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**Abstract:** The annotations of the Greek humanist Marcus Musurus in the recently recovered biblical manuscript UCM 22 (= 442 Rahlfs, 16th century *in*.), corresponding to the *Septuaginta* (*Maccabaei*, Book II), are studied in this article, as well as their possible origin: the Marc.gr. 1.
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The Universidad Complutense de Madrid (UCM) BH ms. 22 Villa-Amil (= 442 Rahlfs) (abbreviated, UCM 22), from the Historical Library “Marqués de Valdecilla” at the Complutense University, is a Greek codex on parchment, which was apparently copied in the late 15th or early 16th century.¹ It contains part of the Old Testament (*Septuaginta*) and for a long time was considered “deperditus”² in the fighting during the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939) in the University City of Madrid. The manuscript was likely sent by the “Signoria” of Venice to Cardinal Cisneros in the early 16th century to serve as a model for the Greek column of the *Biblia Polyglota Complutensis*, which the cardinal was promoting in Alcalá de Henares and which was the first printed edition of the Bible, chronologically speaking, although it was distributed throughout Europe shortly after the Aldine edition.³ Originally the manuscript, on parchment, 370 x 250 mm., contained 307 ff and ended with *Maccabei* III.⁴ Some 600 fragments are currently preserved, to a greater or lesser degree of conservation.

¹ According to Bravo García (2008, 160), whose view was accepted by Ángel Espinós (2009, 180–182), UCM 22 was copied by John Severus the Lacedaemonian during a poorly documented stay in Venice, prior to his better known stay in Rome (1518–1525).

² De Andrés (1974, 230–232) and, more recently, O’Connell (2006, 82, n. 29; 89, n. 53). For further information on the manuscript, please refer to the bibliography cited at the end.

³ The Complutensian *Polyglota* was completed in July 1517, although the first volume is dated to January 1514, while the Aldine edition was not published in Venice until 1518. However, papal approval for the distribution of the *Polyglota* did not happen until March 1520, and it was put on sale two years later (Sáenz-Badillos 1996, 139). They are therefore two almost contemporary editions, and, in principle, it is possible that there were relations between them, not only for chronological reasons but also because of particular figures, such as Marcus Musurus, Demetrius Ducas or Niketas Faustus (also known as Victor Faustus), who collaborated in both editions.

⁴ Villa-Amil 1878, 5–6.
The recent ordination and digitisation of all the preserved fragments of the UCM 22 manuscript, which we have been able to carry out thanks to the incorporation into the project of our Portuguese colleague Carlos Martins de Jesus, has allowed us to verify that, as already suspected, this manuscript was a model for the Polyglotta, especially in vol. IV (Maccabaei) and, to a lesser extent, in vols. II and III.

The “recovery” and subsequent digitisation of all the preserved fragments of UCM 22 has also revealed the many annotations made by the well-known Greek humanist and collaborator of Aldus Manutius, Marcus Musurus (1470–1517), who also annotated, although more scarcely, the Lond. BL Add. 10968 manuscript. This is considered to have been the model for the Aldine edition and with it the Complutensian manuscript seems to have a close textual relationship, perhaps because it shares the same model: Marc.gr. 5, itself a copy of Marc.gr. 16.

5 Accessible at: http://dioscorides.ucm.es/proyecto_digitalizacion/index.php?doc=5309496614&y=2011&c=1 See also: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QeY3VLChq4c. Before its partial destruction during the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939), only three passages from the manuscript were known. Two of them (Judges, 5:1–31 and Reges II, 19–26) were copied at the end of the 19th century by the scholar Pascual Gayangos and were reproduced by Delitzsch (1886, 13–17 and 17–18). The other passage (Reges II, 23:1–5) was transcribed by Revilla (1917, 100–101). The current digitisation, which is now almost complete, would not have been possible without the contribution of the colleagues who preceded us with their valuable work on the manuscript, such as Antonio Bravo García, Natalio Fernández Marcos and Jesús Ángel Espiños. To all of them, we pay a tribute of sincere gratitude.

6 In the research projects “Greek manuscripts in Spain and their European context” (II) FFI2015–67475-C2-2-P and (III) PID2019–05733GB-I00, with the technical support of the staff of the Historical Library at the Complutense University. We would like to pay tribute to all involved, with a very special remembrance going out to the humble caretaker of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters of the Complutense University, L. Ángel López Castro who, during the turbulent years of the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939), was apparently responsible for the “salvage” of some of the most precious bibliographic treasures that are now housed in the Historical Library at the Complutense University (De Ontañón, 2005).


8 Something that Antonio Bravo (2008, 160) already pointed out in view of some preserved fragments.

9 Cataldi Palau (1998, 451, 458) recognised printing marks on the manuscript by the Aldine editors. These two manuscripts, Lond. 10968 and UCM 22, would be the only biblical manuscripts annotated by Musurus. The Lond. 10968, whose抄ists have not yet been identified with certainty, although the names of Bartolomeo Zanetti, Constantinos Mesobotes and Demetrius Ducas have been mentioned (Cataldi 1998, 459; Speranzi 2013, 271; Jesus 2020a, 725, n. 34), was probably also copied in Venice at the beginning of the 16th century. The manuscript was “a” model of the Aldine edition, but was not, pace Cataldi, “the” only model. In fact, in recent works (Hernández Muñoz 2020a, 231, n.6; Jesus 2020a, 741–742) we have suggested the possibility that the two biblical manuscripts that were annotated by Musurus, being to a certain extent complementary in their content, served, in principle, for the creation of the Aldine edition, in which Musurus collaborated. UCM 22 was then sent to Cardinal Cisneros, promoter of the Polyglotta in Alcalá de Henares, as an aid for the work of this edition. In any case, the question of the sources of the Aldine edition of the Greek Bible remains still not fully resolved with there being different models according to the biblical books and even “eclectically” within the same book or passage (Hernández Muñoz 2020b).

10 It is the tentative conclusion we have reached after a partial collatio. The Marc. gr. 5 is a codex that can be dated to the third quarter of the 15th century, and was copied by George Tzagaropoulos and
In a previous work (Hernández Muñoz 2020a, 241 n.44, and 246), I suggested the possibility that Musurus’ annotations in the UCM 22 came from the consultation of other manuscripts in the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice (specifically, from the collection of Cardinal Bessarion). We will now proceed to the collatio of Book II of Maccabaei, where most of Musurus’ annotations are concentrated, comparing them with those of the following manuscripts: Marc. gr. 1 (= N/V Rahlfs), 9th century\(^\text{11}\) (abbreviated, Marc. 1); Marc.gr. 2 (= 29 Rahlfs, partim 9th century, partim 14th century) (abbreviated, Marc. 2); Marc.gr. 4 (= 120 Rahlfs), 11th century (abbreviated, Marc. 4); Marc.gr. 5 (= 68 Rahlfs), 15th century (abbreviated, Marc. 5); Marc.gr. 16 (= 731 Rahlfs), 13th century (abbreviated, Marc. 16); Lond. BL Add. 10968, 16th century in. (abbreviated, Lond. 10968), and UCM 22 (= 442 Rahlfs), 16th century in. (abbreviated, UCM 22). We will also use the testimony of the two great first editions: the Polyglota (Alcalá de Henares, 1514–1517; abbreviated, Polyg.) and the Aldine edition (Venice 1518; abbreviated, Ald.).

1. The text of UCM 22 and Musurus’ annotations

For each passage de Maccabaei II we copy the text transmitted by UCM 22 (ff. 189v–202v.) and in brackets and italics ( ) the annotation of Musurus to facilitate its location in the passage.

Abbreviations:

\[\text{marg.} = \text{scripsit Musurus in margine in UCM 22}\]
\[\text{s. l.} = \text{scripsit Musurus supra lineam in UCM 22}\]
\[\text{i. v.} = \text{scripsit Musurus in vacuo}\text{13 in UCM 22}\]

It should also be noted that, given the current precarious state of preservation of UCM 22, many parts are now missing. The probable text that would originally have been included is between [ ].

3.15 δύψαντες έαυτούς ἐπεκαλοῦντο εἰς (s. l. τὸν) οὐρανὸν τὸν περὶ παραθήκης  
5.3 καὶ προσβολάς γνομένας καὶ καταδρομὰς (s. l. ἐκάτερον) καὶ ἀσπίδων κινήσεις  
5.14 [ἐν ταῖς πάσαις θαλάσσεσι διὰ] καθαρὰ κάλλικα καὶ καθαμάκτιστα μάτισε (s. l.-ε) τοῦ τῶν ἐσφαγμένων  
7.40 καὶ σ[πείρας αὐτὸς προηγούμενον] μενος συνέλαβε (s. l. συνέβαλε) τῷ Νικάν[ορι]  
8.23 [κατήγγελεν ἔχειν] τοὺς Ιουδ[αίους καὶ διὰ τὸν τρόπον]  
9.4. τὴν πορείαν τῆς (marg. ἤδη) ἐξ οὕτων δὴ κρίσεως συνούσης αὐτῶ.
9.19 χαίρειν καὶ υγιαίνειν καὶ εὖ πράττειν (marx. διευτυχεῖν) βασιλεύς καὶ στρατηγὸς Αντίοχος. From 9.19 onwards, we have been able to include the testimony of Lond. 10968, which currently does not transmit the previous part. In its present state, Marc. 16 also shows some mutilations and transpositions of folia; therefore, its testimony could not be included in all the passages, as in 13.2 or 14.3, where it would probably coincide with a copy of its own: Marc. 5.

9.21 τῆς κοινῆς πάντων ἀσφαλείας. (marx. εἰς οὐρανὸν ἐλπίδα ἐχόντων ὑμῶν) 9.22 συνεύρη κατὰ τὴν (s. l. αὐτὴν) ἁμέραν τὸν καθαρισμὸν γενέσθαι τοῦ ναού, τῇ πέμπτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ αὐτοῦ (s. l. μηνός), ὡς ἠστιν Χάσελευ. Ex 9.20. Figure 1 can be seen, with two annotations by Musurus in the margin. The images have been reproduced with permission of the Historical Library at the Complutense University.

10.5 συνεύρη κατὰ τὴν (s. l. αὐτὴν) ἁμέραν τὸν καθαρισμὸν γενέσθαι τοῦ ναού, τῇ πέμπτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ αὐτοῦ (s. l. μηνός), ὡς ἠστιν Χάσελευ. Below ἐν there is a circular stroke indicating a correction of Musurus, which is probably his indication of omission, as it happens on Marc. 1 compared to the rest of the testimonies, including Polyglota.

10.6 τὴν τῶν σκηνῶν ἐορτὴν ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις θηρίων. 10.7 καὶ κλάδους ὡραίους, ἔτι δὲ (s. l. καὶ) φοῖνικας ἔχοντες
10.8 παντὶ τῷ τῶν Ιουδαίων (s. l. ἔθνει) κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτὸν ἄγειν
10.22 τούς δύο πύργους κατεβάλετο (s. l. κατελάβετο). 10.23 τοῖς δὲ ὅπλοις τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς σπῆλαίοις θηρίων
10.26 κατέσφαξεν μυριάδας σωμάτων δύο καὶ πεντακισχιλίους. 12.27 μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ φρούριον ἁμέρας τέσσαρας (marx. τοῦ) ἡμέρας τέσσαρας, ἀδελφὸν Χαίρεαν
11.15 Μετὰ ὀλίγον δὲ παντελῶς χρόνον (s. l. χρονίσκον) Λυσίας ἐπίτροπος
11.16 εὐτυχεῖν (marx. διευτυχεῖν) βασιλεὺς καὶ στρατηγὸς Αντίοχος. After τάζας there is a ^ mark, which indicates that there was an annotation by Musurus in the margin, although not preserved due to damage in the manuscript, cf. 12.17; it was probably καὶ εἴκοσι.
11.17 ut vid., because Musurus' annotation is not very visible today.
11.18 τὸ γεγονός After νομάδες there is the ^ mark, which (see supra, 10.33) indicates an annotation in the margin which has not been preserved today due to damage to the manuscript. It was probably ἄραβες.
11.19 Μετὰ ὀλίγον δὲ παντελῶς χρόνον (s. l. χρονίσκον) Λυσίας ἐπίτροπος
11.20 τὸ γεγονός. 12.28 ἐπικαλεσάμενοι δὲ τὸν δυνάστην τὸν μετὰ κράτους συντρίβοντα τῶν πολεμίων ἀλκὰς ἔλαβον
20 The damage to the manuscript does not allow us to read all of Musurus’ annotations on the lines left blank in UCM 22. Three of the collated manuscripts, Marc. 5, UCM 22 and Lond. 10968, have the same blank lines. On the other hand, Marc. 16 also omitted the text, but this was later added in a barely legible manner in the margin (see also 5.14). This would be evidence that Marc. 16 was a model
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τὴν πόλιν ὑποχείριον κατέστρωσαν δὲ [τῶν ἐνδού εἰς μι]ράδας δύο (s. l. καὶ) πεντακισθιλίους 12.29 ἀναζεύξαντες δὲ ἐκείθεν

12.33 ἐξῆλθον δὲ (s. l. μετὰ) πεζῶν τρισχιλίων, ἱππέων δὲ τετρακισίων

12.34 πρὸς τοῦτον δὲ (παρατα[ ] i. v. ut vid.)21 δὲ συνέβη πεσεῖν ὄλγοις τῶν Ιουδαίων.

13.2 πεζῶν μυριάδας ἑνδεκάκι χίλιων (s. l. καὶ) πεντακισχιλίους 12.29 ἀναζεύξαντες δὲ ἐκείθεν 12.33 ἐξῆλθον δὲ (s. l. μετὰ) πεζῶν τρισχιλίων, ἱππέων δὲ τετρακισίων

14.3 [Ἀλκιμος δὲ] τις προγεγενόμενος (s. l. προγεγονὼς) ἀρχιερεύς, ἐκουσίως δὲ μεμολύσας [μένος ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἀμαῖξας χρόνοις, συννοήσας ὅτι καθ’ ὄντι οὖν ὑπο καθ’ ὄντι τρόπον ο[ὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ σωτηρία οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸ] 14.7 λέγω δὴ τὴν [ἀρχιερωσύνην,] δεῦρο (s. l. δεύτερον) νῦν ἐλήλυθα 14.8 πρώτον μὲν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνήκοντων τῷ [βασιλεί γνησίως] φρονῶν, δεύτερον δὲ καὶ τῶν ἵδων (s. l. ἰδων) πολιτῶν στοχαζόμενος 22

14.11 προσετύρωσαν τὸν Δημήτριον. 14.12 προσκαλεσάμενος (marg. προχειρισάμενος) δὲ εὐθέως Νικάνορα

2. The Musurus’ annotations in UCM 22 agree with:

3.15 (s. l. τῶν) οὐρανὸν: Marc. 2, Ald., Polyg.

5.3 καταδρομὰς (s. l. ἑκατέρων): Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, Ald., Polyg.

5.14 [κατεφθάρσαν, τέσσαρες μὲν ἐν χειρῶν νομαῖς, οὐχ ἢττον δὲ τῶν ἐσφαγμένων] (i. v. ἐπράθησαν): Marc. 1, 2, 4, Marc. 16, Ald., Polyg., om. cum vac. Marc. 23

7.40 καὶ ὦ (s. l. -τος) οὖν καθαρὸς μετήλλαξαν (s. l. -e) παντελῶς ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ πεποιθώς: Marc. 1, 2, 4, Ald., Polyg.24

8.23 συνέλαβε (s. l. συνέβαλε): Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, Ald., Polyg.

8.36 ἔχειν (s. l. τὸν θεὸν): Marc. 1, Polyg.

9.4 τῆς (marg. ἤδη) ἐξ οὐρανοῦ: Marc. 1

9.19 εὑ πράττειν (marg. διευτυχεῖν): Marc. 1

for Marc. 5 (which he could not read or consider it a marginal gloss, and therefore left the blank space for the added text of Marc. 16), and that Marc. 5 was the model for two “sibling” codices: UCM 22 and Lond. 10968, both annotated by Musurus (Hernández Muñoz 2020a, 245, n. 51). However, here UCM 22 is more complete than Lond. 10968, a manuscript that does not have the Musurus addition. On the kinship of these manuscripts see also 10.37 (om. τούτου); 11.13 (ἑαυτὸν instead of ἑαυτοῦ); 14.3 (om. τοῦ), cf. also 7.40 and 12.34. The UCM 22 text inserted in [ ] is conjectural; the rest is effectively preserved. In Figure 2, lin. 12–13, there is the addition of Musurus in the blank space. In lin. 15 and 22. the s. l. additions can be seen, with the typical ^ mark.

21 παρατα[ξαμένου appears to be written by Musurus in the space left blank by the UCM 22 copyist.

22 In Figure 3 different annotations can be seen s. l. vel in marg. with the sign γρ.

23 Marc. 5 leaves space blank here, as does UCM 22 (before Musurus’ annotation), and the text is added to the margin in Marc. 16, as in 12.27

24 οὗ and -αξαν are offered only by UCM 22, Marc. 16 and Marc. 5, which is proof of their connection. They were probably also transmitted by Lond. 10968, but this part today is not in the manuscript and cannot be verified. Again, we can see a coincidence of Marc. 16, Marc. 5 and UCM 22 and Lond. 10968).
9.21 φροντίσω τῆς κοινῆς πάντων ἁσφαλείας (marg. εἰς υπερανύ ἐλπίδα ἐχόντων ὑμῶν): Marc. 1
10.5 κατά τὴν (s. l. αὐτὴν) ἁμέραν: Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, Lond. 10968, Ald., Polyg.
10.7 ἐτὶ δὲ (s. l. καὶ) φοίνικας: Marc. 1
10.8 τῷ τῶν Ιουδαίων (s. l. ἑδει): Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, Lond. 10968, Ald., Polyg.
10.22 κατεβάλετο (s. l. κατελάβετο): Marc. 1, 2, Polyg.
10.23 ἔτι δὲ (s. l. καὶ) φοίνικας: Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, Lond. 10968, Ald., Polyg.
10.26 τῷ τῶν Ιουδαίων (s. l. ἑδει): Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, Lond. 10968, Ald., Polyg.
10.32 προκατελάβετο (s. l. προκατελάβοντο): Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, Lond. 10968, Ald., Polyg.
10.37 τόν (s. l. τούτου) ἄδελφον: Marc. 1, 2, 4, 16, Ald., Polyg. (om. τούτου Marc. 5, Lond. 10968 et UCM 22.a.c.)
11.1 χρόνον (s. l. χρονισκον): Marc. 1
11.13 ἕαυτον (s. l. ἑαυτὸν): Marc. 1, 2, 4, Lond. 10968, Ald., Polyg. 26
11.13 ἄντιβάλλων [ων (s. l. ut vid. ἀντιβάλων)]: Marc. 1
11.38 ἁπαθεία (s. l. Διοσκουρίδου): Marc. 1
12.11 οἱ νομάδες (marg. ἄραβες ut vid.): Marc. 1, Polyg.
12.16 ἔχουσαν σταδίων δύο (marg. σταδίων σέβαν δύο) 27: Marc. 1
12.27 δύο καὶ πεντακισθιλίους, μετὰ δὲ τῇ (i. u. τούτων τροπὴν καὶ ἁπόλειειν ἐπετράτευσε καὶ ἐπὶ Εφραίμ πόλιν ὄχυραν, ἐν [h] κατόχω νεαια μὲ χωμαλέω πρὸ τῶν τειχῶν καθεστῶτες εὐρώστως ἀπεμάχοντα, ἐνθάδε ωράνων καὶ βελ[]): Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16 mg, Ald., Polyg., om. cum vac. Marc. 5, Lond. 10968 et UCM 22a.c. 29
12.28 μυριάδας δύο (s. l. καὶ) πεντακισθιλίους: Marc. 1, 2, Polyg.
12.33 ἐξῆλθεν δὲ (s. l. μετὰ) πεζῶν: Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, Lond. 10968, Ald., Polyg.

25 In this passage, the reading of Marc. 16 differs from that of Marc. 5, which again agrees with Lond. 10968 and UCM 22 a.c., as in 12.27. The omission of τούτων (10.37) in Marc. 5 may be a mere copying error without anticipating a change to a different model from Marc. 16. In the case of 5.14 and 12.27, what seems to happen is that Marc. 5 does not incorporate the marginal additions of Marc. 16 and leaves the corresponding blank space blank, as is also the case in the Lond. 10968 and in UCM 22 before Musurus’ intervention.
26 Marc. 5 (ἑαυτοὺς) departs here from the rest of the collated testimonies, except Marc. 16, Lond. 10968 and UCM 22 a.c.
27 The Aldine edition offers here ἔχουσαν σταδίων δύο, which does not coincide with any of the testimonies collated, but does in fact coincide with others, as we can see in the critical apparatus of Hanhart’s edition ad loc. (“71, L-93, 46–52, 106, 311”). In fact, many of the exclusive readings of the Aldine edition, as opposed to the other testimonies collated in our study, are also found in the so-called “L. recension”.
28 With some textual changes between these testimonies.
29 Again, these three testimonies, together with UCM 22, coincide in leaving a blank space, which is filled in the margin by Marc. 16 and introduced by Musurus in the blank space of UCM 22, see 5.14, cf. 10.37
12.34 πρὸς τοῦτον δὲ (παρατα[ ] i. v. ut vid.)30 δὲ συνέβη πεσεῖν
13.2 πεντακισχιλίους (marg. τριακοσίους) καὶ ἔλεφαντας: Marc. 1, 2, 4, Lond. 10968mgs, Ald., Polyg., om. τριακοσίους Marc. 5
14.3 τις προγεγενόμενος (s. l. προγεγονὼς) ἀρχιερεύς: Marc. 1
14.3 [οὐδὲ πρ]ὸς (s. l. τὸ) ἄγιον θυσιαστήριον: Marc. 1, 2, 4, Polyg., om. τὸ Marc. 5, Lond. 10968, Ald. et UCM 22a.c. 32
14.7 ἀρχιερωσύνην, δεύτερο (s. l. δεύτερον) νῦν ἐλήλυθα: Marc. 1
14.8 δεύτερον δὲ καὶ τῶν ἰδίων (s. l. ἡμετερων) πολιτῶν: Marc. 1
14.11 προσκαλεσάμενος (marg. προχειρισάμενος): Marc. 1

From these data, it can be concluded that the Musurus’ annotations in UCM 22 (in Maccabaei Book II)33 seem to come from Marc. 1, a manuscript in capitals from ca. 8th century, since a significant amount of its text only seems to be found, among the manuscripts collated in our study, in this vetustissimus manuscript from the

30 As already noted, παρατα[ξαμένους] seems to have been written by Musurus in a space left blank (or erased) by the copyist of UCM 22. What is offered here by Marc. 16, Marc. 5 and Lond. 10968 is περιταξαμένους. Of the collated testimonies, only Marc. 1 and the Aldine edition omit πρὸς τοῦτον δὲ, though in the following word there are differences: παραταξαμένων (Ald.), παραταξαμένου (Marc. 1). The continuation of the word in the preserved part of UCM 22 has been lost. Most probably it was παρατα[ξαμένου], as in Polyg., Marc. 2 and Marc. 4, but this is without ruling out παρατα[ξαμένου], as in Marc. 1. The letters παρατα[ ] appear to be written by Musurus (see also the stroke of ρα in ὀχυραί in the Musurus addition in lin. 12 of Figure 2), which are distinct from εὐχαριστά[ ] (in lin. 18 of Figure 2) by John Severus.

31 Both UCM 22 and Lond. 10968 have the marginal addition, τριακοσίους, which is missing in the probable model of both: Marc. 5. At present, this passage has been not transmitted by the probable model of the latter, Marc. 16; we do not know, therefore, whether it would have also omitted τριακοσίους or added it marginally. This is an annotation which, as in 5.14 and 12.27, would not have been incorporated into the text of Marc 5, with the space being left blank.

32 The Aldine edition has been added to this group of closely related codices.

33 In book III, transmitted by a smaller number of manuscripts, there are not so many corrections and annotations in UCM 22, but the available data (Hernández Muñoz 2020a, 241–246) also seem to confirm a connection with Marc. 1 (and in this book perhaps also with Marc. 4). The reading with the correction in UCM 22 appears first; then, after /, the text of the other testimonies:

With Marc. 1:
3.20 καὶ add. (before μετὰ) / om.
4.16: πεπλανημένος / πεπλανημένη vel πεπλανημένοι
5.13 οἱ τε / οἱ δὲ.
With Marc. 1, Polyg.:
2.31 ὑπὸ (before τῆς ἐσομένης) / ἀπὸ
6.25 οἰκίας / οἰκιας
With Marc. 1, 4, Polyg.:
4.5 ἀπάσης / ἀπειλῆς
4.10 λαμβάνων (v) / λαμβάνων
5.11 ἐπιβαλλόμενον / ἀπο- vel ὑποβαλλόμενον
5.25 πολυδάκρνων (UCM 22 s.l. cum Marc. 4) vel πολυδάκρεων (Polyg. cum Marc. 1) / πολυδάκρεω.
Biblioteca Marciana, although Musurus may also have consulted others, such as Marc. 2. As is well-known, access to Cardinal Bessarion’s codices in the early 16th century was not easy (Jesus 2020a: 728, n. 43; 2022: 374, n. 20), but not impossible either, at least for Musurus in Venice. It is also noted that some of Musurus’ corrections in UCM 22, which are here only found in Marc. 1, are also found in the Polyglota text, because its editors used UCM 22 with Musurus’ correction and incorporated it into their edition. Finally, Marc. 16 is, as was supposed, a model for Marc. 5 and this, in turn, is a model for Lond. 10968 and UCM 22. Of these, UCM...
Marcus Musurus’ annotations in the ‘recovered’ UCM 22 (= 442 Rahlfs) manuscript: Maccabaei II

22 seems to be the most complete as it contains more annotations and corrections by Musurus.
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Figure 3: UCM 22