Casaubon and Camb. Univ. Adv. B. 3. 3

Casaubon. 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 Praetorius 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-Dophie in her ‘La survivre d’Eschyle à la Renaissance’ is largely in agreement, with reservations given in n. 33 cp. p. 341. But it is hard to see how the state of affairs recorded below on Ch. 510 can be reconciled with this theory, and I remain sceptical.

Further examination may, however, prove that my comments on Ag. 304 and Sapp. 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 scortasse. It is clear that in many cases he is simply indicating his acceptance of conjectures by others, whose readings he may indicate in the margin, without even any such prefix. His debt to Caster can be clearly traced (Ag. 830 lego δεικνύειν; 963 lego σθίναι; 1024 oδήγησαν τὸ πέρατον ἀνελκυσθείς; 1112 and 1212 δώροντο καὶ ὁλόσχερον; 1428 πρόσωπον, and once or twice it seems expressly acknowledged. But establishing who has priority among the Bourdets, Dorans, 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 editors seem called for, and I now list some readings from Casaubon’s copy of Vettori which may be of some interest.

Prom. 116 ἐν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. In this, I think, to whom and by whom it is ascribed is not clear.

Prom. 656 and 697. Casaubon prefers to write ἔσται τῆς ἐκκλησίας with a rough breathing. See LSL s.v. inc.

Pers. 422 Casaubon is misled by ἀπέστησαν, a reading found only sparingly in the manuscript tradition and very possibly therefore an independent conjecture of his own.

Pers. 494 «Πατον παῖς ἀρχηγὸς.» The word carries no accent.

Ag. 304 ἀνελκυσθείς, the latter attributed by West to Casaubon’s marginal note, are perhaps not in his hand.

Ag. 307 ἐκκλησία. Followed by an indecipherable abbreviation was most probably intended to record Caster’s ἐκκλησία, but it is pleasing to speculate that it might have been an anticipation of Headlam’s ἐκκλησία in E.

Ag. 336 West’s note ascribing ἐκκλησία to Casaubon is erroneous. Casaubon wrote «λέγει δὲ καὶ ἐκκλησία.»

LEXIS 19.2001
Ag. 365 Casaubon knows of Doria's ἐπίστολα περὶ τοῦ θρόνου, but writes 'μαλάν ἠδιπρον', thus anticipating Frosch.  
Ag. 391 ἐφιάλον.  
Ag. 409 τοῦ ... ἄνθων.  
Ag. 457 ἰδιαρείταιν.  
Ag. 461 ἐνεμεθέξερα, as is no more to be ascribed to Pearson.  
Ag. 469 τὸῦ Θεοῦ.  
Ag. 467 τοῦ Θεοῦ.  
Ag. 468 Wecklein reports ἡ ἐμπορία τῆς ἀκρωτηρίας as Casaubon's contribution. In Adv. b. 3. 3 the left hand margin has only ἐς τῆς ἀκρωτηρίας τῆς ἀκρωτηρίας τῆς ἀκρωτηρίας, and in his printed edition Canter's note reads ἡ ἐμπορία αὐτῆς ἀκρωτηρίας ἀκρωτηρίας ἀκρωτηρίας.  
Ag. 906 Cerver's edition omits the note.  
Ag. 999 West's attribution of ὅπως to Casaubon may be mistaken. (Wecklein had attributed it to Doria.) It has the Sc. sign before it which appears from time to time, so Scaliger should deliberately get the credit.  
Ag. 1024 Egeria's edition is, but for the final m., anticipated.  
Ag. 1109—1110.  
Ag. 1264 ἐπίστατον ἐπίστατον ἐπίστατον.  
Ag. 1392 To be precise, γάρ, not γάρ (as Wecklein records) is what stands here, because it follows.  
Ag. 1430 οὐκ ἂν, which West has removed from Voss and given to an an, is also Casaubon's.  
Ag. 1567 Casaubon intended τὸν, but there is no correction of the preceding adjective. He thus appears to have proposed what Weil was later to conjecture, ἐπίστατον ἐπίστατον.  
Ag. 1661 οὗτος οὗτος οὗτος.  
Ag. 1564 ἐπίστατον τὸν...  
Ag. 1664 ὅπως οἷς is West's ὅπως.  
Ag. 232 Casaubon should be to his Hesychius, i.e. in Adv. b. 3. 3.  
Cha. 69 νόμος anticipates Stanley.  
Cha. 173 Casaubon suggests punctuating with a question mark after ἡ ἐπίστατον.  
Cha. 183 The priority for conjecturing ἐπίστατον (see West's ὅπως) may be impossible to establish, but on the evidence of Adv. b. 3. 3 Casaubon has a claim.  
Cha. 510 The deletion of this line should not be ascribed to Schetz. The word ἐπιστρέφειν has been written over a note by Casaubon, who had gone on to write ἐν ἠδιπρον. The implication is clear.  
Cha. 111 οὗτος τῷ τῷ (as Porson).  
Suppl. 444-45 and 447-48. West's ascertainment of the re-arrangement of lines to Casaubon is incorrect. The writing is not his.