

Marcus Musurus' annotations in the 'recovered' UCM 22 (= 442 rahlfs) manuscript: *Maccabaei* II

Felipe G. Hernández Muñoz
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

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.

Keywords: manuscript; UCM 22; recovered; Marcus Musurus; Marc. gr. 1



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 *Maccabaei* III.⁴ Some 600 fragments are currently preserved, to a greater or lesser degree of conservation.

✉ fhmunoz@filol.ucm.es.

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,⁵ which we have been able to carry out thanks to the incorporation into the project of our Portuguese colleague Carlos Martins de Jesus,⁶ has allowed us to verify that, as already suspected,⁷ this manuscript was a model for the *Polyglota*, 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),⁸ who also annotated, although more scarcely, the Lond. BL Add. 10968 manuscript. This is considered to have been the model for the Aldine⁹ edition and with it the Complutensian manuscript seems to have a close textual relationship, perhaps because it shares the same model: Marc.gr. 5,¹⁰ itself a copy of Marc.gr. 16.

⁵ Accessible at: http://dioscorides.ucm.es/proyecto_digitalizacion/index.php?doc=5309456614&y=2011&p=1 See also: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QeY5VLChq4c>. Before its partial destruction during the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939), only three passages from the manuscript were known. Two of them (*Judices*, 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 Espinós. 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).

⁷ Villa-Amil 1878, 5–6; Graux & Martin 1892, 125–126; De Andrés 1974, 227, 245; Fernández Marcos 2005 79; Bravo García 2008, 160.

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 copyists 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 *Polyglota* 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 Tzangaropoulos 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 century¹¹ (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:

marg. = scripsit Musurus in margine in UCM 22

s. l. = scripsit Musurus supra lineam in UCM 22

i. v. = scripsit Musurus in vacuo¹² 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 ῥίψαντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐπεκαλοῦντο εἰς (*s. l. τὸν*) οὐρανὸν τὸν περὶ παραθήκης
 5.3 καὶ προσβολὰς γινομένης καὶ καταδρομὰς (*s. l. ἐκατέρων*) καὶ ἀσπίδων κινήσεις
 5.14 [ἐν ταῖς πάσαις ἡμέραις τρισὶν κατ]εφθάρησαν, τέσ[σαρες μὲν ἐν χειρῶν νομαῖς, οὐχ ἦττον δὲ τῶν ἐσφαγμένων]¹³ (*i. v. ἐπράθησαν*). 5.15 οὐκ ἀρ[κεσθεῖς]
 7.40 καὶ οὐ(*s. l. -τος*) οὐκ καθαρὸς μετέλλαξαν (*s. l. -ε*) παντελῶς ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ πεποιθώς.
 8.23 [σπείρας αὐτὸς προηγού]μενος συνέλαβε (*s. l. συνέβαλε*) τῷ Νικάν[ορι]
 8.36 [κατήγγελλεν ὑπέρμαχον ἔχ]ειν (*s. l. τὸν θεόν*) τοὺς Ἰουδ[αίους καὶ διὰ τὸν τρόπον]
 9.4. τὴν πορείαν τῆς (*marg. ἤδη*) ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δὴ κρίσεως συνούσης αὐτῶ.

the so-called “Anonymus ΔΤ” (Martínez Manzano & Hernández Muñoz 2019, 142). It is possible that the “castigatissimo codice” to which Cisneros refers in the “Prologue to the reader” of vol. I of the *Polyglota* refers not so much to Marc. 5 but to its copy, UCM 22, which was revised by Musurus.

¹¹ For the details of its chronology, see Andrist (2020, 46)

¹² It refers to the spaces originally left blank in the UCM 22 and later filled in by Musurus.

¹³ We remember that the text that has been lost due to material damage in the manuscript, and reconstructed by comparison with other testimonies, appears between [].

- 9.19 χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν καὶ εὖ πράττειν (*marg.* διευτυχεῖν) βασιλεὺς καὶ στρατηγὸς Ἀντίοχος.¹⁴
- 9.21 τῆς κοινῆς πάντων ἀσφαλείας. (*marg.*¹⁵ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἐλπίδα ἐχόντων ὑμῶν) 9.22 οὐκ ἀπογινώσκων τὰ κατ' ἐμαυτὸν
- 10.5 συνέβη κατὰ τὴν (*s. l.* αὐτῇ) ἡμέραν τὸν καθαρισμόν γενέσθαι τοῦ ναοῦ, τῇ πέμπτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ αὐτοῦ (*s. l.* μηνός), ὃς [ἐστιν] Χασέλευ.
- 10.6 τὴν τῶν σκηνῶν ἑορτὴν ἐν τοῖς ὅρεσιν καὶ ἐν (***)¹⁶ τοῖς σπηλαίοις θηρίων
- 10.7 καὶ κλάδους ὠραίους, ἔτι δὲ (*s. l.* καὶ) φοίνικας ἔχοντες
- 10.8 παντὶ τῷ τῶν Ἰουδαίων (*s. l.* ἔθνει) κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἄγειν
- 10.22 τοὺς δύο πύργους κατεβάλετο (*s. l.* κατελάβετο). 10.23 τοῖς δὲ ὅπλοις τὰ πάντα ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν εὐδοκίμως ἀπώλεσεν ἐν ταῖς (*s. l.* τοῖς) δυσὶν ὀχυρώμασιν
- 10.33 [τὸ φρούριον ἡμέρας τέσσαρ]ας (***)¹⁷ 10.34 οἱ δὲ ἔνδον τῇ ἐρυμνότητι
- 10.36 οἱ δὲ τὰς πύλας διέκοπτον, εἰσδεξάμενοι δὲ τὴν λοιπὴν τάξιν προκατελάβετο (*s. l.* προκατελάβοντο) τὴν πόλιν.
- 10.37 κατέσφαξαν καὶ τὸν (*s. l.* τούτου) ἀδελφὸν Χ[αιρέαν]
- 11.1 Μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ παντελῶς χρόνον (*s. l.* χρονίσκον) Λυσίας ἐπίτροπος
- 11.13 [οὐκ ἄνους δὲ ὑπάρχων πρὸς ἑα]υτοὺς (*s. l.* ἑαυτὸν) ἀντιβάλλ[ων] (*s. l.* ἀντιβάλλον)¹⁸ τὸ γεγονὸς
- 11.38 ὑγιαίνετε. ἔτους ἑκατοστοῦ τεσσαρακοστοῦ ὀγδόου, Ξανθικοῦ (*s. l.* Διοσκουρίδου) πεντεκαιδεκάτῃ.
- 12.11 [ἐ]λαττονωθέντες οἱ νομάδες (***)¹⁹ ἤξιον δοῦναι τὸν Ἰου[δαν] δεξιὰς αὐτοῖς]
- 12.16 τὸ πλάτος ἔχουσιν σταδίου δύο (*marg.* σταδίων οὖσαν δύο) κατάρρυστον
- 12.26 κατέσφαξεν μυριάδας σωμάτων δύο καὶ πε[ντακις]χιλίους. 12.27 μετὰ δὲ τὴν (*i. v.* τούτων τροπὴν καὶ ἀπώλειαν ἐπεστράτευσε καὶ ἐπὶ Εφρων πόλιν ὀχυράν, ἐν [ῆ] κατώκει νεανία δὲ ῥωμαῖοι πρὸ τῶν τειχέων καθεστῶτες εὐρώστας ἀπεμάχοντο, ἐνθάδε ὀργάνων καὶ βελ[ῶν] πολλὰ παραθέσεις ὑπῆρχον. 12.28 ἐπικαλεσάμενοι δὲ τὸν δυνάστην τὸν μετὰ κράτους συντρίβοντα]²⁰ τὰς τῶν πολεμίων ἀλλὰς ἔλαβον

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ 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.

¹⁶ 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*.

¹⁷ after τέσσαρας 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. 12.11; it was probably καὶ εἰκοσι.

¹⁸ ut vid., because Musurus' annotation is not very visible today.

¹⁹ 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.

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

- τὴν πόλιν ὑποχείριον, κατέστρωσαν δὲ [τῶν ἔνδον εἰς μυ]ριάδας δύο (*s. l. και*)
 πεντακισχιλίου 12.29 ἀναζεύξαντες δὲ ἐκεῖθεν]
- 12.33 ἐξῆλθον δὲ (*s. l. μετὰ*) πεζῶν τρισχιλίων, ἰππέων δὲ τετρακοσίων
- 12.34 πρὸς τοῦτον δὲ (*παρατα* [] *i. v. ut vid.*)²¹ δὲ συνέβη πεσεῖν ὀλίγους τῶν Ἰουδαίων.
- 13.2 πεζῶν μυριάδας ἑνδεκα ἰππεῖς πεντακισχιλίου (*marg. τριακοσίου*) καὶ
 ἐλέφαντας εἴκοσι δύο
- 14.3 [Ἀλκιμος δέ] τις προγεγεγνόμενος (*s. l. προγεγονώς*) ἀρχιερεύς, ἐκουσίως δὲ
 μεμολυσ[μένος ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἀμει]ξίας χρόνοις, συννοήσας ὅτι καθ' ὄντιναοῦν
 τρόπον οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ σωτηρία οὐδὲ πρὸς (*s. l. τὸ*) ἄγιον θυσιαστήριον ἔτι
 πρόσσδος
- 14.7 λέγω δὴ τὴν [ἀρχιερωσύνην,] δεῦρο (*s. l. δεύτερον*) νῦν ἐλήλυθα 14.8 πρῶτον μὲν
 ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνηκόντων τῷ [βασιλεῖ γνησίως] φρονῶν, δεύτερον δὲ καὶ τῶν ἰδίων (*s. l. ἡμετερων*)
 πολιτῶν στοχαζόμενος²²
- 14.11 προσεπύρωσαν τὸν Δημήτριον. 14.12 προσκαλεσάμενος (*marg. προχειρισάμενος*)
 δὲ εὐθέως Νικάνορα

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

- 3.15 (*s. l. τὸν*) οὐρανόν: Marc. 2, Ald., Polyg.
- 5.3 καταδρομὰς (*s. l. ἐκατέρων*): Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, Ald., Polyg.
- 5.14 [κ]ατεφθάρησαν, τέσ[σαρες μὲν ἐν χειρῶν νομαῖς, οὐχ ἦττον δὲ τῶν ἐσφαγμένων]
 (*i. v. ἐπράθησαν*): Marc. 1, 2, 4, Marc. 16^{mg}, Ald., Polyg., om. cum vac. Marc.
 5²³
- 7.40 καὶ οὗ(*s. l. -τος*) οὖν καθαρὸς μετήλλαξαν (*s. l. -ε*) 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 [ἐχ]εῖν (*s. l. τὸν θεόν*): Marc. 1, Polyg.
- 9.4 τῆς (*marg. ἥδη*) ἐξ οὐρανοῦ: Marc. 1
- 9.19 εὖ 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 (ἐαυτοῦς instead of ἐαυτὸν); 14.3 (om. τὸ), 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 lin. 22. the *s. l.* additions can be seen, with the typical ^ mark.

²¹ παρατα[ξαμένους 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 -άζαν 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 ^{a.c.} (and probably also with Lond. 10968).

- 9.21 φροντίσαι τῆς κοινῆς πάντων ἀσφαλείας (*marg. εἰς οὐρανὸν ἐλπίδα ἔχόντων ὑμῶν*): Marc. 1
- 10.5 κατὰ τὴν (*s. l. αὐτὴν*) ἡμέραν: Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, Lond. 10968, Ald., Polyg.
- 10.7 ἔτι δὲ (*s. l. καὶ*) φοίνικας: Marc. 1
- 10.8 τῷ τῶν Ιουδαίων (*s. l. ἔθναι*): Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, Lond. 10968, Ald., Polyg.
- 10.22 κατεβάλετο (*s. l. κατελάβετο*): Marc. 1, 2, Polyg.
- 10.23 ἐν ταῖς (*s. l. τοῖς*) δυσὶν: Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, Lond. 10968, Ald., Polyg.
- 10.33 [τὸ φρούριον ἡμέρας τέσσε]ρας (*marg. καὶ εἴκοσι ut vid.*) οἱ δὲ: Marc. 1, Polyg.
- 10.36 προκατελάβετο (*s. l. προκατελάβοντο*): Marc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, Lond. 10968, Ald., Polyg.
- 10.37 τὸν (*s. l. τούτου*) ἀδελφόν: Marc. 1, 2, 4, 16, Ald., Polyg. (om. τούτου Marc. 5, Lond. 10968 et UCM 22^{a.c.})²⁵
- 11.1 χρόνον (*s. l. χρονίσκον*): Marc. 1
- 11.13 [ἐα]υτοὺς (*s. l. ἐαυτὸν*): Marc. 1, 2, 4, Lond. 10968, Ald., Polyg.²⁶
- 11.13 ἀντιβάλλ[ων (*s. l. ut vid. ἀντιβάλλον*)]: Marc. 1
- 11.38 Ξανθικοῦ (*s. l. Διοσκουρίδου*): Marc. 1
- 12.11 οἱ νομάδες (*marg. ἄραβες ut vid.*): Marc. 1, Polyg.
- 12.16 ἔχουσιν σταδίου δύο (*marg. σταδίων οὔσαν δύο*)²⁷: Marc. 1
- 12.27 δύο καὶ πεντακισχίλους. μετὰ δὲ τὴν] (*i. v. τούτων τροπὴν καὶ ἀπώλειαν ἐπεστράτευσε καὶ ἐπὶ Εφρων πόλιν ὀχυρὰν, ἐν [ᾗ] κατῴκει νεανίαί δὲ βωμαλέοι πρὸ τῶν τειχέων καθεστῶτες εὐρώστως ἀπεμάχοντο, ἐνθάδε ὀργάνων καὶ βελ[]*): Marc. 1, 2, 4, Marc. 16^{mg}, Ald., Polyg.²⁸, om. cum vac. Marc. 5, Lond. 10968 et UCM 22^{a.c.}²⁹
- 12.28 μυριάδας δύο (*s. l. καὶ*) πεντακισχίλους: Marc. 1, 2, Polyg.
- 12.33 ἐξηλθεν 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 τούτου (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 (ἐαυτοὺς) 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 ἔχουσιν 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 Hantzsch'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 ἐλέφαντας: Marc. 1, 2, 4, Lond. 10968^{mg31}, Ald., Polyg., om. τριακοσίους Marc. 5
 14.3 τις προγεγενόμενος (*s. l. προγεγονώς*) 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 22^{a.c. 32}
 14.7 [ἀρχιερωσύνην], δεῦρο (*s. l. δεύτερον*) νῦν ἐλήλυθα: Marc. 1
 14.8 δεύτερον δὲ καὶ τῶν ιδίων (*s. l. ἡμετέρων*) 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[ξαμένους], 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 ὄχυραί in the Musurus addition in lin. 12 of FIGURE 2), which are distinct from εὐχαριστήσαντ[] (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 / οἰκείας

With Marc. 1, 4, Polyg.:

4.5 ἀπάσης / ἀπειλῆς

4.10 λαμβάνωσι(ν) / λαμβάνων

5.11 ἐπιβαλλόμενον / ἀπο- vel ὑποβαλλόμενον

5.25 πολυδάκρυον (UCM 22^{s.1} cum Marc. 4) vel πολυδάκρυον (Polyg. cum Marc. 1) / πολυδάκρεω.

Biblioteca Marciana,³⁴ although Musurus may also have consulted others, such as Marc. 2.³⁵ 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.³⁶ 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 edition³⁷. 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

³⁴ It remains to be seen what happens in other biblical books not transmitted by Marc. 1, for example in *Reges*. It is most likely that most of the annotations from UCM 22 are found in Vat. gr. 2106, which originally formed a single codex with Marc. 1 (Andrist 2020, 45). This is a hypothesis that is currently being tested by Carlos A. M. de Jesus, to whom I am grateful for the information. The data presented here suggest such access in *Maccabaei*, at least, to Marc. 1 (and perhaps also Marc. 4) and would thus complete the information provided by D. Speranzi in his monograph on Musurus (2013). It is true that in the critical apparatus other editions of *Maccabaei* (Book II), such isolated readings of Marc. 1 are also found in a small group of biblical manuscripts, such as: n. 55 (Vat. gr. 1, 10th century), n. 447 (Ambros. 267 inf., a. 1568) and n. 771 (Batopaed. 290 + 113, Par. gr. 682, Mosc. 346, also from the 10th century) in 10.33; n. 58 (Vat. gr. 10, 11th century), in 14.7, 9.21 (with n. 771) and in 14.3 (here also with n. 771 and with n. 55); n. 771 in 11.1, and n. 347 (Athos 29, 13th century) in 9.4 and 9.19. In other words, it seems that these manuscripts (n. 55, 58, 347, 771) would also be connected to Marc. 1; however, the simplest hypothesis seems, in our opinion, that Musurus accessed Marc. 1 (or a copy of it) in Venice.

³⁵ See the first example (3.15), although it is a trivial addition, and the doubts about 12.34.

³⁶ As well attested in 1515 the *Diarii* de Marino Sanuto (XX, 177 [100]) apud Ross (1976, 42–542, n. 78). In one example (13.2), it can be seen that the same marginal correction by Musurus in UCM 22 is also found in the margin of Lond. 10968, the other biblical manuscript annotated by Musurus. The annotations, at least in the case of UCM 22, would have been made before 1516, the year in which Musurus left Venice for Rome.

³⁷ Until now, it was known that the editors of the *Polyglota* had used two Greek manuscripts from the Vatican Library that Pope Leo X lent to Cisneros: Vat. 330 (= 108 Rahlfs, 13th century, especially for vol. II) and Vat. 346 (= 248, 13th–14th century, especially for vol. III). Today, we know that they also used two manuscripts which are preserved today in the old collection of the Complutense University of Madrid: UCM 23 (= 1670, 16th century *in.*, also for vol. III, but only in *Psalms*) and UCM 22 (= 442, especially for *Maccabaei* in vol. III), the manuscript with which the present work is concerned. We have recently brought attention to the coincidences between the *Polyglota* and another manuscript in the Vatican Library: Vat. 348 (= 671 Rahlfs), 15th century, a manuscript which seems to be a copy of Marc. 4 (Kappler & Hanhart 1959⁴: 9; Hanhart 1960²: 12, n. 4), although it may also offer some different reading, as in 4.19 (προκομοιζόντες / παρακομοιζόντες), 10.5 (τοῦ μηνός / τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνός) and 12.3 (τηλικοῦτον / τηλικοῦτο). Vat. 348 today contains, among the *Septuaginta* books, only *Maccabaei* I–III, a part missing in the other two Vatican manuscripts, and we have explored the hypothesis that perhaps the manuscript (or a copy of it) was also on loan to Alcalá. Specifically, for the collated part of *Maccabaei* II, the readings of the *Polyglota* always coincide with UCM 22 (either the readings *ante correctionem* or the readings corrected by Musurus) and, when this is not the case, it coincides with Vat. 348, as in 10.6 (μεμονώμενοι), 11.36 (προσανεχθήναι), 12.3 (τηλικοῦτον) and 14.5 (καιρὸν δέ). Thus, if we are right, we believe we have shed light on a question about the models of vol. IV of the *Polyglota* regarding which their greatest connoisseur, S. O'Connell (2006, 146), considered them to be “totally in the dark”. Moreover, thanks to the use of UCM 22 and, more hypothetically, Vat. 348, it can be said that the Complutensian editors would have had access, albeit indirectly, to some important manuscripts from the “Cardinal Bessarion's collection” in the *Biblioteca Marciana* in Venice: through UCM 22, at least to Marc. 5 (its model) and Marc. 1 (corrections and additions by Musurus); thanks to Vat. 348 (if our hypothesis is correct) also to Marc. 4.

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

Bibliography

- Andrist, P. 2020. "Au croisement des contenus et de la matière: l'architecture des sept pandectes bibliques grecques du premier millénaire", *Scrineum Rivista* 17/2, 3–106.
- Ángel Espinós, J. 2009. "El códice *Complutensis Graecus* 22: su destrucción y posterior recuperación", in *Actas del XII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, vol. I, Madrid, 177–184.
- Bravo García, A. 2008. "UCM. Biblioteca Histórica *Marqués de Valdecilla*, Vill-Amil 22 (442 Rahlfs)", in *Lecturas de Bizancio. El legado escrito de Grecia en España. Biblioteca Nacional. Catálogo de la exposición*, Madrid, 160–161.
- Cataldi Palau, A. 1998. *Gian Francesco D'Asola e la tipografia aldina*, Genoa.
- De Andrés, G. 1974. "Catálogo de los códices griegos de las colecciones: Complutense, Lázaro Galdiano y March de Madrid", *CFC* 6, 239–249.
- Delitzsch, F. 1886. *Fortgesetzte Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Complutensischen Poliglote*. Leipzig.
- Domingo Malvadi, A. 2014. "Las fuentes de la Biblia Políglota en lengua griega", in *V Centenario de la Biblia Políglota Complutense. La Universidad del Renacimiento. El Renacimiento de la Universidad. Catálogo de la exposición*, UCM, Madrid, 267–280. (The entry regarding UCM 22 on 276–278 is written by J.L. Gonzalo Sánchez-Molero & T. Torres Santo Domingo).
- Fernández Marcos, N. 2005. "Un manuscrito complutense redivivo. Ms griego 442 = Villa-Amil 22", *Sefarad* 65, 65–83.
- Fernández Marcos, N. 2014. "El texto griego de *Septuaginta* en la Políglota Complutense", in I. Carbajosa & A. García Serrano (eds.), *Una Biblia a varias voces. Estudio textual de la Biblia Políglota Complutense*. Madrid, 125–142.
- Gil Fernández, L. 2015. "A cuento del centenario del texto griego de la *Políglota Complutense*", *CFC (G)* 25, 291–300.
- Graux, Ch. & A. Martin. 1892. *Rapport sur une mission en Espagne et en Portugal. Notices sommaires des manuscrits grecs d'Espagne et de Portugal (Nouvelles archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires)* 2, 1–322.
- Hanhart, R. (ed.) 1960². *Maccabeorum Liber III*. Göttingen.
- Hernández Muñoz, F.G. 2020a. "El texto griego de *Septuaginta* en la *Biblia Políglota Complutense* y su relación con otros testimonios, especialmente con el 'recuperado' manuscrito UCM (BH) 22", *CFC (G)* 30, 229–252.
- 2020b. "Notas sobre las fuentes griegas de la edición Aldina de la *Biblia* (y de la *Políglota Complutense*) y el manuscrito griego UCM 22 (= 442 Rahlfs). A propósito de *Jueces* 5.26–30", *Fortunatae* 32(2), Anejo (Tribute to Prof. Ángel Martínez), 251–257.

- Jesus, C.A.M. 2020a. "A New Manuscript of the Septuagint and the First Two Editions of the Greek Bible", *GRBS* 60.4, 718–744.
- 2020b. "A incrível história de um manuscrito da Septuaginta quase destruído na Guerra Civil Espanhola (BH UCM 22 = 442 Rahlfs)", in Andrade, A.M.L. (ed.), *Do Manuscrito ao Livro Impresso II*, Imprensa da Universidade de Aveiro. Coimbra, 53–74.
- 2022. "La Biblia Políglota "no nacida" de Aldo y los folios 86–87 del *Parisinus graecus* 3064", *CFC (EGI)* 32, 367–379
- Kapler, W. & R. Hanhart (eds.) 1959⁴. *Maccabeorum Liber II*. Göttingen.
- Labowsky, L. 1979. *Bessarion's library and the Biblioteca Marciana: six early inventories*. Rome.
- Lowry, M.J.C. 1974. "Two Great Venetian Libraries in the Age of Aldus Manutius", *BRL* 57(1), 128–166
- Martínez Manzano, T. & F.G. Hernández Muñoz. 2019. "BH Mss. 22" and "BH Mss. 23", in A. López Fonseca & M. Torres Santo Domingo (eds.), *Catálogo de manuscritos medievales de la Biblioteca Histórica "Marqués de Valdecilla (UCM)"*. Madrid, 141–144.
- O'Connel, S. 2006. *From most Ancient Sources: The Nature and Text-critical Use of the Greek Old Testament of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible*, Freiburg-Tübingen.
- Rahlfs, A. 1914. *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*. Berlin.
- Revilla Rico, M. 1917. *La Políglota de Alcalá: estudio histórico-crítico*. Madrid.
- Ross, J.B. 1976. "Venetian Schools and Teachers Fourteenth to Early Sixteenth Century: A Survey and a Study of Giovanni Battista Egnazio", *Renaissance Quarterly* 29, 521–566
- Sáenz-Badillos, A. 1990. *La filología bíblica en los primeros helenistas de Alcalá*, Estella.
- Sáenz-Badillos, A. 1996. "La Biblia Políglota Complutense", in Jiménez Moreno, L. (ed.), *La Universidad Complutense Cisneriana. Impulso filosófico, científico y literario. Siglos XVI y XVII*. Madrid, 137–153.
- Speranzi, D. 2013. *Marco Musuro. Libri e scrittura*. Roma.
- Tacón, J. & P. Puerto Manouvriez. 2001. "Códice griego del siglo XV semidestruido en la guerra civil. Montaje a partir de láminas de poliéster", *Restauración y Rehabilitación. Revista internacional de Patrimonio Histórico*, 58, 70–74.
- Torres Santo Domingo, M. 2005. "Libros que salvan vidas, libros que son salvados: La Biblioteca Universitaria en la Batalla de Madrid", in B. Calvo Alonso-Cortés, (ed). *Biblioteca en Guerra. Catálogo de exposición*, Madrid, 261–285.
- Villa-Amil Castro, J. 1878. *Catálogo de los manuscritos existentes en la Biblioteca del Noviciado de la Universidad Central (procedentes de la antigua de Alcalá). Parte I. Códices*. Madrid.



FIGURE 2: UCM 22



FIGURE 3: UCM 22