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Euripides’ *Medea*, the famous tragedy staging a filicide mother, has been transmitted to us through medieval manuscripts (some scraps of papyrus also preserve a few lines). In some of these manuscripts, the text of the tragedy is accompanied by marginal exegetical notes, covering virtually every aspect of the tragedy and helping readers to fully understand the text. These marginal notes, which go under the name of scholia, are the result of a century-long process of reworking, expansion, and abbreviation of previous scholarly works, mostly monographs and commentaries from the Hellenistic and Roman times, even though Late antique and Byzantine remarks are also present.

In my critical edition of these scholia accompanying Euripides’ *Medea*, I aim on the one hand to inquire into their manuscript tradition and on the other hand to produce a new critical text, updating the edition by Eduard Schwartz (1889-1891). For my critical edition, I considered all the manuscript material available to date and focused not exclusively on the main sets of scholia, but also scrutinised notes and glosses added between the lines by later hands. I studied most of the material from either digital images or online digitalisation. Digitalisation has surely helped research in many ways, but an autoptic inquiry may still prove to be necessary, either because of the condition of the manuscript or the quality of digitalisation. This is especially true for notes added later on to manuscripts. Frequently, indeed, later notes have been crammed into the narrow spaces left available from previous copying and are therefore, in some instances, difficult to decipher and understand correctly. To this end, a research trip to the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris was essential in order to check details on two of their valuable manuscripts autoptically: Par.gr.2713 and Par.gr.2818. Par.gr.2713 (11th [or late 10th?] cent.), is one of the two main witnesses carrying scholia to *Medea*, not to say the most ancient completely preserved (the most ancient one is a palimpsest, which we cannot read entirely). Par.gr.2818 (late 15th- early 16th cent.) is a later item copied by Michael Suliardus, which was possibly available in Lascaris’ circle in Florence. As this manuscript has not been thoroughly studied yet as far as *Medea* is concerned, it therefore contains some unpublished material which deserves attention.

During my research stay in Paris, I inspected both manuscripts, checking notes added by later hands which were impossible to decipher from the online images, mostly for their position on the page or for the colour of the ink (text penned in red ink is at times hard to read in black and white images).

Thanks to the generous support of the Dover grant and the kindness of the BNF, I have been able to inspect these two items and improve my work. I am extremely grateful to these institutions for their support.