Being much closer to the original CC (namely to the manuscript group Y as established by Strecker\(^2\)) in the passages after line 159 does not mean that CV is free of interpolations. The same types of interpolations appear also in other cena manuscripts and thus reflect the general nature of transmission of the text – the cena is unstable, oscillating, and undergoing many changes. Creating an edition necessarily includes reducing this important characteristics of the text, and, as not enough evidence survives in order to reconstruct its original version, I find any edition more confusing than helpful.\(^2\) At the same time, however, the interpolations provide an excellent source for studying the actual medieval reception of the text.

Besides the usual phonetic variants (in the cena this concerns primarily spelling of Biblical names, Greek, and Vetus latina words), the cena manuscripts seem to have interchanged freely:

- singular and plural (here e.g., line 58: *pelles* for *pellem*, or 359: *lucernam* for *lucernas*)
- accusative and ablative (e.g. 36: *super arenam* for *in arena*, or 101: *in scamnpo* for *super scamnum*)
- active and passive (e.g. 493: *querebat* for *querubatur*)
- adding, omitting or changing a verbal prefix (e.g. 227: *fudit* for *ejfudit*, 243: *attulit* for *intulit*)
- linking verb choice (e.g. 374: *dedit* for *dixit*, 377: *dedit* for *porrexit*)
- linking words (e.g. 349: *quia* for *quoniam*, 509: *post* for *posteaquam*).

These variants might have originated in manuscript abbreviations but, as they do not affect the links to the Bible, they rather suggest that the meaning of the text did not depend on them.

The case is similar with the tenses: the use of imperfect, perfect, past perfect, and even present seems random in the manuscripts (shifts here e.g. 250: *manducavit* for *manducabat*, or 251: *gustavit* for *gustaverat*). Thus, it is impossible to speak about the tense – and therefore time – of the cena (as Orlandi and others do\(^2\)). It is a characteristic feature of the text that it is not bound to a certain type of time. This, again, does not seem to be a strategy of the author: as the cena is an ‘impossible meeting’ the tense/time in which it takes place is impossible to grasp.

---

\(^{20}\) Karl Strecker, “Iohannis Diaconi versiculi de Cena Cypriani,” *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, IV, 2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1896), 863. The manuscripts belonging to group Y are much more numerous than those of group X.

\(^{21}\) Both Strecker and Modesto were in their editions trying to retrieve the original but their suggestions are not always persuasive.

\(^{22}\) Although in CV the tense changes are all in favour of the perfect, many of the allusions remain in the imperfect.

Changing the order of the allusions,\textsuperscript{24} as well as changing the character-attribution sequence to attribution-character are omnipresent in \textit{cena} manuscripts, while the order of the catalogues usually remains the same. In \textit{CV}, however, the catalogues of the \textit{gustus}, wines, and gifts to the king are omitted. While the gifts might have seemed redundant or illogical considering the plot (in \textit{CC} this catalogue is followed by a list of thefts from the king by the guests), omitting the other two catalogues could be due to clarity. These catalogues consist of metaphorical puns in the original \textit{CC}, their link to the Bible is looser, the riddles are more complicated to solve. The third catalogue of this type, the catalogue of fish, is not omitted from \textit{CV}, but it is greatly transformed – 13 out of 29 attributions are completely changed (l. 294-322). Most of the new attributions are closer to the Bible but they are not types of fish at all (e.g., for \textit{cornutam Esau} there is the more specific \textit{cervum} [l. 315], for \textit{Rebecca rubelionem} there is \textit{capellam} [l. 320]), and so the catalogue of fish actually also disappears from this version.

As far as the semantic changes in the \textit{cena} are concerned, it is frequently difficult to distinguish between corruption and attempts at correction, especially when the variants are spelled in a similar way. E.g., in line 244 where \textit{olus manducavit Esau} replaces \textit{solus manducavit Esau} (‘Esau ate vegetable’ instead of ‘ate alone’). There are frequent ‘improvements’ of the original by either changing a character or an attribution with a ‘closer’ one. In \textit{CV} the allusions are generally closer to the immediate expectations of the reader: Jonah is connected to the fish (lines 75 and 316) rather than to vinegar as in \textit{CC}, Jesus is shown converting water into wine (lines 328-330), which strengthens the parallel between the \textit{cena} and the wedding at Cana (John 2), John is the baptist rather than the prisoner (line 386). Some attributions are replaced with a synonym (usually taken from the Vulgate, by which the text gets closer to the Bible version familiar in the fourteenth century, e.g. 280 : \textit{iecur} for \textit{sicotum}\textsuperscript{25}). At some occasions, however, the new link does not seem to be clearer than the original – e.g., line 231 Abimelech rather than Peleg dividing\textsuperscript{26}, or line 211 : Cham rather than the servants bringing water\textsuperscript{27}.

Like in \textit{CHM, CAR} and \textit{CAZ}, all mentions of apocryphal characters are eliminated – they are either omitted\textsuperscript{28} or the character is replaced\textsuperscript{29}. The same happens to other obscure characters, such as Molessadon\textsuperscript{30}, who is replaced by Loth, Absalon, and Manasses (respectively on lines 233, 324, and 405).

\textsuperscript{24} The allusions within the catalogues in \textit{CV} as well as \textit{CHM} and \textit{CAZ} are arranged mostly, but not always, in the Biblical order.

\textsuperscript{25} Tobit 6,5.

\textsuperscript{26} The original allusion is etymological – Peleg means division; the link with Abimelech is not quite clear – perhaps it alludes to him dividing his troops.

\textsuperscript{27} While the original clearly evokes the wedding at Cana, the \textit{CV} variant is perhaps an indirect reference to the flood.

\textsuperscript{28} E.g., \textit{speculum argenteum Thecla, bestiis datur Thecla}, and several more.

\textsuperscript{29} E.g., line 500 : Jeremiah instead of Trifena was crying (\textit{plorabat}), or line 516, Amnon instead of Thecla tore off the dress (\textit{vestem detraxit}).

\textsuperscript{30} The original character, Molessadon, is very probably not Melchisedech, as suggested by Strecker and Modesto, but an apocryphal name of Lot’s wife. (Cf. Francis Lee Utley, “The One
Some of the additions or omissions result in a shift of the attribution chain in which the new connections do not make sense (e.g., line 126: Rachel prunum for malum Rachel, prunum Ananias; or l. 404: adding Abacuch, which results in new chain: Abacuch in stupido, Manasses in edificonso, Salomon in ministro, Martha in milite, Urias in insano, Herodes in famulo, Cham in ebrio, Noe in ridiculo... Unlike in several other cena manuscripts, the shift here is not resolved in the end – it just becomes clear that it was a mistake, although the manuscript punctuation supports the wrong links.)

There is no known model for the most extensive addition: the list of the apostles in lines 94-104, of which only Peter and Matthew appear in CC. The allusions do not seem to be textually linked to the Vulgate but rather evoke the roles of the apostles or refer to apocryphal stories about them, some of which I was unable to identify. Most of the other additions beyond line 158 seem to be inspired by characters and events already present. Thus, accipit Josep is newly added after miscuit ciphum Beniamin (l. 345-6), new allusion in principe Moyses comes after in insecutore Pharao by (l. 389-90), ambulabat Judith follows stertebat Holofernes (l. 337-338). Such connections are the only links between the characters in CV. The story is disjointed in many ways and there is a lot of repetition.31

Adjusting the allusions in order to reflect events in the Bible more directly sometimes has negative consequences on the continuity of the plot. E.g., the beginning of the catalogue of eating the lamb, which reads in CC: Primus ergo sustulit Iohannes caput, is split here into two allusions: Illatus est caput Iohanis Baptiste. Primus ergo sustulit David caput (lines 266-7). On the one hand, this change creates a closer allusion to the Bible (it not only points out the link between John and his head but reenacts the whole event). On the other hand, the result, if read as a story, gives an impression that it is the head of John the Baptist that the characters eat at the feast: Illatus est caput Iohanis Baptiste. Primus ergo sustulit David caput, cerebrum Sisara, linguam Aaron, maxillam Sampson, auriculam Petrus, oculos Ly, cervicem Olofernes, arterias Zacharias, collum Josep (lines 266-275). The catalogue of the killing is similarly interrupted by a new allusion: interfecit Abymelech (line 514). As it is placed second in the list, the following characters seem to torture an already dead body: Tunc Moyses primus omnium calce eum percussit, interfecit Aby-

---

31 E.g., maxillam Sampson appears twice – in lines 270 and 322. Also, the same objects are frequently attributed to different characters, e.g., honey (mel) is linked to Samson (line 138) and Iohannes (154), crumbs (micae) to Lazarus (156 and 253) and Aaron (132), dried fish (piscis assus) not only to Thobias (248) as in CC, but also to Jesus (155). The hare (hedum) is eaten by Isaac (123 and 247, as in the CC), Tobias (148), and even Tamar (305). Syssara (135), Hagar (306) and Abraham (326) all drink milk; lion (leones, leoninam) is linked to: Judas (29), Daniel (174), Samson (260), and David (307); salt (sal) to Lot (23, 121, and 233) and Absalon (324).
melech, elisit Daniel, detraxit vestem Amon, perfodit Eliezer, virga percussit Aron, lapide David, Jesus flagello (lines 513-520).32

It is clear that CV is not a very polished version of the cena. Because CV does not differ much from other manuscripts of the other cenae in this respect, it suggests the way the cena was read in the Middle Ages. Scholars have read the cena as a story and, struck by its inconsistencies and funny scenes33 they have interpreted it as a Biblical parody.34 Medieval readers, it seems, read rather a series of Biblical riddles. Furthermore, among the various versions, it is neither the sophisticated CAR nor the clear and detailed CAZ – versions adjusted for the medieval public – which achieve the greatest popularity, but the original CC with all its obscurities. It is conceivable that the long explanatory strophes of Azelinus were a blind alley of adapting CC – the tension is lost, there is no joy in solving the riddles, the whole becomes too long for the reader to follow the plot. But could the same have been true for CAR, with its elaborate allegorical story? It could have been argued before that CAZ and CAR remained fragmentary or unknown and thus did not have any impact during the Middle Ages but CV provides evidence for their reception. Its author knew CAZ and/or CAR but chose to use them only as a source of more different Biblical guests at a feast which in its core remains the same as the original CC. CV is on the one hand a very particular version of the cena; on the other hand, however, it clearly reveals a general tendency of the CC reception in which individual allusions were a much more important concern than the consistency of the plot.

---

32 Another example of discontinuity of the plot is the change of the original Tunc intulit panes Saul, fregit Jesus (then Saul brought bread, Jesus divided [it]) into Tunc fregit panes Jesus, intulit Petrus piscis et Andreas panes (then Jesus divided bread, Peter brought fish and Andrew bread – lines 240-242). Thus, it looks as if the bread was first divided and only after was brought to the feast.

33 E.g., Achan, who as an innocent victim stands for Jesus, being whipped by Jesus himself (here line 520) or the characters getting drunk and falling asleep (here 332-336).

The Vadstena version of the *Cena Cypriani*,
ms. Uppsala C178, f. 118v-119v

First column: CV as compared to CC:

- **Underlined** additions
- **Bold** changes (interpolations) not found in other CC mss. (i.e. significant changes)
- **Italics** changes (interpolations) found in other CC mss. (i.e. minor, usual changes)
- omission of a word
- omission of a phrase
- change of order of a word
- change of order of a phrase

Second column: identification of sources, list of variants:

- C = CC
- Z = CAZ
- R = CAR
- I = CID
- H = CHM

(...)

- differing either only in detail, or a variant attested by more CC manuscripts
  - (sometimes more CC manuscript variants provided)
- [...] substantially different (variants provided for the sake of comparison)
- + CC parts omitted in CV
- 0 there is not a surviving source in a cena version (followed by identification of the Biblical place referred to)

Biblical sources – identified only when the allusion differs from allusions in the other *cenae* (because those are identified in Modesto’s edition, as well as in Strecker and Mosetti Casaretto).

[f. 118v]36

1  [Q]uidam rex nomine Iohel nuptias faciebat C
2  in regione orientis in Chana Galilee. C
3  Hz/s nupciis invitati sunt plures C (- qui temperius loci in Iordane affuerunt - convivio. C (+ iigitur; loti; + in)
4  Tunc manus lavit Naaman * Z (lavat) [C: commundavit]
5

---

35 I am very grateful to Häkan Hallberg from the Uppsala University Library who kindly provided me with transcription of the passage partly covered by a stain (lines 103-112), as well as of other problematic places not discernible on my paper copy of the manuscript.

36 In the ms, the *cena* is written in two columns, on f. 118v they have 58 and 54 lines, on f. 119r 54 and 57 lines, f. 119v has the remaining 8 lines. The initial Q is omitted but space is provided for it. The lines frequently end in the middle of a word or an attribution. Here the text is presented as a numbered list, the attributions are separated from each other in order to make it easier for the reader to follow the commentary. At the same time, however, the manuscript punctuation is included, as it clearly shows the occasional wrong links between the characters and attributions. Paragraphs (or paragraph signs on the margins of the manuscript) are marked in the transcription by ¶.
6 sparstit aquam Amos
7 Iacobus et Andreas attulerunt fenum.
8 Matheus et Petrus straverunt
9 mensam posuit Salomon
10 Atque omnes distribuerunt turbe.
11 Sed cum iam locus discumbencium plenus esset
12 qui supervenient prout poterant locum sibi inveniebant.
13 Primus itaque omnium sedit Adam in medio

14 Eva super folia
15 Cayn super sarculum
16 Abel super vellera
17 Noe super archam
18 Phalech super laterem
19 Abraham super arborem

20 * S. Sara iuxta ostium
21 Ysacar super aram
22 * Rebecca super ydryam
23 * Loth super salem
24 Esau super pharetram
25 *. Iacob super petram
26 *. Rachel super sarcinam
27 Ruben super stratum

28 Symeon super murum
29 Judas super leonem
30 Zabolon super naves
31 Yaschar super vectigal
32 Dan super cerasten *
33 Beniamin super saccum
34 * Joseph super modium
35 filii Israel super lateres
36 *. Pharao super arenam

37 Moyses in fiscella
38 Iosue super lapides
39 Achar super regulam 37
40 *. Raab super -* fenestram
41 Eglon super cenaculum
42 Yael super malleum

37 Not certain: abbreviated as rm in the ms.
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43 Sysara super utrem
44 Gedeon super vellus [R: super lagenam Gedeon]
45 Abimelech super molam
46 leptus super tribunal [R: lepte super fulcrum]
47 * Sampso super columnam C, H, R, I
48 * Ruth super stipulam C, Z (stipulis), R
49 * Hely super scellam (C, H, I: sellam); R (sellum); [Z: sedendo deficit]
50 Ophin et Phinees super bebetem Z (Ophni... lebetem); R (only Phin.)
51 Jonathan super alvearia Z, [R: in scopulo]
52 Nabal super capram Z, R
53 Absalon super currus Z, R
54 * David super monticulum C, Z; I (in) [R: super tympanum]
55 Salomon super mulam Z, R
56 Roboam super iugum Z, R
57 Ochosias in cancellis Z, R
58 Helias super pelles C (pellem), I (in pellibus) Z, [R: axe flammeo]
59 Helyseo super aratrum Z, R, [C, H, I: Cain super aratrum]
60 Gyesi super vestes Z; R (in dupla veste)
61 Jezabel in agro 2 Reg 9,10 (canes in agro)
(R: super canem)
62 Ezechias super aromata Z, [R: in scriniis]
63 Ysaias super torcular Z, R
64 Achaz super gradus Z, [R: in horologio]
65 * Thobias super lectum C, [R: super feretrum]
66 Daniel super tribunal C, [R: super leonem]
67 * Susanna super posticum Dan 13,18 [C: in orto],
[R: s. pixidem]
68 tres pueri in chamino 0 Dan 3,22
69 Jeremias super cisternam 0 Jer 2,13 [R: super pannos]
70 Ezechiel super sartaginem 0 Ez 4,3 [R: in lateere]
(frying pan)
71 Ozee in sulcis 0 [R: prostitulo]
72 Iohel iuxta vestibulum 0 Joel 2,17 (inter vestibulum et altare plorabunt sacer-
dotes)
73 Amos super trellam R (trullam) Amos 7,8-9
74 Abdyas super scissuras 0 Abdias 1,3 [R: in rupe]
75 Jonas super piscem [R: sub hedera; H: the link]
76 Mycheas super turrem [R: genu complicat]
77 Naum super ollam [R: ollam cathedram + iohel]
78 Abacuk in presepio R
79 Sophonias super ovile [R: facit domum bidentium]
80 Aggeus in domo
81 Zacharias super candelabrum
82 Malachias super herbam
83 Assuerus in orto
84 Hester super cubiculum
85 Mardocheus in gradibus
86 Achior super restes
87 Holofernes in sanguine
88 Judith super peram
89 Zacharias super pugillarem
90 Elizabeth super montem
91 Johannes super terram
92 *. Iesus super puteum
93 Maria in ortis
94 *. Petrus super cathedram
95 Paulus in cophino
96 Johannes super doleum
97 Andreas in rethibus
98 Iacobus super carinam
99 Philippus super currum
100 Iacobus iuxta premaculam
101 *. Matheus in scamnpo
102 Bartholomeus iuxta palatium
103 Thomas stat non sedet
104 Mathias sedet ultimus
105 *. Zacheus super sichorum
106 Lazarus in sinu Abrahe
107 *. Marta ministrat
108 *. Iudas super loculos
109 Symon super pecuniam ----- .
dolebat lob quod solus sedebat in stercore Tandem porrexit Rebecca palium * et Agar stragulum et Judith coopertorium Sem et Iaphet operuerunt discumbentes in latus.

¶ [T]unc accepit * Adam pomum *. Eva ficus * Cayn cardwm * Abel agnum * Noe olivas * Abraham avem * sal Loth

Sara vitulum *. Ysaac edum Esau lentem

Jacob frumentum *. - Rachel prunum -

ovum Joseph * Ysachar carduos Dan ungulas equi filii Israel ollas carnium Moyses panes Aron micas

uvam Josue

Achar financias Sysara lac Abymelech glandes Jepte spicam

Samson mel Nabal capernas carnes Amon sorbiciunculas David panes Salomon carnes Helyas panem [2nd column] Helyseus pulmentum

patiens stabat Paulus, et murmurabat Esau et C, I; H + R: sterquilinio C (tunc) C C (recumbentes. Illatus + est gustus cenae) [C: citrum], [H + R: Eva] C, I I; C (carduum) H (but in cat. of gifts), R (in seating) C C, R: gustat de volucre, [H: passerinam] Gen 19,26 (respiciensque uxor eius post se versa est in statuam salis) [R: de panibus] R; C (different place) [R: rufa coctio (Gen 25,30)] C R (+ vinum, oleum) [C: malum Rachel, prunum Ananias – shift due to om.; R: mandragoris] C [R: amigdalas] R R 0 Num 11,33 0 (cf. 151) 0 Lev 2,2 ? [C: uvas, R: nuces] 0 Num 13,24 [R: botrum de Ebron] 0 Joshua 7,24 R [R: de ramni fructibus...] 0 Judges 12,6 [H: Cain spicas] R (de favo) 0 same link as line 52. R (2 Reg 13,6) R 0 [R: bubalum] R (+ cum carne) 0 2 Reg 4,38-44 [R: colochnitidas]
145 Jezabel vinum
146 Ezechias pigmentum
147 *. Ysaias olus
148 Tobias edum
149 *. lupinos Daniel
150 tres pueri pepones
151 prophete lactucas agrestes
152 Olofernes multum bibit.

153 *. Zacheus sichomorum
154 **. Johannes mel
155 Jesus piscem assum

156 Lazarus micas

157 Martha collegit fragmenta.

158 Judas buccelina

159 Job mustum. ---.

160 Deinde supervenit Iacob cum filiiis suis -
161 Laban cum filiabus suis -
162 sederunt foris super lapides.
163 Venit et Abraham cum domesticis suis
164 et Moyxes cum cetera turba et sederunt foris.
165 Tunc rex respiciens invitatos suos sic ait:
166 Unusquisque vestrum - veniat in vestiarium meum

167 et dabo singulis singulas cenatorias vestes.
168 Tunc aliqui iuerunt et acceperunt.
169 Primus itaque eorum omnium accepit Zacharias albam

170 Abraham passerinam
171 Loth sulphuream
172 Lazarus lineam
173 Jonas cervineam.

0 1 Reg 21,6
0 2 Reg 20, 13
C, R (oleru)
R
C
[C: Pharao] [R: legumina]
0 Ex 12, 8 [R: Moyses... lactucis cum agrestibus]
0 Judith 12,20 (bibit vinum nimin multum quantum numquam biberat in vita sua)
0 Lu 24,42 [C: Tobias – here l. 248]
R ; C [repeated on proper l. 253]
0 Mt 14,20, Mk 6,43,
0 Jo 13,27 (post buccelam)38
0 [R: Heliu] (+ cucurbitas Jonas, [Isaias], betas Israel, morum Ezekiel, [Zacharias, Daniel] pepones Pharao [Cain, Eva] bulbos Lia [Noe] uvas Aaron nucleos Simeon acetum Jonas accepit oxigarum Iesus)
C (+ et)
C (+ et)
C
C
C
C
C (quisque vestrum voluerit veniat...)
C
C (ierunt)
C
C
C (sulphurinam)
C
C corrupted? [ceruleam]

38 Iudas buccelam appears in CHM ms. Hannover Stadtbibliothek 28, f. 227v (XV), but otherwise these two mss. do not share any variants.
174 - Daniel leo niam C (+ Tecla flammeam)
175 *, Adam pelliceam C
176 Judas argenteam. C (argyrinam)
177 Johannes tygrinam C (trichiniam)
178 Raab coccineam C (cardinam)
179 Herodes cardineam C (cardinam)
180 Pharao marinam C
181 Enoch celinam C (trichiniam)
182 Agar variam C
183 David nervinam C (aerinam)
184 Helyas aeream C
185 Eva arborinam C (aerinam)
186 Job bìpligiam C
187 Ysaias mesoropem -. C (mesotropam) (+ Maria stolam)
188 Susanna castìlinam C (castalinam)
189 Moyses conchilinam *. C
190 Thamar thoborinam C corrupted ? (colorinam)
191 Abel purpureara C (+ Levi spartacinam, Azarias carbasinam)
192 Aron marinam -. C (myrrinam) (+ ludith iacintinam)
193 Chayn ferrugienam C (ferrugineam)
194 Abyron nigrum C
195 -. * Nativam Ysaa c (+ Anna persi(ci)nam)
196 Paulus candidam C
197 Petrus operariam C
198 Esau villosam 0 Gen 27, 11 (pilosus)
199 Joseph talarem. 0 Gen 37, 23 (tunica talari)
200 -. Jesus columbinam. C (+ Iacob pseudoaletinam)
201 § At ubi divisit * rex vestes respiciens eos sic ait: C (praeccepta sibi/sive)
202 Non ante cenabitis nisi singuli singulas vices feceritis.
203 Atque ita praeccepta regis sine dyaconia consumaverunt. C (primus ergo ignem petit)
204 Primus itaque omnium ignem petit Helias C
205 succendit Azarias C (Iepte)
206 lignum porrexit Sara C
207 attulit Ysaa c C
208 Concidit Joseph C
209 puteum aperuit Jacob -. C (+ ysopum porrexit Sephora) Gen 7,10-16 [C: attulerunt ministri]
210 ad lacum stabat Daniel C
211 aquam attulit Cham. C
212 ydriam portabat Rebecca C
213 Vinum protulit Noe C
214 utrem portabat Agar. C
215 * argentum attulit ludas C
216 vitulum adduxit Abraham C
Alligavit Raab resticulam
porrexit Iesus pedes
copulavit Helias
ferrum tradidit Petrus
et elisit Daniel
occidit Cayn
Supportavit Abacuch
suspendit Absalon
Pellem detraxit Baldach --.

veru prebuit Baalam.
sanguinem fudit Herodes
Stercus proiectit Sem
aquam adiecit Japheth
g se lavit Elyseus
 partes 39 fecit Abymelech.
Numeravit David.
Sal mittit Loth.

Oleum adiecit Samuel.
in focum inposuit Anthiocus
Coxit Rebecca
prior gustavit Eva.
Septuaginta duo sunt qui ministrant nupciis
Explicitisque omnibus in locis suis resederunt.

Intuitit Petrus pisces
et Andreas panes.
Artuit * Jacob lentem.
Olus manducavit Esau

intuit intracham Abacuk
Totum comedit Daniel. --.

Sed quia * coctum hedum comederat Ysaac
et piscem assum Thobias.
cepit tumultuari Eglon --.

Non manducavit Johannes.
nichil gustavit Moyses
Jeiunus fuit Iesus.
micas colligebat Lazarus.

C [shift, common in mss.]
C
C
C
C
C
C
C
C
C
C [Balac]
[C: Helias] (+ ventrem aperuit Hermocrates, mediana suspendit Tobias)
0 Num 22-23 (linked to the previous)
C (effudit)
C
C
Jud 9,43 ? [C: Phalech]
2 Sam 24,1 [C: Auses] Gen 19,26 [C: misit Molessadon], cf. 23, 121
1 Sam 16,13 [C: lacob]
C (Ariochus)
C
0 Lu 10,1
C (omnes locis suis...)
C (tunc intuit panes Saul, fregit Iesus)
0 Mt 4,18
0 Jo 6,8-9 [C: Saul] C (intuitit)
C corrupted? (solus!)
(Gen 25,34)
C (intritam)
C (+ fabam intulit Amelsad, Prior gustavit Misahel)
C (quoniam hedum coctum)
C
C (+ Valde esuriebat Danihel, panem petebat Hermocrates)
C (manducatabat)
C (gustaverat)
C (erat)
C
39 Corrected in the ms. from partem.
254 Carnes divisit Nemroth.  
255 quas ex - venacionibus acceperat  
256 et accepit Abraham vitulinam carnem  
257 Esau cervinam  
258 Abel agninam  
259 Noe arietinam  
260 Sampson leoninam  
261 Helyseus ursinam  
263 Tunc postmodum dedit * Pharao panes.  
264 - divisit Joseph  
265 discum attulit Herodes.  
266 Illatum est caput Johanis Baptiste.  
267 Primus ergo sustulit David caput  
268 Cerebrum Sisara.  
269 linguam Aaron  
270 maxillam Sampson  
271 auriculam Petrus  
272 oculos Lya  
273 cervicem Olofernes  
274 arterias Zacharias  
275 collum Josep  
276 * armum Saul.  
277 * Interanea Agar  
278 * ventrem Jonas  
279 *. cor Pharao  
280 * Thobias iecur  
281 renalia Ysaias  
282 latum Adam  
283 costam Eva  
284 ylia Maria.  
285 * Sara viscera.  
286 * Elizabeth ubera.  
287 adypem Abel.  
288 femora Abraham  
289 * Moyses caudam.  
290 * Loth clunes.  
291 * Jacob pedes.  
292 Ossa collegit Ezechiel.  

0 Gen 10,9 [C: Ceteri autem partes suas tenebant]  
C (+ variis... acceperant)  
C  
C  
C  
C  
C  
C (+ tamen + tenebat)  
C (panes Pharao)  
C (+ omnibus)  
C (+ Partes composit  
Rebecca, intulit Iacob, distribuit omnibus Noe)  
0 Mk 6,28  
1 Sam 17,51 [C: Johannes cf. 1. 266]  
Jud 4,21 [C: cerebellum Absalon]  
C  
C  
C  
C  
C  
C  
Gen 41,42 ? [C: Saul]  
1 Sam 9,24 [C: armora  
Agar – shift !]  
Gen 16,4 ? C: Jonas  
Jon 2,1 (C: cf. 285)  
C (sicotum)  
C  
C  
C  
C  
C  
C  
Gen 21,2 (C: ventrem,  
cf. 278)  
Lu 1,24 (C: vulvam)  
C  
C (femur)  
C  
C  
C  
C

40 followed by acceperat crossed out (and then repeated).  
41 tenebat omitted but space provided in the ms.
293 - Jacobus et Andreas intulerunt pisces.  
294 Sustulit itaque asellum Iesus  
295 Labionem Moyses  
296 lupum Beniamin.  
297 Agnum Abel

298 murenam Eva  
299 * Adam pelamidem  
300 locustam Johannes.  
301 Cayn sarculum  
302 capitones Absalon  
303 polipum Pharao.  
304 noctuam Lya.

305 hedum Thamar  
306 * Agar lac.  
307 * David leonem.  
308 Regina sabbata aromata  
309 * Joseph alaeceum.  
310 * Jeremias ululas  
311 umbram Lazarus.  
312 * Judas scorpium.

313 * Thobias yrundinem.  
314 -. sepiam Herodes

315 * Esau cervum.  
316 * Jonas piscem.  
317 Alopidadam Yaasob.  
318 -. denticem Ysaies.  
319 -. * Noe columbam.

320 capellam Rebecca.  
321 * Golias lacertum. -.  
322 maxillam Sampson.

323 * Jonas cetum posuit  
324 et Absalon sal  
325 Prior intinxit Cayn.  
326 Explicitis itaque omnibus dedit -. * Abraham lac.  
327 Conspersit Sara. -.*.  
328 Replentur aqua ydrie.  
329 Aquam convertit Jesus in vinum
330 Bibit architiclinus *
331 bībit et Iesus passum *.
332 - ministravit Paulus ---.

0 Jo 2,7-9 (= architiclinus)
C (passum bibebat Iesus)
C (+ omnia ; perministravit)
(+ Sed quoniam aliquid genera vini habebant, passum bibebat Iesus, marsicum Ionas, surrentinum Pharao, pellinum Adam, laletanum Moyses, creticum Isaac, adrianum Aaron, arbustinum Zacheus, arsimum Tecla, albense Ioannes, campanum Abel, signinum Maria, florentinum Rachel)

333 Saturatione - sopitus jacebat Adam
334 Ebrius dormivit Noe
335 satis biberat Loth *.
336 sompnus tenebat Jonam
337 Stertebat Holofernes
338 **Ambulabat Judith**

C (+ vini)
C (obdormivit)
C
C
C
0 Judith 13,12 [link to the preceding]

339 Vigilavit prope gallum Petrus
340 suscitavit Iesus
341 Petrum terret hostiaria
342 Adest nocte Nychodemus.
343 Surgere querebat Jacob
344 prior surrexit Lazarus.
345 Tunc miscuit ciphum Beniamin.
346 **Accepit Josep**

0 Jo 18,17
0 Jo 3,2
C
C
0 [content link to the preceding]

347 intulit Marta pocculum
348 Prior bibit Petrus.
349 Sed quia -. tarde miscuerat Ionas.

C (Hermippus)
C (aquam)
C (vinum petebat Maria, non consentiebat Susanna)
C (siciebat)
C (volebat)
C (sublatisque ; petit)
C (+ [ministravit Martha cf. 1.107], effudit Hermocrates)
C
C (lucernas)

350 Murmurabat Philippus.
351 Aquatum bibebat Johannes
352 --. ampullam ferebat Martha

353 Sciciebat Ismahel
354 ire nolebat Thobias
355 Alieum calicem bibere volebat Jacobus.
356 Sublatis omnibus aquam manibus petit Pylatus.
357 Tradidit Judas --.

358 lintheum porrexit Petrus
359 Intulit lucernam Ysayas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Lines Excerpt</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>gratias egit Symeon.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>Benedixit Anna</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>intulit coronam Rachel</td>
<td>C (coronas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>ygapum porrexit deo</td>
<td>[C: David]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>dedit unguentum Maria</td>
<td>[C: Aaron]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Perunxit Martha</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>poma intulit Adam</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>Favum porrexit Sampson</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>percussit tympanum Maria</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>David cytharam</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>psalterium duxit Tubal</td>
<td>C (Iubal), H (some mss.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Choros duxit Judith</td>
<td>C (choreas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>cantavit David</td>
<td>C (Asaph)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>saltavit Herodias</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>* dedit laudes Ananias</td>
<td>C corrupted? (laudes dixit Azarias)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>- lusit Mambres 42</td>
<td>C (+ magia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>risum fecit Ysaac</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>osculum dedit Judas</td>
<td>C (porrexit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>vale fecit Jetro.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Sed cum iam vellent ire</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>respiciens * rex invitatos suos sic ait eis:</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Nunc per omnia diem nuptiarum celebrate -</td>
<td>C (+ et confrequentate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>et inmutate habitus et sic velut pompas facientes</td>
<td>C (demutato habitu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>ite in domos vestras.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Placuit vero omnibus voluntas regis</td>
<td>C (omnium prodiit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>atque ita primus eorum processit in magistro Iesu</td>
<td>Mt 3,1 [C: in custodia]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>in baptismo Johannes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>in retiarcho Petrus</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>in villico Paulus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>In insequione Pharao</td>
<td>C (secutore)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>In [2nd column] principe Moyses</td>
<td>0 Ex [content link to the previous]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>-. In prodiitore Judas</td>
<td>C (+ in venatore Nemrod)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>in ortolano Adam</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>In exodiario Eva</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>in latrone Cayn</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>In pastore Abel</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>in cursore Azahel.</td>
<td>? [C: Iacob]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>In sacerdote Zacharias</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>in rege David</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>in cytarca Tubal.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>in piscatore Iacobus</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>In guoco Adonias</td>
<td>C (in cocomo Ariochus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42 Corrected from Mambren.
402 in aquario Rebecca
403 In fornicario Osee
404 - inter alia Abacuk
405 in stupido Manasses
406 in edificioso Salomon
407 in ministro Martha
408 in militie Urias
409 in insano Herodes
410 in famulo Cham
411 in medico Thobias
412 in ebrio Noe
413 in ridiculo Ysaac
414 in tristi Job
415 in iudice Daniel
416 in fabro Joseph
417 in prostituta Thamar
418 in formosa Rachel
419 in odibili Lya
420 in domina Maria
421 in impio Loth
422 in adversario Amalech
423 in structore Sem
424 in rustico Esau
425 In forti Golias
426 in armentario Roboam
427 In pastore Jeroboam
428 In naufrago Ionas
429 in scribente Moab

402-404 in aquario Rebecca inter alia Abacuk in stupido Manasses. Abacuk in stupido. Manasses

406 in edificioso Salomon

407-412 in ministro Martha in militie Urias in insano Herodes in famulo Cham in medico Thobias in ebrio Noe in ridiculo Ysaac in tristi Job in iudice Daniel in fabro Joseph in prostituata Thamar in formosa Rachel in odibili Lya in domina Maria in impio Loth in adversario Amalech in structore Sem in rustico Esau in forti Golias in armentario Roboam in pastore Jeroboam in naufrago Ionas in scribente Moab

C

C [Hosea 1,2 [C: in fornicatore Ananias]]

0 (+ in bestiario Tecla) shift

2 Kings 21,2 (or general characterization?) [C: Molessadon]

2 Chro 1-9, 1 Kings 5-9 [C: religioso]

C (risiculo)

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C (odibile)

C

C

C

C

C

C

C (forte)

0 (2 Chro 11-12? – there as herdsman)

C (pistore)

0 [1: different place]

0 (corrupted inebriante?)

43 Osee uxorem forniciam is a new allusion added by Gallus Kemli in his version of CHM (ms. St. Gall 692, written in 1476, p. 13).
430 Set quoniam * die ante quedam de convivio
431 subducta fuerant
432 Iussu regis inquirebantur ab eis
433 Involuerat enim stragulum multicolorium Achar
434 sigillum aureum Rachel -.
435 pomum pulcherrimum Eva
436 cyphum argenteum Beniamin.
437 annulum signatorium Tamar
438 Canopeum sericum Judith
439 Lanceam regiam David
440 Alienam uxorem abduxerat Abimelech.
441 Tunc iussit rex * omnes qui fuerant in convivio
442 ut ducerentur in tormentis.
443 Quo facto primus innocens decollate Johannes
444 * foras prohicitur Adam.
445 Occiditur Abel
446 Timens obmutescit 44 Zacharias
447 fugit Iacob
448 Queritur Enoch
449 -. Excecutur Thobias
450 non creditur Moysi
451 confunitur Abyon
452 suspenditur Absalon
453 Confunditur Rebecca
454 * demergitur Pharao
455 relinquitur Israel
456 Addicitur Datan
457 deprimitur Chore
458 arripitur Ysaac
459 mittitur Nathan
460 Convincitur Osias
461 maledicitur Judas

leonem Samson, [cervum Esau l. 315], vitulum Iesu, iumentum Iacob, currum Helias, vestem Judith, crines Bersabee, ligulam Agar, frumentum Ioseph, resinam Ruben, pecuniam Abimelech, strobilos Levi, capsam Moyses, favum Petrus, copias Abigea)

C (ante diem)
C
C (involaverat)
C (+ speculum argenteum Thecla)
(H : E. vetita gustasset ; R : + Adam)
C (bibitorium)
C (coopertorium subsericum)
C
C
C (tormenta)
C
C
C (+ immutatur Nabuchodonosor)
C
[Subducitur]
C
C
C
Ex 14,23 [C : arguitur]
C
C
C
Gen 22,10 [C : copulatur]
C
2 Chron 26,19 ?
[C : Amalech]
C

---

44 zaza inserted = mistake in the ms. (but neither crossed out nor underlined).
462 Repellitur Manbres

463 -. extinguitur Phinees

464 dimittitur Ophín
465 Timens moritur Hely
466 Confuditur Balthasar.
467 *. Deprecatur Abraham.
468 Assumitur Helyas.
469 Rapitur Dyna.
470 *. Includitur Noe
471 inpingitur Loth
472 *. relinquuit Daniel

473 defrauitur Susanna
474 venditur Joseph
475 -. tollitur Abacuch
476 *. interrogatur Eva -. 
477 funditur Micheas.
478 in fornacem mittitur Ananias
479 Vinculis constringitur Sampson
480 punitur Urias
481 *. scinditur Ysaias
482 Expoliatur Ionas
483 lapidatur Jeremias
484 *. turbatur Abyrnelech.
485 *. crucifixitur Iesus
486 *. Flagellatur Paulus
487 *. traductur David.
488 Disrumpitur Isabel.
489 Post furtum ambulant Jacob.
490 ---. tenetur et negat Petrus

491 *. ne scio clamat Cayn.
492 Sed quia multorum conscientia erat in furto
493 quod erat suscipiens Raab
494 querebat Laban
495 Infamabatur Susanna
496 arguebat Johannes
497 Negabat Rachel
498 dolebat Moyses

499 clamabat Ysayas.
500 Plorabat Jeremias
501 --. tristis erat Job

502 espectabat Symeon.
503 soppniabat Jacob
504 non credebat Pharao  
505 *. Erubescebat Rebecca  
506 Menciebatur Jeroboam -.  

507 † Postmodum scrutatis omnibus  
508 inventum est furtum apud Benyamin  
509 quod erat in conscientia Joseph.  
510 Sed post prolatum est regi  

511 quod Achar filius Carmi solus esset reus furti.  
512 Jussit eum occidi donavitque eum omnibus.  
513 Tunc -. Moyses primus omnium calce eum percussit  
514 interfecit Abymelech. -.  

515 *.- elisit Daniel  
516 * detraxit vestem Amon.  

517 *. Perforat [f. 119v] Eleazar  
518 virga * percussit Aron.  
519 -.*. lapide David  
520 *.* Iesus flagello  
521 † Tunc iussit rex ut is qui mortuus fuerat sepoliretur  
522 tunc vendidit agrum Ephron  
523 emit Abraam  
524 monumentum fecit Jacob  
525 -. clausit Noe  

526 superscrispsit Pylatus  
527 premium accepit Judas.  
528 Quo facto - clamabat Zacharias  
529 anunciabat Elyzabeth  
530 stupebat Maria  
531 ridebat de facto Sara.  
532 Tunc explicitis omnibus domos suas repetierunt.  
533 et sic est totum.  

Since I have finished the article, I have come to realize that 32 allusions which I considered unique for CV appear in manuscript Frankfurt Barth. 56 written in the first half of the 13th century in France and containing primarily Petrus Comestor’s Historia scholastica. Although this manuscript is far from explaining all the specificities of CV, it provides further evidence for the complexity and character of the transmission of Cena Cypriani.