Preface and Acknowledgements

This is the fourth volume of what is projected to be a new edition of the *scholia vetera* to all seven of Sophocles' surviving complete tragedies. It is my purpose in this volume, as it was in its predecessors, the *scholia vetera* to *Electra*, *Trachiniae* and *Oedipus Coloneus*, to restore the *scholia vetera* to *Antigone* in their earliest recoverable version and corpus. This statement contains a number of key terms that are not explained here. What is a version, what does it tell us about the nature of the transmission of *scholia* in general, and what are its implications for the editor? What exactly do the earliest recoverable version and corpus represent, and why is it desirable to seek to establish these rather than alternative ones? By what methods can we gain access to this earliest version and corpus? These questions as well as the principles that guide me in the constitution of the text are fundamental for a proper understanding of the character of this edition, but are thoroughly dealt with in the Introduction of the *Electra* volume, and more specifically in the sections on 'Editing Scholia: Methodological considerations and the scope of the present edition', and on 'The present edition'.¹ Background is also assumed in relation to several other aspects of this book, so the reader is provided with the appropriate references to the previous volumes. From the new material offered in the introduction of the present volume I single out the additional observations on Lascaris's edition and the sections on the codex *Parisinus Graecus* 2799, in which I analyse the textual character of the manuscript and I present philological evidence to question the attribution of its writing to Marcus Musurus.

The University of Cyprus funded this project in the period 2017–2018, thus enabling me to appoint a research assistant, Rodia Rousou: I owe a great debt to her for supporting my work in the best possible way. Georgios Christodoulou discussed several passages of this text with me and put a number of his unpublished conjectures at my disposal. Paolo Scattolin generously supplied me with his careful and very detailed collation of the palimpsest *Lugdunensis BPG* 60A. Nigel

1 Relevant are also the remarks in Xenis³ 31 n. 91.

Wilson and Rudolf Stefec kindly advised me on the aforementioned Parisian manuscript. I am extremely grateful to all five of them.

University of Cyprus, Nicosia
February 2021

Georgios A. Xenis