A Note on Lysias 1.22

> καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα διεγένοντο ἡμέραι τέσσαρες ἢ πέντε, ... ὡς ἐγὼ μεγάλοις ὑμῖν τεκμηρίοις ἐπιδείξω. πρῶτον δὲ διηγήσασθαι βούλομαι τὰ πραχθέντα τῇ τελευταίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ.
>
> And after this there was an interval of four or five days, ... as I shall demonstrate to you with clear evidence. But first I wish to narrate what happened on the last day.

Euphiletus, informed by an old crone of his wife's affair with Eratosthenes, has interrogated her slave girl (§§ 18-22) and now proceeds to narrate what happened on the fateful day when he caught the lovers *in flagrante*. He never does demonstrate that 'there was an interval of four or five days' between the interrogation and the capture, and editors since Reiske[1] have accepted that there is a lacuna in the text here[2]. Chris Carey has recently argued against the existence of this hiatus, noting that Euphiletus' failure to keep his promise may be nothing more than a rhetorical strategy[3]. I agree with Prof. Carey, but while he would keep the manuscript text as it survives, I have a textual solution to offer in support of his position.

My concern is with μεγάλοις. It can be argued that Euphiletus is bluffing and so chooses to emphasise his promise in order to enhance its credibility[4]; and of course μέγα and μέγιστον occur very frequently in Lysias with τεκμήριον (cf. 7.33, 13.73, 16.11,

[1] J.J. Reiske, *Oratorum Graecorum*, Leipzig 1773, V, 25. Reiske proposed the addition καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ τὸν μοιχὸν ἔνδον ἔλαβον.

[2] Including the present author; see M.J. Edwards, *Lysias. Five Speeches*, Bristol 1999.

[3] C. Carey, "Marginalia Lysiaca", *SIFC* 20, 2002, 63-5.

[4] As has been suggested to me by the journal's anonymous referee. For

19.25, 45, 21.6, 9, 22.11, 24.11, 25.5). But I suggest that the very frequency of the combination is what led to a scribal error, and we might in fact expect Euphiletus to want to pass lightly over his manoeuvre. In other words, in my opinion what we have here is a throw-away remark, and the adjective needed is not 'clear' or 'great' (μεγάλοις), but 'other' (ἄλλοις), even though Euphiletus has not so far mentioned any other proofs during his narrative[5]. The addition of the particle μέν (reading ὡς ἐγὼ μὲν ἄλλοις) then both explains the corruption (a scribe deleting the second lambda) and gives us an example of the common μέν ... δέ couple. It is certainly true that this is a highly unusual example of it, and ἐγώ is not elsewhere in the orators contrasted with πρῶτον δέ. Nevertheless, there are examples in Lysias of the first person pronoun in a μέν clause followed by a δέ clause with the verb in the same first person: 3.32 (ὡς ἐγὼ πρότερον μὲν ἐξέπλευσα ... ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀφικόμην πάλιν), 37 (ἐγὼ τούτων μὲν οὐχ ἡπτόμην, τοῦ μειρακίου δ' ἐπελαμβανόμην); 14.46 (ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ... κατηγόρηκα, ἐπίσταμαι δ' ὅτι); 32.12 (ἐγὼ ἠγανάκτουν μὲν πρὸς Ἡγήμονα ... λόγους δὲ ἐποιούμην)[6]. Further, while the transitional formula πρῶτον δέ, which is not very common in the orators, regularly does not imply any contrast with what precedes (e.g. 16.3; Isoc. 15.198; D. 22.5), there is a similar example to the one I am putting forward here (albeit after a briefer ὡς clause without μὲν) at D. 41.26: ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἔλαττον εἶχες, ὡς ἐγὼ διδάξω. πρῶτον δ' ἐφ' οἷς ἐξέδοτο τούτῳ, λαβὲ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ('but you received no less than I, as I will show. But first, take the deposition about the terms on which she was given to him')[7]. I propose, therefore, that the text of Lys. 1.22 originally read:

---

this and other critical points, which I attempt to answer below, I am most grateful.

[5] In the extant speeches Lysias does not indeed use ἄλλο with τεκμήριον, but compare Is. 5.26 (καὶ ἄλλο τι τεκμήριον παρεξόμεθα) and 8.15 (ἡμεῖς τοίνυν καὶ ἄλλα τεκμήρια πρὸς τούτοις ἔχομεν εἰπεῖν).

[6] Cf. with longer intervening clauses 7.39-40 (ἐγὼ μὲν ... ἐγὼ δέ), 12.3-4 (ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ... ὅμως δὲ πειράσομαι).

[7] Cf. also D. 41.18.

καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα διεγένοντο ἡμέραι τέσσαρες ἢ πέντε, ὡς ἐγὼ μὲν ἄλλοις ὑμῖν τεκμηρίοις ἐπιδείξω· πρῶτον δὲ διηγήσασθαι βούλομαι τὰ πραχθέντα τῇ τελευταίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ.

And after this there was an interval of four or five days, as I shall demonstrate to you with other evidence; but first I wish to narrate what happened on the last day.

Michael J. Edwards
Queen Mary, University Of London
Mike.Edwards@sas.ac.uk