LYSIAS COMPOSED this speech for Euphiletus, accused by relatives of a young man, Eratosthenes, of having murdered him on the pretext that he had caught him with his wife. Euphiletus is eager to show that he neither enticed nor compelled Eratosthenes to come into his house, but that he came in of his own free will, and that he, Euphiletus, reacted at that point, not having made preparations in advance. It is therefore intelligible that both in the narrative (διήγησις) and in the rebuttal (which forms part of the πίστεις) Euphiletus deals with the same events. A transcription follows of the two passages with which this paper is concerned and of their respective contexts:

For both passages, I have printed the underlined words as they have been transmitted in the manuscripts, and there are editors

1 Cf. 1.37: τὸν νεονίσκον. There is therefore no reason to follow some scholars in identifying this Eratosthenes with the infamous figure of Or. 12.
who still adopt these texts.² It ought to be obvious, however, that to do so would ruin Euphiletus’ argument: he cannot say in the narrative that some friends he caught at home (τοὺς μὲν ἐνδον κατέλαβον) and in the rebuttal, referring to the same group of friends, that he did not catch them at home (ἐτέρους δὲ οὖκ ἐνδον ὄντας κατέλαβον). This was seen long ago by Reiske, who proposed to insert a negative before ἐνδον at 1.23 and to change the following negative (οὖκ) into οὐδὲ.³ Reiske did not offer any arguments in favor of his emendation; nevertheless, his solution has found acceptance among editors of Lysias,⁴ though none of them has given any argument to support it. The main point in its favor would be that scribes more often omit a negative than add one. Still one must analyze the context and determine whether the proposed solution is satisfactory or not. I submit that it is not, and that the evidence cries out for the very opposite to Reiske’s suggestion: that is, that we must excise the οὖκ before ἐνδον at 1.41 as a scribe’s interpolation.

The difficulty is apparent in Reiske’s own interpretation of his emendation at 1.23: “alios quidem, cum urbem non excessisset, tamen domi suae non reperiebam. alios audiebam ne in urbe quidem esse.” For who then are those who were present (παραλαβὼν δ’ ὦς οὖν τε ἦν πλείστους ἐκ τῶν παρόντων ἐβαδιζον)? The Greek suggests that they must have been mentioned in what precedes, but the reading, τοὺς μὲν (οὖκ) ἐνδον κατέλαβον, τοὺς δὲ οὐδ’ ἐπίδημοντας ήφυον, leaves no room for this possibility. Moreover, it is, I believe, highly improbable that (after τοὺς μὲν ... τοὺς δὲ ...) ἐκ τῶν παρόντων could by itself indicate a third group among Euphiletus’ friends, or that Lysias intended us mentally to supply a third group, i.e.,

² Cf. e.g. W. R. M. Lamb (Loeb) and L. Gernet and M. Bizos (Budé).
³ Cf. I. I. Reiske, Oratorum Graecorum Volumen Quintum, Lysiae Primum, Graecam Orationem, Taylori et Marklandi Annotationibus Explanatum Complectens, Quibus Suas Aliaque Addidit (Leipzig 1772) 27 with nn.61-62. I have not discussed Reiske’s proposal to change οὖκ to οὐδ’ in 1.23 because it depends on his proposal to insert οὖκ before ἐνδον in the same passage, which I reject.
⁴ Cf. e.g. H. Frohberger, Ausgewählte Reden des Lysias II (Leipzig 1868) 121; C. Hude, Lysiae Orationes (OCT: Oxford 1912); T. Thalheim, Lysiae Orationes² (editio maior: Leipzig 1913) 7; C. Carey, Lysias, Selected Speeches (Cambridge 1989) 20.
another τοῦς δ', who were at home. In any case, these two pos-
sibilities are incompatible with the wording of the second text,
where the same events are narrated (i.e. 1.41): καὶ ὃς Ἀριμόδων
μὲν καὶ τὸν δεῖνα ἧθον οὐκ ἐπιδημοῦντας (οὐ γὰρ ἥδη),
ἐπέρνος δὲ οὐκ ἑνδον ὄντας κατέλαβον, οὗς δ' οὐς τε η λαβὸν
ἐβαδίεν. Here the relative οὗς must designate either both, or
one of the two groups into which Euphiletus' friends have been
divided, for there is no possibility of supplying a third group of
friends. Yet if at 1.41 we keep the transmitted text, none of the
friends Euphiletus says he collected was at home. And so, even
apart from the evidence of 1.23, the very wording of the second
passage (1.41) suggests that the correct solution of the problem
lies in excising οὐκ before ἑνδον at 1.41. In this way, the two
passages say the same thing: that is, from those of his friends
whom he found at their respective homes Euphiletus took with
him as many as possible.

Let us look briefly at the lines in 1.41 immediately preceding
the passage transcribed in the previous paragraph; this will both
confirm the interpretation given above and at the same time
furnish a plausible reason for the wrong insertion of οὐκ before
ἑνδον:

5 Here, οὐκ ἑνδον (and its equivalent ἐξω), which is ambiguous, might
mean outside their houses, i.e., in the street just outside their houses. This
meaning, however, would not fit the context. If many of his friends were thus
found late at night, it would create a strong impression in the jury that
Euphiletus had warned them in advance, something that he emphatically
denies.

6 The wrong insertion of a negative is not unusual, cf. e.g. IL 9.453, where τῇ
was changed to τῇ οὐ by Sosiphanes and Aristodemus (see T. W. Allen's
editio maior II 257), and Soph. OC 1677, where the scribes have wrongly
inserted οὐκ before the second ἔστιν in the line (cf. G. Hermann, Sophocles
Oedipus Coloneus [Leipzig 1825] 322f). These examples are cited by M. L.
West, Hesiod, Works and Days (Oxford 1978) 202f ad 192. His proposal,
however, to change οὐκ ἔστι to ἔστειται at 193 is not persuasive. For more
complicated examples cf. Parmenides 2888, 12, where the manuscripts' μή
(ἔντος) must be changed to τοῦ (ἔντος): cf. L. Tarán, Parmenides
(Princeton 1965) 82, 95–102; and Pl. Prm. 162A8–B2, where it is necessary to insert (μὴ) in
A8 and to excise it in B2. This twofold mistake is undoubtedly due to scribal
misunderstanding. The emendation was first proposed by P. Shorey, "On
Parmenides 162 A. B.," AJP 12 (1891) 349–53 (=Selected Papers I [New York
1980] 492–96), and was adopted by J. Burnet in his edition of Plato. Cf. also
H. Cherniss, "Timaeus 38A8–B5," JHS 77 (1957) 19 n.15 (=Selected Papers
There are here only two possibilities: Euphiletus did not know (a) whom he would catch at home (οὐκότι) and (b) who would not be at home (ἐξώ). And it is these two possibilities that he then handles in chiastic order; first (b): he found that Harmodios and others were not in town, though he went to their house (n.b. the parenthetical οὐ γὰρ ἦδη); then (a) those who were at home, of whom he took with himself as many as possible. That is to say, ἐνδοὺ here corresponds to those who were οὐκότι; otherwise this alternative would simply be ignored by Euphiletus, unless we postulated here a lacuna (after κατέλαβον), surely an unwarranted hypothesis and a much more radical remedy than excising οὐκ. Moreover, one would need to postulate a similar lacuna at 1.23. We can now see the probable reason why a scribe (earlier than the archetype of the extant manuscripts) inserted οὐκ: he wrongly connected the two possibilities (a) οὐκότι and (b) ἐξώ with the two that follow in the next sentence: first, not in town; second, not at home, as he thought that “not at home” here must answer ἐξώ in the previous sentence. Yet, as we saw, (a) and (b) are answered in the next sentence in chiastic arrangement, so that ἐνδοὺ corresponds to οὐκότι.

In short, as 1.23 and 1.41 report the same events, they must say the same thing. The most probable solution, given the context and wording of the two passages, is to excise the negative before ἐνδοὺ at 1.41, for it was wrongly interpolated into the text.