

Camb. Univ. Adv. B. 3. 3 is to be found in the Rare Books room of the Cambridge University Library. It is a copy of Vettori's edition of Aeschylus, and it contains *marginalia* by Casaubon, but also many notes by other hands. All too often it is difficult to distinguish between these different hands, and it seems likely that ascriptions have been made to Casaubon which ought really to have been made to other scholars. Or so any one would think. But in *Appendix I* to the *Prolegomena* to his *Agamemnon* edition Fraenkel assigns the very different kinds of handwriting and inks all to Casaubon (which is what an entry on the title page would have you believe). Mund-Dopchie in her *La survie d'Eschyle à la Renaissance* is largely in agreement, with reservations given in n. 13 on p. 348. But it is hard to see how the state of affairs recorded below on *Cho.* 510 can be reconciled with this theory, and I remain sceptical. Further examination may, however, prove that my comments on *Ag.* 304 and *Suppl.* 444-45 and 447-48 are not merely dogmatic, but wrong. An additional complication is the ambiguity inherent in Casaubon's casual use of *lego* or *f<ortasse>*. It is clear that in many cases he is simply indicating his acceptance of conjectures by others, whose readings he may indicate in the margins without even any such prefix. His debt to Canter can be clearly traced (*Ag.* 803 *lego* ἀκούσιον); 963 (*lego* δ' εἰμάτων); 1024 (ἐπ' εὐλαβείαι γε crossed out); 1211 and 1212 (ἄνατος and οὐδέν οὐδέν); 1428 (ψύχαι), and once or twice is even expressly acknowledged. But establishing who has priority among the Bourdelots, Dorats, and others without a name is a minefield which I leave others to tread. But notwithstanding these reservations some corrections or additions to the standard editions seem called for, and I now list some readings from Casaubon's copy of Vettori which may be found of interest.

*Prom.* 116 θέορτος appears as an early conjecture, but to whom and by whom it is ascribed is not clear.

*Prom.* 656 and 697. Casaubon prefers to write ἔστε and ἔστ' with a rough breathing. See *LSJ* s.v. *init.*

*Pers.* 422 Casaubon is tempted by ἀκόσμωι, a reading found only sparsely in the manuscript tradition and very possibly therefore an independent conjecture of his own.

*Pers.* 494 «*Puto legendum* Βοιβης». The word carries no accent.

*Ag.* 304 μοι and χρονίζεσθαι, the latter attributed by West to Casaubon's marginal note, are perhaps not in his hand.

*Ag.* 307 f. κατοπ, followed by an indecipherable abbreviation was most probably intended to record Canter's κάτοπτον, but it is pleasing to speculate that it might have been an anticipation of Headlam's κατόπτην.

*Ag.* 336 West's note ascribing δ' (*i.e.* ὡς δ') to Casaubon is erroneous. Casaubon wrote «*lego* ᾧδ' εὐδαιμόνες.»

Ag. 365 Casaubon knows of Dorat's ὑπέραστρον but writes «malim ἄστρον», thus anticipating Heusde.

Ag. 391 «lego προσβολαίς», so not to be ascribed to Pearson.

Ag. 409 τοῦδ' ... δόμου.

Ag. 457 δημοκρότου.

Ag. 661 νεώς is ascribed by Wecklein to Dorat, and to anon. by West. νεώς - with this accent - may well be in Casaubon's hand.

Ag. 664 Wecklein reports ναυστολοῦσ' as Casaubon's contribution. In Adv. b. 3. 3 the left hand margin has only f. ναυστόλου. στελοῦσ' stands in the right hand margin, and in his printed edition Canter's note reads «puto Aeschylum scripsisse στελοῦσ' ἐφέζετο...».

Ag. 839 γρ. εἰδώλου σκιᾶς.

Ag. 990 West's attribution of ὄμως to Casaubon may be mistaken. (Wecklein had attributed it to Dorat). It has the Sc. sign before it which appears from time to time, so Scaliger should doubtless get the credit.

Ag. 1024 Enger's εἴασεν is, but for the final nu, anticipated.

Ag. 1199 παιώνιος.

Ag. 1268 ἄλλην τιν' ἄλλην anticipates Voss.

Ag. 1392 To be precise, γὰρ', not γὰρα (as Wecklein records) is what stands here, because εἰ follows.

Ag. 1430 τύμματι, which West has removed from Voss and given to anon., is also Casaubon's.

Ag. 1547 Casaubon intended αἴνον, but there is no correction of the preceding adjective. He thus appears to have proposed what Weil was later to conjecture, ἐπιτύμβιος αἴνον.

Ag. 1625 f. τοῦδ' ἤκοντος anticipates Stanley.

Ag. 1664 ἀμαρτεῖν τόν in West's *apparatus* should be ascribed to his Casaub., i.e. is in Adv. b. 3. 3).

Cho. 69 νόσους appears.

Cho. 173 Casaubon suggests punctuating with a question mark after τριχί.

Cho. 183 The priority for conjecturing καρδίαι (see West's *apparatus*) may well be impossible to establish, but on the evidence of Adv. b. 3. 3 Casaubon has a claim.

Cho. 510 The deletion of this line should not be ascribed to Schuetz. The word «*expunge*» has been written over a note by Casaubon, who had gone on to write «*vel emenda*». The implication is clear.

Cho. 511 f. τῆς τ (as Portus).

Suppl. 444-45 and 447-48. West's ascription of the re-arrangement of lines to Casaubon is incorrect. The writing is not his.