

**PORTALS, PREMISES, PARTICLES: THREE PERSPECTIVES ON
*LYSIAS 1: THE KILLING OF ERATOSTHENES***

by

Tom Norton, M/Res

28001101

**A dissertation submitted to University of Wales, Trinity Saint David, for the degree of
MA in Greek**

July 2026



Master's Degrees by Examination and Dissertation Declaration Form

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Name: Tom Norton

Date: 27/07/26

2. This dissertation is being submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of:

MA Greek.....

Name: Tom Norton spl

Date: 27/07/26

3. This dissertation is the result of my own independent work/investigation, except where otherwise stated. Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Name: Tom Norton

Date: 27/07/26

4. I hereby give consent for my dissertation, if accepted, to be available for photocopying, inter-library loan, and for deposit in the University's digital repository.

Name: Tom Norton

Date: 27/07/26

Supervisor's Declaration I am satisfied that this work is the result of the student's own efforts.

Signed:

Date:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I wish to thank my supervisor Dr Matthew Cobb of Trinity Saint David, University of Wales, for advice, encouragement, and constructive criticism during the preparation of this dissertation, and for steering me towards the right path when my direction wandered. And, in particular, for suggesting significant items of bibliography which I am happy to draw on.

I also acknowledge the influence of Dan Brown, whose fast-paced esoteric thriller *The Lost Symbol* started me on this path of inquiry with the words: ‘Portals and doorways are common symbolic constructs that represent transformative rites of passage’ (Brown, 2009, p.119).

Finally, I acknowledge the inspiration I received from Eric Hayot’s *The Elements of Academic Style: Writing for the Humanities* (Hayot, 2014), an inspiring monograph whose sage advice I have tried to follow in matters of style and structure in academic writing.

CONTENTS

	PAGES
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	6-14
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	15-22
CHAPTER 3: PORTALS	23-29
CHAPTER 4: PREMISES	30-41
CHAPTER 5: PARTICLES	42-55
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION	56-58
BIBLIOGRAPHY	59-62

ABSTRACT

The dissertation argues that the persuasive force of *Lysias 1* emerges from the interplay of spatial design, culturally embedded reasoning, and stylistic calibration, articulated through a unified model of portals, premises, and particles.

Chapter 1 (introduction) shows how the speech constructs an inhabitable world for jurors: the organisation of the *oikos*, norms governing marriage and sexual conduct, and the speaker's linguistic self-presentation collectively shape moral evaluation. It also outlines the methodological foundations, narratology, rhetorical theory, discourse analysis, and scholarship on Athenian social values, supporting a close, contextually-grounded reading.

Chapter 2 (literature review) situates the project within debates on plain style, narrative technique, focalisation, ethos construction, and the ideological and legal dimensions of adultery. It identifies a gap in scholarship: although spatial imagery, cultural norms, and stylistic features have been studied individually, no existing model explains how they operate together to guide jurors' perceptions. The dissertation addresses this gap through an integrated account of spatial, cultural, and linguistic cues.

Chapter 3 (portals) shows how the *oikos* functions as a moral landscape whose thresholds encode ideas about gender, citizenship, and household integrity, turning Eratosthenes' intrusion into a symbolic violation of civic order.

Chapter 4 (premises) demonstrates how shared cultural knowledge, honour, modesty, household governance, activates unstated reasoning that renders Euphiletos' actions necessary and justified.

Chapter 5 (particles) analyses how connective structures, pacing, and tone construct an ethos of openness and moderation, reinforcing the narrative's moral framing.

Chapter 6 (conclusion) synthesises these findings, arguing that portals, premises, and particles reveal the speech's underlying coherence and its transformation of a domestic crisis into a narrative of disrupted and restored order. The conclusion proposes the model as a productive tool for analysing other Lysianic speeches and for comparative work on narrative persuasion, household ideology, and the performance of character in democratic Athens.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The speech known as *Lysias 1, On the Killing of Eratosthenes*, is one of the most vivid and intricately constructed examples of Athenian forensic oratory. Its narrative appears straightforward: Euphiletos, an ordinary Athenian citizen, recounts how he discovered his wife's adultery, trapped the adulterer Eratosthenes, and killed him. Yet beneath this apparent simplicity lies a sophisticated rhetorical performance that mobilises spatial imagination, shared cultural assumptions, and stylistic calibration to shape how the jurors perceive the events. The speech does not merely present a sequence of actions; it constructs a world, an inhabited, morally charged, spatially organised world, within which Euphiletos' behaviour appears natural, necessary, and justified. This dissertation argues that the persuasive power of *Lysias 1* emerges from the interplay of three interlocking dimensions: the spatial design of the οἶκος and its thresholds, the activation of culturally embedded reasoning, and the stylistic texture that shapes Euphiletos' ethos. Together, these dimensions form a unified rhetorical design that guides the jury's moral judgment and reveals the speech's deeper cohesion.

Athenian jurors were not legal specialists. They were ordinary citizens whose judgments were shaped by shared cultural knowledge, emotional responses, and expectations about how a credible speaker should sound (Hansen, 1991, pp.180–186; Ober, 1989, pp.79–106). The courts were spaces where narrative, performance, and ideology intersected, and where the persuasive force of a speech depended as much on its ability to evoke a morally intelligible world as on its explicit arguments (Carey, 2020, p.155; Edwards, 2020, p.173). In this environment, the speaker's task was not simply to present facts but to shape the interpretive framework through which those facts would be understood. *Lysias 1* exemplifies this dynamic. It invites the jurors to imagine the interior of Euphiletos' house, to recognise the social norms that govern marriage and sexual conduct, and to respond to the stylistic cues that signal sincerity and moderation. The

speech's success depends on the jurors' willingness to inhabit the world it constructs and to judge Euphiletos' actions from within that world.

The stakes in the speech are high. Euphiletos must convince the jury that his killing of Eratosthenes was lawful, justified, and consistent with Athenian values. He must present himself as a man who acted not out of passion or premeditation but out of necessity, in accordance with the expectations placed upon him as the head of a household (Cohen, 1991, pp.103–111; Fisher, 1998b, pp.75–80). The speech therefore constructs a narrative in which Euphiletos' actions appear as the natural culmination of a sequence of events that violated the integrity of the οἶκος and threatened its stability. The persuasive force of this narrative depends on the jurors' ability to imagine the space of the house, to recognise the cultural norms that govern sexual wrongdoing, and to trust the speaker's stylistic self-presentation. The speech's rhetorical power lies not only in its explicit claims but in the way it orchestrates these spatial, cultural, and stylistic elements into a coherent moral vision.

Modern readers often approach Lysias 1 with assumptions shaped by contemporary legal systems, where evidence, procedure, and formal argumentation dominate. Athenian courts operated differently. They were participatory, performative, and deeply embedded in the social fabric of the city (Todd, 2007, pp.373–375; Mirhady, 2005, pp.118–122), a dynamic vividly caricatured in the mock trial of the household dog in Aristophanes *Vespae* (975–977). Jurors were expected to draw on their own experience, their understanding of civic values, and their sense of what constituted appropriate behaviour. The speech therefore relies on the jurors' ability to supply unstated premises, to recognise the significance of spatial cues, and to respond to stylistic signals that mark Euphiletos as a trustworthy citizen. This creates a challenge for modern interpretation. The speech's persuasive force lies not only in what it says but in what it assumes, evokes, and implies. To understand how the speech works, we must reconstruct the cultural, spatial, and stylistic

frameworks that shaped Athenian juror perception. This requires an approach that moves beyond isolated analysis of narrative technique, legal context, or linguistic detail. It requires a model that integrates these dimensions into a single account of how the speech constructs a persuasive world.

Although scholarship on Lysias is extensive, it has tended to treat the speech's components separately. Studies of the 'plain style' have illuminated the linguistic features that create an impression of simplicity and sincerity (Carey, 1994, pp.26–45), but they have not examined how these features interact with spatial imagery or cultural assumptions. Analyses of narrative technique have shown how the speech structures its story to guide juror interpretation (Gagarin, 2002, pp.17–22; Mirhady, 2007, pp.118–121), but they have not explored how the spatial organisation of the οἶκος shapes the narrative's moral logic. Research on adultery law and household ideology has clarified the cultural context of the speech (Cohen, 1991, pp.95–103; Kapparis, 1999, pp.42–51), but it has not analysed how these norms are activated through narrative and stylistic cues. The result is a fragmented picture in which style, narrative, and cultural context are treated as discrete elements rather than as components of a cohesive persuasive strategy.

The first perspective on the integrated framework proposed here concerns the spatial design of the speech. The οἶκος is not merely the setting of the events but a moral landscape whose boundaries encode Athenian ideas about gender, authority, and social stability (Nevett, 1999, pp.71–92; Winkler, 1990, pp.30–36). The speech foregrounds thresholds, doors, and controlled access points, turning them into symbolic markers of order and transgression. Euphiletos' movements through the house are framed as measured and appropriate, while Eratosthenes' intrusion is presented as a violation of the household's safeguarding structure. The jurors are invited to imagine the house as a structured environment with clear boundaries and zones of authority. The women's quarters, the bedroom, the stairs, and the locked door all carry moral significance.

Comparable appeals to spatially encoded moral reasoning appear elsewhere in the Lysian corpus, for example, in *Against Simon* 3.6, where habitual disorderly behaviour is framed as a threat to civic and domestic stability, but *Lysias I* develops this logic with exceptional narrative precision. By guiding the jurors through these spaces, the speech shapes their understanding of the events and their evaluation of Euphiletos' actions. Spatial cues are not decorative but integral to the construction of the narrative's moral framework, and the chapter devoted to this dimension shows how imagining space becomes a method of guiding moral judgment.

The second perspective concerns the cultural assumptions that the speech activates. Rather than stating legal principles or ethical rules directly, Lysias relies on the jury's familiarity with norms surrounding marriage, sexual misconduct, and household authority (Fisher, 1998b, pp.75–80; Cohen, 1991, pp.119–123). These norms function as the unstated premises of an enthymeme: the jurors supply the reasoning that makes Euphiletos' actions appear necessary and justified. This reliance on shared cultural knowledge reflects the democratic ethos of the Athenian courts, where ordinary citizens were expected to judge cases based on their understanding of social norms and moral expectations (Hansen, 1991, pp.189–193; Ober, 1989, pp.297–333). The speech activates assumptions about male honour, female modesty, and the proper management of the household, allowing the jurors to fill in the gaps in the argument. These cultural premises shape the jurors' interpretation of the narrative and their evaluation of Euphiletos' behaviour. The chapter on this dimension situates the speech within broader discussions of democratic 'common sense', showing how the activation of shared assumptions shapes jurors' interpretation and how the speech's enthymematic structure relies on the audience's cultural competence.

The third perspective concerns the stylistic surface of the speech. The linguistic texture of *Lysias I*, its particles, connective structures, pacing, and tone, plays a crucial role in constructing Euphiletos' character and supporting the narrative's persuasive

trajectory. The ‘plain style’ is not a natural mode of speech, but a carefully crafted rhetorical effect designed to present the speaker as ordinary, transparent, and morally steady (Carey, 1994, pp.26–31). The careful deployment of particles such as δέ, γάρ, and μέν structures the narrative, signals transitions, and creates a tone of reasonableness (Denniston, 1954, pp. 57–76, 162–175, 371–383; Wakker, 1997, pp. 231–236). These stylistic cues contribute to the construction of Euphiletos’ ethos as a man who speaks plainly, expresses emotion within socially acceptable limits, and avoids the excess associated with sophistic rhetoric. Stylistic restraint is integral to the speech’s persuasive design. It supports the narrative’s moral framing, reinforces the cultural premises of the argument, and shapes the jurors’ perception of the speaker’s character. The chapter devoted to this dimension (chapter 5) shows how micro–level linguistic choices contribute to macro–level rhetorical effects.

To analyse the interplay of space, culture, and style in *Lysias I*, the dissertation draws on four methodological strands. Narratology provides tools for understanding how the speech constructs and manipulates its story–world (de Jong, 1999, pp.5–9; Allan, 2022, pp.145–172). Concepts such as focalisation, spatial framing, and temporal sequencing help explain how the narrative guides juror attention and emotional engagement. Rhetorical theory, especially Aristotle’s analysis of ethos, pathos, and logos, offers a framework for analysing how the speech constructs credibility, manages emotion, and structures argument. Discourse analysis, with its attention to particles, connective structures, and syntactic patterning, reveals how the linguistic surface of the speech shapes perceptions of sincerity, spontaneity, and moral steadiness (Drummen, 2013, pp.82–88). Finally, social and cultural history provides the context necessary for understanding how jurors would have interpreted the behaviour of the characters and the significance of the household as a site of honour, authority, and vulnerability (Nevett, 1999, pp.71–92; Cohen, 1991, pp.119–

123; Fisher, 1998b, pp.90–94). These methods are not applied separately but woven together to reveal the speech’s integrated persuasive design.

By bringing together the dimensions of space, culture, and style, this dissertation offers a separate way of understanding *Lysias 1* and, more broadly, the workings of Athenian forensic rhetoric. It shows how narrative, cultural reasoning, and stylistic shaping interact to guide jurors’ perception, and it argues that this interaction is central to the persuasive power of the speech. The tripartite framework of portals, premises, and particles provides a model for analysing how the speech constructs a persuasive world and how that world shapes moral judgment. The chapters that follow develop each dimension of this framework in turn. The overall structure and content of the dissertation are as follows:

Chapter 1: Introduction. The opening chapter establishes the project’s central claim: that the persuasive force of *Lysias 1* emerges from the interplay of spatial imagination, culturally embedded reasoning, and stylistic calibration. It outlines how the speech constructs a world that jurors can inhabit, one in which the layout of the house, the norms governing marriage and sexual conduct, and the speaker’s linguistic self–presentation work together to guide moral evaluation. The chapter introduces the tripartite analytical framework, portals (space), premises (cultural knowledge), and particles (style), and explains why this integrated approach is necessary for understanding how the speech produces conviction. It also sets out the methodological foundations of the study, drawing on narratology for analysing story–world construction, rhetorical theory for understanding persuasive strategy, discourse analysis for examining linguistic patterning, and scholarship on Athenian social values for reconstructing the assumptions shared by speaker and jury. Together, these methods provide the tools for a close, contextually grounded reading of the speech.

Chapter 2: Literature Review. This chapter situates the dissertation within major scholarly debates on *Lysias* and Athenian forensic rhetoric. It surveys discussions of the

plain style and its ideological implications, analyses of narrative technique and the management of focalisation, studies of character construction and the presentation of ethos, and research on the legal and social frameworks surrounding adultery and the defence of the household. It also reviews work on the symbolic and emotional significance of the οἶκος in Athenian thought, showing how scholars have understood the house as both a physical space and a moral category. Across these strands, the chapter identifies a persistent gap: while scholars have examined spatial imagery, cultural norms, and stylistic features individually, no existing model explains, as far as I can discover, how these elements operate together to shape jurors' perceptions. The dissertation positions itself as addressing this gap by offering a unified account of how spatial, cultural, and linguistic cues combine to structure judgment.

Chapter 3: Portals. The third chapter analyses the spatial architecture of the speech and argues that the οἶκος functions as a moral landscape whose boundaries encode Athenian ideas about gender, citizenship, and household integrity. It examines how Lysias foregrounds thresholds, doors, and controlled access points, turning them into symbolic markers of order and transgression. Eratosthenes' entry becomes not merely a physical intrusion but a violation of the household's safeguarding structure, an act that destabilises both domestic and civic norms. In contrast, Euphiletos' movements through the house are framed as measured, appropriate, and restorative, aligning him with the values of self-control and legitimate authority. By tracing how the speech invites jurors to imagine and evaluate space, the chapter shows that spatial design is not decorative but central to the moral logic of the narrative. Space becomes a persuasive tool: a way of guiding the jury's sense of what is natural, expected, and just.

Chapter 4: Premises. This chapter explores how the speech relies on shared cultural knowledge to generate persuasive force. Rather than articulating legal principles or ethical rules explicitly, Lysias stimulates the jury's familiarity with norms surrounding

marriage, sexual misconduct, and the governance of the household. These norms function as the unstated steps of an enthymeme: jurors supply the culturally obvious reasoning that makes Euphiletos' behaviour appear both necessary and morally sanctioned. The chapter examines how the speech draws on expectations about male honour, female modesty, and the defence of the οἶκος, and how these expectations shape the interpretation of events. It situates the speech within broader discussions of democratic 'common sense', showing how Athenian decision-making often relied on implicit, collectively held assumptions rather than formalised legal reasoning. Through this lens, the speech emerges as a performance of shared values, one that persuades by activating what the jury already believes.

Chapter 5: Particles. Turning to the stylistic surface of the speech, this chapter analyses how linguistic choices construct Euphiletos' character and support the narrative's persuasive trajectory. It examines the deployment of particles, connective structures, pacing, and tone, showing how these features create an impression of openness, ordinariness, and moral steadiness. The chapter argues that the style is not merely 'plain' but carefully calibrated: Euphiletos expresses emotion within socially acceptable limits, displays σωφροσύνη through measured narration, and avoids the rhetorical excess associated with sophistic manipulation. These stylistic cues reinforce the narrative's moral framing, making his account feel unforced and trustworthy. By demonstrating how micro-level linguistic decisions contribute to macro-level rhetorical effects, the chapter shows that style is integral to the speech's construction of ethos and its broader persuasive design.

Chapter 6: Conclusion. The final chapter synthesises the findings of the study, arguing that the triad of portals, premises, and particles reveals the speech's underlying coherence. Through spatial design, cultural reasoning, and stylistic shaping, the speech transforms a domestic crisis into a narrative of disrupted and restored order, encouraging jurors to see Euphiletos' actions as aligned with Athenian moral life. The conclusion

reflects on what this integrated approach contributes to the study of Athenian forensic rhetoric, suggesting that attention to the interaction of space, culture, and style can illuminate other speeches in the Lysian corpus. It also outlines how the framework might be extended to comparative work on narrative persuasion, household ideology, and the performance of character in democratic Athens.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The previous chapter argued that the persuasive power of *Lysias I* emerges from the interplay of spatial design, cultural reasoning, and stylistic texture, and it outlined a tripartite framework, portals, premises, and particles, through which these dimensions can be analysed. To understand how this framework stands in relation to existing scholarship, it is necessary to examine the major strands of research that have shaped modern interpretations of Lysias and Athenian forensic rhetoric. Although the scholarly tradition is rich and varied, it has tended to treat the speech's components in isolation. The present chapter surveys these discussions to clarify what has been established, where the debates lie, and what remains underexplored. In doing so, it prepares the ground for the integrated analysis that follows.

The study of Lysias has long been dominated by debates over his so-called plain style, conventionally associated with clarity, restraint, and an ostensibly unornamented diction. Early scholarship cast him as the exemplar of an artful artless mode of expression, a speaker whose persuasive force lay in the impression of transparency and ordinariness. Carey offers one of the most influential modern formulations of this view, arguing that Lysias deliberately cultivates a stylistic surface that appears simple and uncontrived. This calculated plainness enables the speaker to project the persona of an ordinary Athenian citizen whose credibility derives precisely from his apparent lack of rhetorical display (Carey, 1994, pp. 26–31). On this reading, the power of Lysian rhetoric lies in its ability to disguise technique beneath an idiom of naturalness. Although this interpretation has shaped later scholarship, it has been refined by work showing that Lysias' 'plain' style performs subtle rhetorical and ideological work (Viidebaum, 2021) and by cognitive-stylistic analyses that reveal its strategic construction of ἡθοποιία (characterisation) (van Emde

Boas, 2022, pp. 233–254). Likewise, Usher argues that Lysias’ apparent naturalness conceals a sophisticated rhetorical artistry, while Todd emphasises the careful narrative and characterising techniques that underpin the persuasiveness of his speeches (Usher, 1999; Todd, 2007). Kurland similarly highlights the ideological and argumentative complexity embedded within discourse that only appears straightforward (Kurland, 2019). Carey has further argued that the plain style is not a natural mode of speech but a carefully constructed rhetorical effect, designed to conceal its own sophistication and to present a ‘superficially artless style’ (Carey, 1989, p. 8). Recent scholarship has therefore increasingly stressed that Lysias’ much-praised simplicity is best understood as a deliberately fashioned rhetorical posture rather than evidence of genuine naïveté. The plainness of his diction and the seemingly straightforward organisation of his narratives operate as a performance of ordinariness, aligning the speaker with the jury’s expectations of the reasonable Athenian citizen while simultaneously concealing the sophistication of the underlying argumentative design (Carey, 1994, pp. 26–31). These studies have illuminated the linguistic features that create an impression of transparency, but they have tended to focus on style in isolation, without examining how stylistic choices interact with spatial imagery or cultural assumptions. The plain style is sometimes treated as a purely linguistic phenomenon rather than as part of a broader persuasive design. Apostolakis’ analysis of courtroom performance strengthens this point; by reading Athenian trials as staged ‘pitiable dramas’ (Apostolakis, 2017, pp. 133–156), he shows that stylistic plainness functioned within a performative environment, reinforcing emotional alignment and juror identification, an aspect crucial for understanding how Lysias’ stylistic surface interacts with the embodied dynamics of the lawcourt.

A second major strand of scholarship concerns the narrative strategies of Athenian forensic oratory. O’Connell argues that *ἐνάργεια* (vividness) in Athenian forensic oratory persuades by prompting jurors to visualise narrated events, heightening emotional

engagement and credibility. He shows that this ‘vividness effect’ makes ἐνάργεια a strategic tool of manipulation, directing jurors’ attention and moral evaluation (O’Connell 2017, pp.225–251). Narrative sequencing, focalisation, and emotional pacing all shape the audience’s understanding of the characters and their actions, enabling litigants to frame events in ways that support their argumentative aims (Johnstone, 1999, pp. 75–102). In *Lysias I*, the movement from domestic harmony to suspicion, discovery, and confrontation has been read as a way of eliciting sympathy and framing Euphiletos’ actions as reactive rather than premeditated. Scholars have noted the speech’s use of vivid detail, temporal control, and selective revelation to create a sense of immediacy and moral clarity. Yet even in this rich body of work, the spatial dimension of the narrative has received relatively little attention. The οἶκος is often treated as a backdrop rather than as a meaningful structure that shapes the story’s moral logic. The relationship between narrative technique and stylistic texture has also been underexplored. The present study builds on the insights of narrative scholars but argues that narrative, space, and style are inseparable: the story–world of *Lysias I* is constructed through linguistic choices that guide the jury’s spatial and emotional orientation. Morgan’s analysis of ritual boundaries in the Athenian home (Morgan, 2007, pp.113–129) reinforces this point by showing that domestic space encoded moral thresholds that shaped social interpretation. Likewise, Goldberg’s study of spatial and behavioural negotiation in Athenian houses (Goldberg, 1999, pp.142–161) demonstrates that movement within the οἶκος was socially meaningful, an insight that strengthens the argument that the narrative’s spatial logic is central to its persuasive force.

The legal and social context of adultery (μοιχεία) forms another major area of scholarship. Cohen’s analysis shows that adultery was understood not as a purely private matter but as an offence with far reaching implications for household stability, civic order, and male honour. He argues that μοιχεία threatened the integrity of the οἶκος and the authority of the husband, whose control over legitimate lineage was seen as directly

compromised by sexual transgression (Cohen, 1991, pp. 98–114). At the same time, Cohen shows that the Athenians understood adultery not merely as a domestic transgression but as a public offence, warranting severe legal sanctions because it threatened the social and ideological foundations of the polis (Cohen, 1991, pp. 114–118). His account of the legal mechanisms surrounding μοιχεία further clarifies the procedures available to aggrieved husbands and the specific conditions under which the killing of an adulterer was legally permitted (Cohen, 1991, pp. 103–112). Together, these arguments present μοιχεία as a socially charged and legally codified transgression situated at the intersection of household stability, civic ideology, and male authority. This framework highlights the cultural pressures shaping Euphiletos’ account and the jurors’ likely responses, revealing the οἶκος as a site of both vulnerability and authority, where the intrusion of Eratosthenes becomes a symbolic as well as a physical violation. Yet while scholars have analysed the legal and social frameworks of adultery, they have paid less attention to how these frameworks are activated through narrative and stylistic choices. The cultural premises of the speech are often discussed in abstract terms, without sufficient attention to how they are embedded in the spatial and linguistic fabric of the narrative. Dillon’s analysis of households, families, and women (Dillon, 2016, pp. 241–256) further enriches this context by showing how the οἶκος functioned as a site of gendered ideology, reinforcing the cultural stakes that Lysias activates in framing Euphiletos’ actions.

Scholarship on the οἶκος has increasingly emphasised its architectural, social, and ideological complexity, treating the household not merely as a physical structure but as a key site for the production and regulation of social relations. Nevett’s study has been central to this shift, demonstrating that domestic architecture in classical Greece was carefully organised to manage movement within the house, protect the privacy of its inhabitants, and encode gendered expectations through spatial differentiation (Nevett, 1999, pp. 77–104). By analysing the layout and circulation patterns of Greek houses, she

shows how the built environment itself functioned as a mechanism of social control, reinforcing hierarchies within the household and shaping everyday interactions. Her work thus provides an essential framework for understanding the οἶκος as a dynamic intersection of material form, social practice, and ideological meaning.

A second major strand of scholarship examines the spatial and symbolic organisation of the classical Athenian house. Nevett highlights the social significance of thresholds, doors, and controlled access points, showing how domestic architecture both reflected and reinforced hierarchical relationships within the household (Nevett, 1999, pp.53–61). Foxhall has explored the ideological significance of the household in Athenian thought, showing that the οἶκος functioned as a microcosm of civic order and as a primary site for the construction and maintenance of gendered identities (Foxhall, 1989, pp.22–32). These insights are crucial for understanding the spatial design of *Lysias 1*. The house is not merely the setting of the events but a moral landscape whose boundaries encode Athenian ideas about gender, authority, and social stability. But despite the richness of this scholarship, the spatial dimension of the speech has received relatively little sustained attention. While scholars have acknowledged the spatial detail, it remains unclear to what extent they have explored how spatial cues might influence juror interpretation or how these cues interact with cultural assumptions and stylistic choices. Morgan's (2007) and Goldberg's (1999) findings reinforce the need to treat the οἶκος not simply as a backdrop but as an active persuasive resource within the speech.

The scholarship on Athenian democratic ideology provides an essential backdrop for understanding the persuasive strategies deployed in forensic oratory. Ober's analysis has shown that Athenian democracy operated not through rigid adherence to formal legal rules but through a shared reservoir of cultural knowledge, collective reasoning, and civic ideology that structured how citizens interpreted arguments and evaluated evidence (Ober, 1989, pp. 112–130). In his account, the effectiveness of persuasion in the courts depended

on a speaker's ability to stimulate these common assumptions and appeal to widely held norms about behaviour, status, and civic responsibility. This emphasis on the ideological foundations of democratic deliberation offers a crucial framework for interpreting the rhetorical choices made by litigants, whose narratives and evaluative claims were crafted to resonate with the jurors' communal expectations and their sense of what constituted reasonable judgement within a democratic polis. Hansen emphasises the role of 'common sense' (φρόνησις) and practical wisdom in juror decision-making, showing how ordinary citizens were expected to judge cases based on their understanding of social norms and moral expectations (Hansen, 1991, pp.180–188). These studies help explain why *Lysias 1* relies so heavily on unstated premises and why the speech's enthymematic structure is so effective. The jurors are expected to supply the cultural reasoning that makes Euphiletos' actions appear necessary and justified.

While there is substantial work on the ideological underpinnings of Athenian democracy, the extent to which these assumptions are operationalised through the spatial and stylistic design of forensic narratives remains only partially explored. Studies of legal reasoning have illuminated the role of shared cultural premises in persuasion. Lanni's analysis of precedent, for example, demonstrates how litigants navigated a system that formally rejected precedent while nevertheless relying upon widely recognised patterns of argument and judgement (Lanni, 1999, pp. 27–51). But such approaches focus primarily on the logical structures of persuasion rather than on how narrative form and spatial representation help to activate those assumptions before a jury.

Finally, scholarship on Greek particles and discourse structure has illuminated the linguistic mechanisms through which speakers shape the flow of information, manage audience alignment, and construct ethos. Denniston's classic study remains foundational, offering a systematic account of the pragmatic and connective functions of particles such as δέ, γάρ, and μέν and demonstrating how these small words organise discourse and guide

interpretation (Denniston, 1954, pp. xxxviii–xl; 1–50). More recent work has expanded this perspective by situating particles within broader models of discourse cohesion and cognitive processing. Bonifazi, Drummen, and de Kreij show how particles operate as cues for discourse segmentation, speaker stance, and narrative pacing, providing a sophisticated framework for understanding their contribution to discourse architecture (Bonifazi, Drummen & de Kreij, 2021, pp. 1–52, esp. 33–48). Denniston’s analysis of μήν highlights the role of particles in signalling emphasis and interactional force (Denniston, 1954, pp. 65–78), while Fühner’s analysis of dramatic dialogue demonstrates how particles structure turn taking, resonance, and the incremental unfolding of meaning (Fühner, 2018, pp. 45–92).

Recent narratological work has highlighted the cognitive conditions under which jurors process the *narratio* of *Lysias I*. Allan’s analysis of ‘persuasion by immersion’ is central here: he argues that the *narratio* is designed to produce a sense of experiential presence, drawing the audience into the narrated world so that they adopt the speaker’s perspective with minimal resistance (Allan, 2022, pp. 272–276; 279–287). But the immersive effect he identifies is not a single phenomenon but the outcome of several interacting mechanisms. The present study refines Allan’s insight by demonstrating that immersion in *Lysias I* arises from the coordinated operation of spatial structuring (portals), culturally shared heuristics (premises), and the discourse–texturing functions of particles. Spatial immersion is generated through the sequencing of thresholds and movements within the οἶκος; cultural immersion through the activation of normative expectations that jurors supply as unstated premises; and linguistic immersion through particle–driven modulation of stance, pacing, and focalisation, precisely the kinds of stylistic cues Allan identifies as contributing to immersion (Allan, 2022b, pp. 287–292). In this way, Allan’s model identifies the persuasive effect, while the tripartite framework developed here explains the mechanisms that generate it. But immersion is only one dimension of the

speech's persuasive texture, and its operation intersects with broader stylistic, spatial, and cultural strategies.

Although these studies offer essential tools for analysing the stylistic surface of the speech, they do not yet account for the deeper interaction of those elements within its persuasive architecture. They have rarely been integrated into broader discussions of narrative strategy or cultural ideology. Scholarship on the plain style has illuminated Lysias' linguistic texture, but its spatial and cultural implications remain only partially explored; studies of narrative technique have not always foregrounded the architectural logic of the story world, and discussions of the legal and social context of adultery have tended to treat these norms separately from their linguistic and spatial realisation within the narrative. These gaps suggest the need for an approach that treats stylistic, spatial, and cultural cues as mutually reinforcing components of a single persuasive ecology. Lanni's and Apostolakis' insights into legal reasoning and courtroom performance further underscore that stylistic texture operates within a broader persuasive environment shaped by spatial, cultural, and ideological cues. The present dissertation responds to this need by offering a unified framework, portals, premises, and particles, that reveals the speech's multi-layered persuasive strategy. The framework captures the interaction of spatial, cultural, and stylistic elements that shape juror perception, treating them not as discrete strands but as mutually reinforcing components of a coherent rhetorical design. By situating the speech within the broader scholarly landscape and identifying the limitations of existing approaches, this chapter prepares the ground for the analyses that follow. The next chapter turns to the spatial design of the speech, showing how the οἶκος functions as a moral landscape whose thresholds and boundaries guide jurors' judgment.

CHAPTER 3: PORTALS

The spatial world of *Lysias I* is not a neutral backdrop but a carefully constructed moral landscape that shapes how the jurors understand the events of the narrative. The οἶκος is presented as a structured environment whose thresholds, boundaries, and internal divisions encode Athenian ideas about gender, authority, and social order, and, as Dillon's analysis of Greek religion suggests (Dillon, 2016, pp.241–256), functioned simultaneously as a cultic space in which every day ritual practice reinforced these same hierarchies and the ideological centrality of the household to the polis. The speech's persuasive force depends on the jurors' ability to imagine this space vividly and to recognise the moral significance of movement within it. The house becomes a stage on which the drama of adultery and retribution unfolds, and the speaker's navigation of this space is designed to appear measured, appropriate, and consistent with the expectations placed upon him as the head of a household. The adulterer's movements, by contrast, are framed as transgressive, furtive, and corrosive of domestic stability. The spatial logic of the speech thus becomes a mode of moral reasoning: to move rightly within the house is to act rightly; to cross its boundaries improperly is to violate the social order.

The spatial design of *Lysias I* operates on two interconnected levels. While the speech constructs a conceptual model of the οἶκος as a site of vulnerability and authority, drawing on widely shared cultural assumptions about the household's role in Athenian society (Nevett, 1999, pp. 17–33; Fisher, 1998a, pp. 68–97), it also uses specific narrative moments, key passages in which doors, stairs, rooms, and thresholds are foregrounded, to guide the jurors' emotional and moral responses. The analysis therefore moves between broad conceptual discussion and close reading of selected passages, showing how the speech's spatial logic functions both as a general framework and as a set of precise rhetorical techniques. Modern discussions of domestic thresholds often assume that Greek

doorways carried supernatural danger, yet Kerr's detailed re-assessment shows that Greek thresholds were not imagined as haunted; doorway deposits and apotropaic objects do not imply ghost-avoidance, and the restless dead belong instead to crossroads, not the limen of the house (Kerr 2019, pp. 86–102). Roman marriage ritual does invest the threshold with symbolic weight, but this is a culturally specific rite of incorporation and cannot be projected onto Greek practice. Kerr's findings therefore sharpen the reading of *Lysias I* that the threshold is a social and juridical boundary, not a supernatural frontier. Euphiletos' repeated opening, closing, and crossing of doors marks the controlled movement from secrecy to disclosure, structuring how private wrongdoing becomes publicly intelligible and guiding the jury's moral interpretation of events within the οἶκος.

The οἶκος occupied a central place in Athenian thought. It was the primary site of reproduction, economic activity, and the transmission of citizenship, and it served as a microcosm of civic order (Winkler 1990, pp.45–47; Cohen, 1991, pp.97–108). The integrity of the household was therefore a matter of public concern, and the intrusion of an adulterer was understood not merely as a private insult but as a threat to the stability of the community. The architecture of the house reflected these concerns. Domestic space was organised to regulate movement, protect privacy, and reinforce gender norms (Nevett, 1999, pp.52–104). The women's quarters were typically located in the more secluded parts of the house, accessible only through controlled thresholds. Doors, locks, and internal divisions were not merely functional features but symbolic markers of authority and propriety.

Lysias I draws on this cultural logic to frame the events of the narrative. The speaker's account of his household emphasises the proper arrangement of space and the appropriate distribution of authority. He describes how he initially trusted his wife and allowed her greater freedom of movement, only to discover that this trust had been exploited by Eratosthenes. The narrative of domestic harmony disrupted by intrusion is

grounded in the spatial organisation of the house. The adulterer's ability to enter the women's quarters, to manipulate the internal layout of the house, and to evade detection is presented as evidence of his moral corruption. The speaker's eventual reassertion of control over the space, by locking doors, organising an ambush, and confronting the intruder, becomes a symbolic restoration of order.

The jurors' familiarity with the cultural significance of domestic space allows the speech to rely on unstated premises. When the speaker describes the adulterer's presence in the women's quarters, he does not need to explain why this is a grave offence; the jurors understand that such an intrusion violates the fundamental boundaries of the household. Similarly, when the speaker recounts his own movements through the house, the jurors can infer the appropriateness of his actions based on their knowledge of domestic norms. The spatial logic of the speech thus functions as a form of enthymematic reasoning: the jurors supply the cultural premises that make the narrative persuasive. Enthymematic reasoning is discussed in detail in chapter 4 below.

The narrative of *Lysias 1* is structured around a series of spatial transitions that guide the jurors' attention and shape their emotional responses. The speaker moves from the public world of the city to the private world of the house, from the outer rooms to the inner chambers, and from the realm of suspicion to the moment of discovery. Each transition is marked by a shift in spatial framing, and each shift carries moral significance. The narrative's progression mirrors the speaker's movement through the house, and the jurors are invited to follow him step by step. One of the most striking features of the speech is its use of focalisation to control the jurors' perspective. The speaker describes what he sees, hears, and suspects as he moves through the house, and the jurors are encouraged to adopt his point of view. This technique creates a sense of immediacy and emotional engagement, allowing the jurors to experience the unfolding events as if they were present. The spatial details of the narrative: doors left ajar, footsteps on the stairs, the

arrangement of rooms, serve to anchor the jurors' imagination and to guide their interpretation of the speaker's actions.

The speech also uses spatial framing to manage the flow of information. The speaker withholds certain details until the appropriate moment, creating suspense and heightening the emotional impact of the narrative. For example, he does not reveal the full extent of his wife's deception until he has described the layout of the house and the movements that led to his discovery. This sequencing allows the jurors to understand the significance of each spatial detail and to appreciate the speaker's gradual realisation of the truth. The narrative's spatial logic thus becomes a tool for controlling the jurors' emotional and cognitive responses.

The first key passage in which spatial logic plays a central role occurs early in the narrative, when the speaker describes the arrangement of his household. He explains that he initially trusted his wife and allowed her greater freedom of movement, but that this trust was exploited by Eratosthenes (ss. 6–7). The Greek text emphasises the internal divisions of the house and the speaker's management of these spaces. He notes that he 'used to live in great simplicity' (ἀπλῶς διῆγον), allowing his wife to manage the household and to move freely within it (ss. 7–8). This description establishes the speaker's ethos as a moderate and trusting husband, but it also sets the stage for the spatial violations that follow. The key phrase in this passage is the reference to the women's quarters, τὰ γυναικῶν τις, which the speaker describes as being in the more secluded part of the house (s. 9). The jurors would have understood the significance of this detail: the women's quarters were meant to be protected from male intrusion, and the adulterer's ability to enter this space is presented as a grave violation. The speaker's initial arrangement of the household is thus presented as appropriate and consistent with social norms, while the adulterer's intrusion is presented as a transgression of both spatial and moral boundaries.

The passage also introduces the theme of surveillance and concealment. The speaker describes how his wife manipulated the internal layout of the house to facilitate her affair, moving objects and arranging rooms in ways that allowed the adulterer to enter undetected. This manipulation of space is presented as evidence of her moral corruption and as a contrast to the speaker's straightforward and trusting nature. The spatial details of the passage thus serve to establish the moral framework of the narrative and to guide the jurors' interpretation of the events that follow.

The second key passage in which spatial logic plays a central role occurs when the speaker describes the moment he first became suspicious of his wife (ss.11–14). He recounts how she used the pretext of nursing their baby to move between rooms, and how her movements aroused his suspicion. The Greek text emphasises the physical layout of the house, particularly the staircase (ἡ κλίμαξ), which serves as a symbolic threshold between the public and private parts of the household (s.9). The speaker describes how his wife descended the staircase with the baby, ostensibly to nurse it, but how her movements seemed unusual. The staircase becomes a focal point of the narrative, a place where the speaker's suspicions are first aroused and where the boundary between trust and doubt is crossed. The jurors are invited to imagine the scene vividly: the dimly lit staircase, the sound of footsteps, the speaker's growing unease. The spatial details of the passage serve to heighten the emotional tension and to guide the jurors' interpretation of the speaker's actions. The baby itself becomes a symbol of domestic vulnerability, and the wife's use of the baby as a pretext for her movements is presented as particularly despicable. The speaker's description of the scene is designed to elicit sympathy and to frame his subsequent actions as justified. The spatial logic of the passage thus serves both to advance the narrative and to shape the jurors' emotional responses.

The third key passage in which spatial logic plays a central role occurs when the speaker describes how he set a trap for the adulterer. He recounts how he locked the door

(τὴν θύραν κλείσας) and organised an ambush with the help of his friends (s.23–24). The locked door becomes a symbol of the speaker's reassertion of control over the household and of his determination to restore order. The Greek text emphasises the physicality of the door and the speaker's deliberate actions. He describes how he 'quietly locked the door' (ἡσυχῇ τὴν θύραν ἔκλεισα) and how he positioned his friends in strategic positions within the house. The spatial details of the passage serve to create a sense of tension and anticipation, and the jurors are invited to imagine the scene as it unfolds. The locked door becomes a focal point of the narrative, a boundary that separates the adulterer from escape and that marks the moment when the speaker takes decisive action. The passage also highlights the contrast between the speaker's measured and deliberate movements and the adulterer's furtive and panicked behaviour. The adulterer's attempts to escape are framed as futile and as evidence of his guilt. The spatial logic of the passage thus serves to reinforce the moral framework of the narrative and to guide the jurors' interpretation of the speaker's actions.

The spatial organisation of *Lysias 1* operates as a form of moral reasoning. The οἶκος is depicted as a carefully structured environment whose boundaries and internal divisions embody Athenian assumptions about gender, authority, and social order. As Morgan (2007, pp. 113–129) has shown, the Classical Athenian home was itself a system of ritualised boundaries, in which thresholds, circulation patterns, and zones of restricted access articulated social hierarchy and behavioural expectations. The speech draws on precisely this cultural logic: its spatial cues invite the jurors to read the house not merely as a physical setting but as a normative landscape whose organisation encodes the values that the speaker claims to uphold.

Within this framework, the speaker's movements appear orderly and socially sanctioned, whereas the adulterer's movements violate the spatial and moral integrity of the household. Spatial logic becomes a means of directing the jurors' ethical evaluation of

the events. Spatial framing also shapes the jurors' emotional and cognitive responses. The narrative's progression from outer areas to inner rooms mirrors the speaker's shift from suspicion to discovery, inviting the jurors to accompany him step by step. Doors, thresholds, stairs, and rooms anchor the jurors' imagination, giving concrete form to the unfolding drama and guiding their interpretation of the speaker's behaviour. The persuasive force of the speech depends on the jurors' ability to inhabit this spatial world and to recognise the moral significance encoded in movement through it. The spatial design of the speech is therefore not ornamental but integral to its persuasive strategy. By presenting the οἶκος as a moral landscape and aligning narrative movement with ethical judgment, the speech fuses physical space with social meaning, enabling the jurors to read the household's architecture as evidence of character, intention, and transgression. In what follows, the analysis turns to the cultural premises that make such spatial reasoning intelligible, tracing how shared assumptions about gender, honour, and household authority shape the jurors' reception of the narrative.

CHAPTER 4: PREMISES

The persuasive force of *Lysias 1* rests not only on what Euphiletos explicitly states but on what he silently assumes the jury already knows. The speech operates within a dense network of cultural expectations, shared moral intuitions, and socially embedded norms that the audience is expected to recognise without needing them to be articulated. These implicit assumptions, what this dissertation terms premises, function as the unstated warrants of an enthymematic structure. They supply the connective tissue that allows the jury to move from narrative detail to moral judgment, from description to evaluation, and from the circumstances of Euphiletos' household to the broader ideological framework of Athenian civic life. The speech's success depends on activating these premises at precisely the right moments, guiding the jury to conclusions that feel not only plausible but inevitable.

The theoretical foundation for this analysis lies in the long-standing recognition that Athenian rhetoric was fundamentally enthymematic. Aristotle defines the enthymeme as a 'rhetorical syllogism' (συλλογισμὸς ῥητορικός), emphasising that rhetorical argumentation proceeds by leaving certain premises unstated because they are already known and accepted by the audience as shared beliefs (ἔνδοξα) (*Ars Rhetorica*, 1357a7–18). In the forensic context, where jurors were ordinary citizens rather than legal specialists, persuasion depended heavily on these shared assumptions (Gagarin, 2002, pp. 45–48). The speaker's task was not to instruct the jury in the law but to stimulate the moral and social intuitions that made the law intelligible. *Lysias 1* exemplifies this dynamic with unusual clarity: its narrative is structured so that the jury supplies the very reasoning that justifies Euphiletos' actions.

The cultural premises at work in the speech are grounded in Athenian ideology surrounding marriage, gender, household authority, and sexual transgression. The οἶκος was not just a private dwelling but the foundational unit of the polis, responsible for legitimate reproduction, economic stability, and the transmission of citizenship (Nevett, 1999, pp. 12–18). Its integrity depended on the chastity of the wife and the authority of the husband. Adultery (μοιχεία) was therefore not simply a personal betrayal but a civic threat, destabilising the household and potentially corrupting the whole citizen body (Cohen, 1991, pp. 99–104). These assumptions are never stated outright in the speech; they do not need to be. The jury is expected to know them, feel them, and apply them.

Euphiletos' narrative is carefully calibrated to activate these cultural premises. His repeated emphasis on his own naivety, his trust in his wife, and his ignorance of her affair positions him as the idealised Athenian husband: moderate, unsuspecting, and wronged (Todd, 2007, pp. 37–39). His wife's behaviour, by contrast, is framed as a violation of the gendered norms that governed female conduct. Her manipulation of the household space, her control over the door, and her collusion with the maid all signal a breakdown of the expected hierarchy within the οἶκος. The jury does not need to be told that such behaviour is reprehensible; the narrative invites them to recognise it as a transgression of the moral order.

The figure of Eratosthenes is constructed through similar implicit reasoning. He is not described in detail, yet the jury is encouraged to deduce his character from his actions. His repeated visits to the house, his exploitation of the wife's vulnerability, and his intrusion into the most intimate space of the household mark him as a threat not only to Euphiletos but to the social fabric of the city (Wolpert, 2001, pp.420–422). The speech relies on the culturally embedded assumption that the adulterer is a destabilising force, a man who undermines the authority of the husband and endangers the legitimacy of

offspring. These assumptions are the unspoken premises that make the killing appear not only lawful but morally justified.

The speech's enthymematic structure becomes particularly clear in the climactic scene of discovery. The moment in which Euphiletos catches Eratosthenes ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ is narrated in a way that activates the jurors' own knowledge of the homicide law: Euphiletos does not explicitly argue that catching an adulterer in the act sanctions lethal force, but instead presents the events so that the jury supplies this conclusion themselves. The cultural premise, that a husband is entitled to kill an adulterer caught in the act, is triggered through the vividness of the narrative rather than through legal exposition (MacDowell, 1978, pp. 82–84; Todd, 2007, p. 44). The jury is invited to imagine the scene, to feel the shock of revelation, and to recognise the legitimacy of Euphiletos' response. The law is not argued; it is enforced.

This reliance on implicit cultural knowledge aligns with broader discussions of democratic 'common sense' in classical Athens. Scholars such as Cohen (1991, pp. 57–63) and Allen (2000, pp. 30–38) have shown that Athenian jurors were expected to draw on shared norms rather than on technical legal expertise. The courtroom was a space where social ideology was performed and reaffirmed. *Lysias 1* participates in this process by constructing a narrative that resonates with the jury's expectations about gender, honour, and household integrity. The speech does not persuade by advancing new information but by stimulating what the jury already believes. Recent work on the embodied dimensions of Athenian forensic performance further sharpens this picture. Gagarin's (2024, pp. 139–150) analysis of gesture, posture, and bodily comportment in the courts demonstrates that jurors were attuned not only to verbal argumentation but to the speaker's physical presence as an index of character, sincerity, and emotional stance. These nonverbal cues operated as culturally legible signals, activating shared assumptions about moderation, self-control, and trustworthiness. In this sense, embodied behaviour functioned as an additional layer of

premises: unspoken but socially intelligible warrants that shaped how the jury interpreted the narrative. This emphasis on the culturally coded reading of bodies aligns closely with the present analysis, reinforcing the claim that the persuasive force of *Lysias 1* depends on a multimodal ecology in which spatial, cultural, and stylistic cues jointly guide the jury's inferences.

Insights from cognitive narratology further illuminate this process. Narratives do not merely convey events; they shape the interpretive frameworks through which audiences understand those events (de Jong, 1999, pp. 1–5). In *Lysias 1*, the sequencing of the narrative, the distribution of knowledge, and the focalisation through Euphiletos' perspective all work to guide the jury's deductive processes. The speech is structured so that the jury experiences the story as Euphiletos claims to have experienced it: with growing suspicion, dawning realisation, and final certainty. This alignment of cognitive and emotional trajectories reinforces the cultural premises that justify his actions. The speech also draws on the moral psychology of shame and honour. The adulterer's intrusion into the household is framed as an assault on Euphiletos' honour, a violation that demands redress (Fisher, 1998b, pp. 72–75). The wife's betrayal is presented as a source of shame, not only for Euphiletos but for the household, and the appropriate redress is an 'honour killing' (Bianchi, 2018, pp. 22–31). These emotional responses are not argued but assumed; they are part of the cultural fabric that the jury is expected to share. The speech's persuasive power lies in its ability to activate these emotions without naming them.

The implicit reasoning of the speech is reinforced by its stylistic texture. As Carey emphasises, the plain diction, the cultivated impression of artlessness, and the restrained emotional register are central to the construction of Euphiletos' ethos (Carey, 1989, p. 8). This stylistic posture presents him as a man who speaks without embellishment, whose narrative appears transparent and unforced. Usher's account of Lysian style further supports this reading, noting the clarity, brevity, and measured tone that encourage the

audience to treat the speaker as sincere and trustworthy (Usher, 1999, pp. 44–47). Such restraint invites the jury to supply the moral judgments that the speech leaves unspoken: the premises are embedded not only in what the narrative says, but in the way it says it. He appears as a man who speaks plainly, who does not embellish, and who allows the facts to speak for themselves. This stylistic restraint invites the jury to supply the moral judgments that the speech leaves unspoken. The premises are embedded not only in the content of the narrative but in its form.

The persuasive force of *Lysias 1* emerges from its ability to mobilise a network of implicit cultural premises that the jury is expected to recognise and apply. These premises concern the sanctity of the *oikos*, the authority of the husband, the danger posed by the adulterer, and the moral economy of shame and honour. They are activated through narrative structure, spatial symbolism, emotional resonance, and stylistic calibration. The speech does not persuade by explicit argumentation but by guiding the jury to conclusions that feel like the natural expression of their own cultural logic. The analysis of these premises thus reveals the deeper ideological architecture of the speech and underscores the central claim of this dissertation: that the rhetorical power of *Lysias 1* lies in the interplay of spatial, cultural, and stylistic dimensions. While the preceding analysis has shown how the speech relies on culturally embedded premises to guide the jury's moral reasoning, these premises do not operate in isolation. They are activated, reinforced, and ultimately made persuasive through the formal mechanisms of argumentation that structure the speech itself. Chief among these is the enthymeme. If cultural premises supply the ideological content of the jury's inferences, enthymematic reasoning provides the rhetorical form through which those inferences are elicited. To understand fully how *Lysias 1* converts shared assumptions into judicial conviction, it is necessary to examine how the speech's explicit arguments, especially in the peroration, invite the jury to supply

the very premises that justify Euphiletos' actions. It is to this argumentative dimension that the analysis now turns.

Lysias 1 is one of the most celebrated forensic speeches of classical Athens, delivered by Euphiletos. Its persuasive power has long drawn scholarly interest, not only for its vivid narrative but for the sophistication of its argumentative design. Central to this design is the enthymeme (ἐνθύμημα), an argument with an unstated premise or truncated syllogism (*Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, 2015, p.697). This study outlined the theoretical basis of the enthymeme in classical rhetoric and examined how Lysias employed it to build credibility, align his defence with Athenian law, and appeal to democratic values. It argued that the force of the speech depended as much on what remained implicit as on what was stated, illustrating this through a series of practical examples.

In Athenian courts, where large citizen juries judged cases without professional judges, the enthymeme was especially effective. Jurors lacked formal training in logic but were deeply familiar with the values of the polis. By prompting them to infer the missing premise, speakers fostered a sense of shared judgment consistent with democratic ideals, enhancing the legitimacy of the verdict. This dynamic pervades Athenian forensic oratory. Appeals to νόμος (law) and ἔθος (custom) were rarely expressed in full logical form; speakers relied on jurors' assumed knowledge (Wohl, 2010, pp.31–7). In homicide or adultery cases such as *Lysias 1*, litigants used compressed arguments to link personal narratives to civic values, turning private disputes into matters of public concern (Harris, 2013, pp.205–212). The enthymeme thus bridged individual experience and collective ideology. It also aligns with Lysias' style, marked by clarity, brevity, and plausibility, qualities reinforced by enthymematic reasoning (Fredal, 2020, p.150). By offering concise arguments free of technical language, Lysias cultivates an impression of artlessness while deploying sophisticated technique (Carey, 1989, pp. 8–9). In *Lysias 1*, this economy is

crucial: the speaker's account of domestic wrongdoing and justified killing relies on the jury supplying the implicit links between personal injury and civic justice. The following sections examine how these enthymemes function within the speech and shape its appeal to Athenian democratic ideology.

The defence of Euphiletos in *Lysias 1* is built around a series of enthymemes that link his personal narrative to the civic framework of Athenian law. These are most explicit in the peroration (ss.47–50), where he shifts from recounting events to appealing to democratic justice. The enthymemes function practically rather than abstractly, persuading jurors by prompting them to supply the unstated premises that connect obedience to νόμος, with civic virtue. Earlier sections anticipate the peroration's reasoning. When Euphiletos describes catching Eratosthenes in adultery, the implied syllogism is clear:

1. Premise (unstated): Adultery is a capital offence under Athenian law.
2. Premise (stated): Eratosthenes committed adultery with Euphiletos' wife.
3. Conclusion (stated): Euphiletos was justified in killing him.

This enthymeme depends on jurors accepting the major premise as a legal and cultural norm. By leaving the law unstated, Euphiletos invites the jury to complete the reasoning themselves, reinforcing their participation in the argument (Todd, 2007, pp.146–7).

The peroration sharpens this strategy. In s.47, Euphiletos claims his act was public punishment rather than private vengeance: 'I do not consider that this penalty was exacted privately... it was on behalf of the whole city'. The unstated premise is that punishment in accordance with νόμος serves the common good. The ambiguity of τιμωρία, 'vengeance' and 'punishment' (*Brill Dictionary*, 2015, p.2122) strengthens the enthymeme by enabling jurors to interpret his action as lawful retribution. In s.48, he offers a proof by contradiction framed as an enthymeme:

1. Premise (unstated): Laws protect marriage and punish adultery.

2. Premise (stated): Convicting Euphiletos would reverse this, punishing the faithful and acquitting adulterers.

3. Conclusion (stated): Conviction would effectively abolish the laws.

The verb ἐξαλεῖψαι ('to wipe out') highlights the fragility of νόμος, implying that a guilty verdict would metaphorically wipe out civic order (Todd, 2007, p.146).

In s.49, the metaphor of entrapment (ἐνεδρεύεσθαι) frames another enthymeme:

1. Premise (unstated): Citizens must be able to trust the laws.

2. Premise (stated): Convicting Euphiletos would leave citizens 'trapped' by the very laws they obey.

3. Conclusion (stated): Conviction would undermine the reliability of law itself.

Here the enthymeme appeals to jurors' fear of legal manipulation. By inviting them to supply the premise that law must protect rather than ensnare, Euphiletos aligns his case with the democratic anxiety that laws should safeguard citizens rather than expose them to danger.

Finally, in s.50, the speech climaxes in a triple crescendo: 'my life, my property, and everything else... I obeyed the laws of the city'. The enthymeme is clear:

1. Premise (unstated): Obedience to the laws is the highest civic virtue.

2. Premise (stated): Euphiletos obeyed the laws.

3. Conclusion (stated): therefore, he deserves acquittal.

The repetition of περὶ ("concerning") creates a rhetorical rhythm that strengthens the logical structure (Bury, 1893, p. 395). The jury is invited to supply the moral premise that obedience to νόμος must be rewarded, not punished. The enthymeme thus transforms Euphiletos' personal plea into a civic defence of democratic justice.

The enthymemes of ss.47–50 are reinforced by stylistic devices typical of Lysias: euphemism, metaphor, and brevity. Euphemistic references to 'men who commit this sort of offence' generalise the crime, allowing jurors to supply the identification of

Eratosthenes themselves. Metaphors of erasure and entrapment dramatize the fragility of law, inviting jurors to complete the logical connection between verdict and civic collapse. Brevity ensures that the enthymemes remain accessible, avoiding sophistic complexity while still achieving persuasive force (Carey, 1989, pp. 85–6).

One of the most striking features of *Lysias 1* is the way Euphiletos uses enthymematic reasoning to invert the moral positions of the case. At the outset, he is legally the defendant, charged with homicide. Yet through the logic of his argument, he gradually assumes the role of prosecutor, casting Eratosthenes not merely as a private wrongdoer but as a civic threat. This rhetorical inversion is achieved through a series of enthymemes that rely on the jury to supply the unstated premises linking adultery to democratic instability.

In s.47, Euphiletos insists that his act was not ‘private vengeance’ but ‘on behalf of the whole city’. The enthymeme here is clear:

1. Premise (unstated): Crimes against marriage destabilise the city.
2. Premise (stated): Eratosthenes committed adultery.
3. Conclusion (stated): Therefore, punishing him serves the city.

By inviting jurors to supply the premise that adultery is a civic danger, Euphiletos transforms his personal grievance into a public prosecution. The ambiguity of τιμωρία, ‘vengeance/punishment’ (*Brill Dictionary*, 2015, p. 2122) strengthens this inversion, allowing the jury to interpret his act as lawful retribution rather than private revenge.

The inversion becomes sharper in s.48, where Euphiletos argues that convicting him would be equivalent to abolishing the laws and enacting new ones that punish law-abiding citizens. The enthymeme is structured as follows:

1. Premise (unstated): Laws exist to protect citizens who uphold marriage.
2. Premise (stated): Convicting Euphiletos would punish those who guard their wives and acquit adulterers.

3. Conclusion (stated): Therefore, conviction undermines the very purpose of law.

Here the enthymeme turns the tables: the jury, by convicting Euphiletos, would themselves become complicit in undermining civic order. The rhetorical inversion is complete:

Euphiletos is no longer the accused but the defender of νόμος, while Eratosthenes becomes the embodiment of civic danger (Todd, 2007, pp. 146–7).

The inversion culminates in s.50, where Euphiletos declares that he is in danger of losing ‘my life, my property, and everything else, simply because I obeyed the laws of the city’.

The enthymeme here is dramatic:

1. Premise (unstated): Obedience to law is the highest civic virtue.
2. Premise (stated): Euphiletos obeyed the law.
3. Conclusion (stated): Therefore, punishing him would invert justice.

The rhetorical effect is powerful. By inviting jurors to supply the premise that obedience must be rewarded, Euphiletos positions himself as the true guardian of democracy. The defendant becomes the civic prosecutor, while the adulterer becomes the symbol of democratic erosion. This moral inversion is the hallmark of Lysias’ enthymematic strategy.

A distinctive feature of *Lysias 1* is the strategic use of euphemism, which works hand in hand with enthymematic reasoning. By softening or generalising references to the crime and its perpetrator, Euphiletos avoids overt aggression while simultaneously inviting the jury to supply the missing logical connections. Euphemism thus becomes a rhetorical device that enhances the enthymeme’s persuasive force.

In s.47, Euphiletos refers to ‘men who commit this sort of offence’ rather than naming Eratosthenes directly. The phrasing is deliberately vague, yet its meaning is clear to the jury. The enthymeme here is structured as follows:

1. Premise (unstated): Adultery is universally recognised as a crime.
2. Premise (stated): Men who commit this sort of offence deserve punishment.

3. Conclusion (unstated but implied): Eratosthenes was one of these men and deserved the punishment which he received.

The euphemism strengthens the enthymeme by allowing jurors to supply the identification themselves. This participatory logic makes the conclusion more compelling, since it arises from the jury's own reasoning rather than being imposed by the speaker (Todd, 2007, p. 145).

Euphemism also serves to generalise the offence, transforming a private dispute into a civic issue. By avoiding Eratosthenes' name, Euphiletos frames adultery as a category of crime rather than an isolated incident. The enthymeme thus shifts from the particular to the universal: punishing adulterers protects the city, while acquitting them undermines democratic justice. This generalisation is crucial, since it allows the jury to see themselves as stakeholders in the case, not merely arbiters of a private quarrel.

Euphemism also mitigates the risk of annoying the jury. Direct attacks on Eratosthenes could appear excessive or vindictive, undermining Euphiletos' claim that his act was lawful rather than personal. By using euphemistic phrasing, he maintains a tone of moderation, consistent with Lysias' stylistic minimalism. The enthymeme is thereby reinforced: the jury supplies the missing premise that adultery is intolerable, while Euphiletos maintains the ethos of a reasonable citizen acting in obedience to νόμος (Todd, 2007, p.145).

Finally, euphemism contributes to the rhetorical rhythm of the peroration. The generalised references to 'men who commit this sort of offence' and 'citizens trapped by the laws' create a pattern of abstraction that raises the argument from personal narrative to civic principle. The enthymeme is thus embedded in a stylistic climax, culminating in the emphatic declaration of s.50: 'I obeyed the laws of the city'. The omission of Eratosthenes' name throughout the peroration ensures that the jury's focus remains on the laws and their civic function, not on any personal animosity between the two men.

The enthymeme should be understood as both a logical and rhetorical device. The enthymeme is persuasive precisely because it is incomplete: its omissions invite the audience to join in the reasoning process, thereby creating a sense of ownership of the conclusion. In the context of *Lysias I*, this participatory logic is critical. By framing his act as obedience to νόμος, Euphiletos relies on the jury to supply the unstated premise that obedience to law is the highest civic virtue. The enthymeme thus becomes the cornerstone of his defence, transforming a private killing into a civic act of justice. The enthymeme is more than a logical device in *Lysias I*; it is also a narrative and ideological strategy. It invites the jurors to supply premises based in law, custom, and democratic principles. Lysias thereby transforms Euphiletos' defence into a virtual prosecution of the dead Eratosthenes and is portrayed as a communal act of justice. The speech thus shows how enthymematic reasoning was central to the persuasive power of forensic oratory. But such enthymematic dynamics do not operate at the level of narrative structure alone; they are also enacted in the micro-texture of the language itself, where Lysias' deployment of particles guides inference, manages audience alignment, and modulates the very premises the jurors are invited to supply. This is the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5: PARTICLES

Particles are the connective tissue of Greek prose, the small but indispensable elements that shape the flow of thought, guide the listener's expectations, and calibrate the speaker's stance. In *Lysias I* their role is especially pronounced: the speech's persuasive power depends not only on its narrative structure, spatial logic, and cultural premises, but also on the minute linguistic signals that organise the story and present Euphiletos as a sincere, moderate, and transparent speaker.

The category 'particle' is notoriously fluid, its boundaries porous and historically contingent. In Indo-European linguistics the term has often been used as a catch-all for indeclinable elements, affixes, clitics, prepositions, and other function words (Bonifazi et al. 2021, p. 5). Yet mere indeclinability is insufficient as a criterion, since many prepositions and adverbs share that property. Nor can phonological shape serve as a reliable guide; although many particles are monosyllabic, disyllabic forms are well attested. A functional approach is therefore, arguably, preferable. As *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek (CGCG)* notes, particles are best understood as items that signal how segments of discourse relate to one another, or how the discourse as a whole aligns with the speaker's and addressee's expectations, attitudes, and interpretive frames (CGCG, 2019, p. 663). No single morphological, syntactic, or semantic feature, however, captures the class in its entirety. Modern scholarship increasingly treats Greek particles as a heterogeneous yet coherent group of primarily indeclinable discourse operators that modulate connections between clauses, guide inferential processes, and encode nuances of emphasis, contrast, stance, or interactional alignment. In Greek, therefore, particles are defined not by their formal properties but by the pragmatic and discourse-structuring functions they perform within an utterance, a view reinforced by studies of clause linkage and discourse organisation in Classical Greek, which emphasise the centrality of such

small words in signalling coherence relations and managing the flow of information (Allan 2014, esp. pp. 5–12).

The present study concentrates on four particles whose high frequency in *Lysias I*, as recorded by Steadman (2016, pp. xii–xiii), makes them especially revealing for the speech’s stylistic texture: καί (107 occurrences), δέ (69), μέν (34), and γάρ (31). As Sicking has shown, the coherence of *Lysias I* is sustained by a finely graded system of text–articulating devices, with particles such as δέ and γάρ marking the micro–transitions through which the speaker shifts perspective, introduces explanatory backing, and pragmatically anchors each step of his case (Sicking 1993). His analysis demonstrates that these particles shape the cognitive and discourse–functional segmentation of the speech, structuring the movement between narrative and proof even where overt connective marking is deliberately suppressed. It is precisely this level of organisation, the accumulation of local signalling into the speech’s larger argumentative architecture, on which the present study will focus in detail below.

But frequency alone does not tell the whole story. Also significant are the particles that do not appear. Like the Sherlockian dog that failed to bark in the night, the silence of certain particles can itself be revealing. A striking example is the complete non–occurrence of δή in *Lysias I*. This omission is initially surprising when set beside δή’s prominence in large–scale lexicographical resources such as the *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* (*BDAG*), where it occupies nearly three full columns (*BDAG* 2015, pp. 472–473), a reminder of its ubiquity across the wider Greek corpus. The contrast is instructive. A single forensic speech offers only a narrow stylistic sample, and *Lysias I* in particular cultivates a notably restrained particle profile. Δή, with its associations of emphasis, vividness, inferential pressure, and the marking of information as evident or mutually acknowledged, would sit awkwardly within the speech’s carefully crafted plain style. The narrative aims to present itself as the unvarnished testimony of an ordinary citizen, and δή is precisely the

kind of particle that risks exposing the speaker's manipulation of the audience's inferences. Its absence therefore coheres with the broader Lysian strategy of constructing the οἶκος as a morally transparent space whose truths emerge without rhetorical prompting. In a relatively short text committed to the fiction of unforced, self-evident narration, the non-use of δὲ is, arguably, not a statistical accident but a micro-stylistic choice that reinforces the ideological posture of a speaker who appears simply to let the facts speak for themselves.

The connective texture of the speech produces a rhetorical surface of apparent continuity: transitions are smoothed, argumentative turns are less overtly managed, and the persona of unstudied simplicity that Euphiletos cultivates is reinforced. This creates a pattern in which contrast is implied rather than declared, guiding the audience through inference rather than explicit cues. From the perspective of particle analysis, the contrastive architecture of the speech must therefore be reconstructed from narrative sequencing, pragmatic force, and shifts in tempo rather than from overt connective signalling. The methodological implication is pointed: arguments about cognitive pivots and narrative management require particle distributions established from the text itself, not inherited from secondary compilations whose accuracy and completeness cannot be assumed.

Because explicit contrastive cues are largely absent, the connective texture of the speech must be traced through the particles that remain consistently active. These four, δέ, γάρ, καί, and μέν, carry the burden of structuring the discourse and therefore become central to the analysis. Taken together, they do more than link clauses; they help create the impression of a man recounting events as they naturally unfolded, without apparent rhetorical artifice. Each contributes in a distinct way, δέ marking progression and mild contrast, γάρ supplying justification and retrospective framing, καί conveying additive spontaneity, and μέν signalling incipient structuring without overtly completing the pair.

Their cumulative effect is a mode of speech that feels unforced and unpremeditated, even though it is the product of careful rhetorical design. Accordingly, the chapter now moves from the narrative to the analytical. It first traces how these 4 particles shape the unfolding of the story, following the speech's progression from its opening statements to the climactic confrontation. It then turns to functional groupings, particle clusters, and close readings of key passages, showing how these elements interact with spatial logic and cultural premises to produce a persuasive narrative. In this way, particles emerge not as peripheral features of Lysian style but as central components of its rhetorical strategy, the micro-level mechanisms through which the speech's macro-level effects of credibility, clarity, and emotional pacing are achieved.

The narrative of *Lysias 1* itself unfolds in a series of carefully staged movements, each marked by shifts in tone, perspective, and emotional intensity, and particles play a critical role in managing these transitions. They signal changes in topic, introduce explanations, mark contrasts, and guide the jurors' interpretation of events. What appears to be a plain style is in fact a sophisticated manipulation of these small linguistic elements, enabling Lysias to simulate the rhythms of natural speech and to create the impression that Euphiletos is improvising, discovering the truth alongside the jurors, and responding to events with unstudied honesty. As the analysis moves from this broad narrative arc into specific moments, it becomes clear that the particle system is one of the primary means by which the jurors are led through the story.

The speech's particle profile already reveals its rhetorical logic in the opening sections (ss. 1–5), where Euphiletos establishes his ethos and frames the narrative as a straightforward account of wrongdoing. The particles here are chiefly connective and justificatory, supporting the impression of calm, transparent explanation. The repeated use of γάρ (ss. 1, 2, 5, 6) introduces background information and reasons, marking the speaker as one who explains rather than insists. As Wakker shows, γάρ in forensic discourse

provides explanatory or evidential support, guiding the audience toward the intended interpretation of a preceding claim (Wakker 2009, pp.542–548). In *Lysias 1*, γάρ normalises Euphiletos’ behaviour by embedding each action within a chain of seemingly natural motivations; placed at points where suspicion might arise, it supplies justifications that pre-empt alternative readings. Γάρ thus becomes a key instrument for converting narrative detail into moral plausibility and sustaining the ethos of a speaker whose actions appear to follow inevitably from circumstance.

Alongside this justificatory work, δέ marks transitions between points with measured composure, helping to pace the narrative and maintain an air of controlled progression. The balanced μέν...δέ pairing in s.3, together with the careful clause segmentation of ss.1–3, structures the opening account in a way that presents the speaker as fair-minded and capable of distinguishing personal feeling from objective fact. As the narrative turns to the rhythms of domestic life, the particle system adjusts to reflect the speaker’s portrayal of a household marked by routine and apparent harmony. In ss.6–10, the repeated use of καί coordinates actions and descriptive details into a smooth, cumulative sequence, giving the impression of an orderly οἶκος in which husband and wife move through their daily routines without friction. This paratactic flow is characteristic of Lysias’ broader stylistic practice; across the corpus he favours simple coordination in preference to elaborate subordination, producing a narrative texture that feels spontaneous, unforced, and free of rhetorical embellishment. In this context, the prevalence of καί supports Euphiletos’ claim that his trust in his wife arose naturally from the unproblematic routines of domestic life.

Even within this apparent stability, the narrative already begins to register the earliest indications of disturbance. In ss. 11–14, the domestic account proceeds in the same paratactic mode, with καί continuing to dominate the connective texture and to sustain the impression of an unbroken routine. Within this sequence, δέ occurs only sporadically and

with minimal transitional force, marking slight narrative advances rather than signalling contrast or reorientation. The cumulative effect is one of continuity and composure, reinforcing Euphiletos' representation of an orderly οἶκος and his unexamined confidence in his wife. This rhythm is abruptly interrupted in s.15, where the old woman enters the narrative. This episode is not marked by a strong contrastive particle such as ἀλλά, nor even by δέ. Instead, the rupture is achieved structurally; a new voice intrudes, the established paratactic rhythm is broken, and the narrative shifts from habitual domestic description to the disclosure of unsettling information. The absence of connective marking at precisely this moment heightens the sense of intrusion. The old woman's speech arrives without the cushioning of a particle, producing a jolt that mirrors Euphiletos' own shock and the sudden collapse of his earlier assumptions. In ss.16–20, once Euphiletos begins to recount his investigative actions, δέ reappears and resumes its role as a light step–marker. The narrative now moves through a sequence of purposeful actions rather than domestic routine, and the connective pattern reflects this shift; the transitions are more deliberate, but still understated, in keeping with the speaker's self–presentation as measured and reasonable.

The connective texture of the early narrative is central to Lysias' construction of Euphiletos' ethos, and it is here that the speech first establishes the impression of an unforced, transparent account. In the opening domestic narrative (ss.6–14), the connective system is deliberately simple and unobtrusive. Καί dominates, and its dominance is philologically significant. In Classical prose, καί is the least semantically marked of the coordinators; it can signal simple addition, loose temporal succession, or even pragmatic 'nextness' without imposing a strong interpretive relation (*CGCG*, 2019, pp.673–4). In Lysias, this unmarkedness becomes a stylistic resource. The repeated καί in ss.6–14 coordinates actions and descriptive details into a smooth paratactic chain, producing a rhythm of narration that mirrors the habitual, cyclical routines of an orderly οἶκος. The

particle's semantic lightness allows the narrative to unfold as if it were merely accretive, one small fact added to another, rather than rhetorically shaped.

Within this flow, *δέ* appears only intermittently and with correspondingly light transitional force. In Lysias, *δέ* rarely carries strong adversative weight; instead, it typically marks a new step in the discourse, a mild progression rather than a contrast. Its sparse deployment in ss.6–14 reinforces the sense of calm continuity: *δέ* does not reorient the listener but simply nudges the narrative forward. *Γάρ*, by contrast, introduces occasional explanations of motive or circumstance. Its pragmatic function is justificatory rather than argumentative: *γάρ* supplies background information that the speaker presents as necessary for the audience's comprehension. In this early section, *γάρ* reinforces the impression of a speaker who is transparent and matter-of-fact, offering clarifications not to persuade but to ensure that the jurors understand the situation. Together, these particles sustain the ethos of an ordinary man describing ordinary events, with no hint of the suspicion that will soon intrude. The philological point is that the connective system is not merely simple; it is *strategically* simple. Lysias exploits the unmarked semantics of *καί*, the mild progressivity of *δέ*, and the explanatory modesty of *γάρ* to construct a narrative surface that appears uncontrived.

As the narrative moves into ss.11–20, this connective pattern begins to shift. Paratactic continuity persists, but the unmarked rupture at s.15 interrupts the earlier calm, and the transitional rhythm resumes in a subtly altered form. The linguistic texture aligns with the psychological arc, from unexamined trust, through sudden destabilisation, to controlled, rational response. The shift is detectable not only in the presence or absence of particular particles but also in their distributional density and pragmatic load. Lysias' technique of artful artlessness is on full display; the narrative surface remains calm and linear, but the connective texture quietly signals that the emotional and moral equilibrium of the household is beginning to crumble.

Taken together, the connective pattern in ss.11–20, paratactic continuity, an unmarked rupture at s.15, and a resumed but more deliberate transitional rhythm, supports the speech’s broader rhetorical design. Through these subtle adjustments, the particle system guides the jurors’ responses, preparing them for the escalation that will soon dominate the speech while maintaining the fiction of an ordinary man recounting events exactly as they happened. This progression marks the point at which the narrative begins to pivot toward the crisis that follows and lays the linguistic groundwork for the shift from domestic calm to the charged events of the nocturnal discovery.

In ss.15–20, as suspicion crystallises into investigation, the particle system shifts again to reflect Euphiletos’ changing cognitive and emotional landscape. Καί continues to form the connective backbone, but its function subtly changes; whereas earlier it conveyed habitual domestic rhythm, it now coordinates a sequence of investigative actions. This shift in pragmatic environment gives καί a more sequential, almost procedural flavour. This is entirely consistent with Lysias’ broader stylistic practice; simple coordination is a hallmark of his artful artlessness, creating a surface of apparent spontaneity while quietly guiding interpretation.

At the same time, δέ becomes more prominent once Euphiletos begins to describe his investigative actions. Here δέ marks incremental progression from one observation to the next, pacing the narrative with measured deliberateness. Philologically, this is δέ in its most characteristic Lysian usage, not adversative, not contrastive, but gently stepwise. Its increased frequency in ss.16–20 aligns with the speaker’s shift from passive domestic observer to active investigator, reinforcing the persona of a man who proceeds cautiously and rationally.

Γάρ continues to introduce brief justifications of motive or method. In this section, its explanatory force becomes more pointed: γάρ now frames Euphiletos’ increasingly purposeful behaviour as reasonable and necessary. The particle’s semantics, ‘this is why’,

allow Lysias to present strategic actions as natural responses to unfolding circumstances. The philological subtlety lies in the fact that γάρ does not argue; it clarifies. This distinction is crucial for maintaining the speaker's ethos of reluctant necessity rather than calculated aggression.

The rupture at s.15, where the old woman enters the narrative and reveals the affair, is especially striking. It is not marked by a contrastive particle such as ἀλλά or by a μέν...δέ pairing. Instead, the interruption is structural, with a new voice breaking into the established paratactic flow, and the connective pattern momentarily falls away. The absence of particle marking heightens the sense of intrusion. In Greek narrative, unmarked transitions often signal abruptness or emotional shock (e.g. *Lysias* 3, s.6, where the speaker moves without connective marking from Simon's drunken assault to the sudden danger posed to bystanders, producing a similarly jarring escalation in the narrative tempo); here, the lack of connective cushioning produces a jolt that mirrors Euphiletos' own destabilisation. The narrative's first major turning point is thus achieved not through contrastive particles but through a break in rhythm and perspective.

Across ss.6–20, then, the connective pattern, paratactic continuity, an unmarked rupture, and a more deliberate transitional rhythm, tracks the psychological movement from trust to destabilisation to controlled response. The particles do not merely link clauses; they shape the jurors' sense of Euphiletos' character and guide their interpretation of the unfolding events. Particularly revealing is the deployment of γάρ, which introduces explanations with an air of casual clarification rather than argument. This is a hallmark of Lysian narratology, γάρ supplies background information the jurors need in order to follow the story, framing Euphiletos' increasingly strategic behaviour as reasonable, even inevitable.

The absence of explicit contrastive marking in the speech is itself philologically significant. In other Lysian narratives, contrastive particles often signal cognitive shifts or

interpretive reorientation, marking points at which the speaker's understanding changes and the narrative must adjust. In *Lysias* 1, however, these pivots occur without the support of such overt cues. Instead, the movement from assumption to recognition is carried by structural rupture, changes in narrative rhythm, and the cumulative pressure of new information. The result is a more understated mode of transition, consistent with the speech's strategy of artful artlessness: the surface remains unforced and unmarked, even as the underlying perspective subtly realigns. This in turn underscores the need for a particle-based analysis grounded in the text's own connective behaviour, since the speech's interpretive architecture depends on cues that are implicit rather than formally signposted. In this environment, rhythmic and structural cues carry the burden of signalling cognitive shift, the sudden intrusion of the old woman, the clipped sequencing of Euphiletos' investigative actions, and the gradual tightening of the connective texture. These features become the primary vehicles for guiding the jurors' understanding, reinforcing the impression of a speaker whose perspective evolves naturally and without rhetorical contrivance.

Within this broader connective economy, μέν...δέ pairings continue to structure the contrast between what Euphiletos once believed and what he now perceives. In ss. 15–20, these constructions help organise the narrative into balanced segments that juxtapose earlier trust with emerging evidence of deceit. Lysias frequently uses μέν...δέ in this way across his corpus to create the impression of a speaker who calmly distinguishes between different phases of a situation. Here it reinforces the sense of a man who is not leaping to conclusions but carefully weighing what he sees.

Through these particle choices, Lysias sustains his signature technique of artful artlessness. The narrative surface remains linear, unforced, and apparently uncontrived, yet the linguistic texture quietly signals the speaker's growing resolve and the tightening of the narrative's emotional tension. The particles guide the jurors' responses, preparing them for

the dramatic confrontation that follows while maintaining the fiction of an ordinary man recounting events with unstudied honesty.

Once the confrontation has been narrated, the speech shifts again, moving from vivid, emotionally charged narration to a more reflective mode in which the speaker interprets his actions and appeals to the jurors' sense of justice (ss.25–29). The particle system adapts accordingly. Explanatory γάρ clauses become prominent as Euphiletos reasserts the legal and moral framework of his case (ss.26–29, 34–36), where γάρ continues to introduce justificatory background). These γάρ clauses frame his killing of Eratosthenes as lawful and necessary, guiding the jurors toward the interpretive stance he wants them to adopt and reinforcing the persona of a speaker who proceeds with clarity, restraint, and principled reasoning. At the same time, δέ marks the transition from narrative to argument (ss.25–27), signalling a shift from recounting events to evaluating them. This is a typical Lysian move: after a vivid narrative peak, he uses δέ to re-establish composure and to guide the transition into the argumentative phase. The tone becomes steadier, and the particle profile, dominated by connective δέ, justificatory γάρ, and occasional structuring μέν...δέ, helps restore the measured clarity of the speech's opening movement (ss.25–36).

This return to composure is itself a rhetorical strategy. By re-establishing the calm, orderly particle pattern characteristic of the introduction, the speaker signals that the emotional turbulence of the narrative has been contained. The linguistic texture now mirrors the persona he wishes to project: a reasonable, self-controlled citizen who has acted within the law and who now invites the jurors to evaluate the case with the same clarity and steadiness he claims to possess (ss.25–50). As the speech moves beyond the immediate justification of the killing (ss.25–36) into the broader civic and ideological framing of the case (ss.37–50), the particle system shifts once more to support the speaker's evolving rhetorical aims. This final movement is no longer concerned with

narrating events or even with explaining them; instead, Euphiletos situates his actions within the values of the Athenian polis, appealing to shared norms of citizenship, law, and collective security. Kurland's analysis of Lysian argumentation demonstrates that such a shift is structurally characteristic of the corpus: Lysias routinely guides jurors from the particularities of an incident toward the ideological expectations of democratic citizenship, encouraging them to evaluate conduct through the lens of civic virtue rather than through technical legal reasoning (Kurland, 2019, pp. 48–50). In this light, Euphiletos' closing appeal is not merely a rhetorical flourish but the point at which the speech's persuasive force is meant to crystallise, aligning his behaviour with the communal norms that, as Kurland argues, underwrite Lysias' entire forensic method. The particles help orchestrate this widening of perspective. The connective *δέ* continues to advance the argument, marking transitions between successive claims about the law, the behaviour of adulterers, and the expectations placed upon Athenian citizens (ss.37–43). Its steady rhythm reinforces the impression of a speaker who proceeds calmly and logically, guiding the jurors through a series of principled considerations.

This is consistent with Lysias' broader practice with *δέ* as his preferred tool for maintaining composure and structural clarity in extended argumentation, and in this final movement it supports the speaker's shift from personal defence to civic reasoning. Explanatory *γάρ* remains central in this section, introducing appeals to legal precedent, civic duty, and the dangers adulterers pose to the community (ss.38–40, 44–46). These *γάρ* clauses do not merely justify Euphiletos' individual act; they embed it within a larger moral and political framework. By presenting his reasoning as grounded in shared norms rather than personal grievance, the speaker strengthens the ethos of rationality and public spiritedness that Lysias has been cultivating throughout the speech.

Building on this, the connective texture of the argument becomes even more revealing when we consider what is not present. In this stretch of the speech, there are no

μὲν...δέ pairings and no ἀλλά, so the contrasts between lawful and unlawful behaviour, or between civic responsibility and private wrongdoing, are conveyed not through marked contrastive particles but through the cumulative structure of the argument itself. This absence of explicit contrastive signalling reinforces the speech's preference for an unforced, ostensibly transparent mode of reasoning, in which the jurors are guided by the unfolding logic rather than by overt connective cues. The shifts in perspective and emphasis arise from the sequencing of claims and the steady alternation between general principles and specific applications, rather than from explicit connective marking. This understated connective texture reinforces the impression of a speaker who reasons calmly and systematically, inviting the jurors to adopt the same measured evaluative stance.

As the argument develops, this constellation of particles, above all δέ and γάρ, enables the speech to return to the calm, orderly texture of its opening movement. This composure is not merely stylistic but strategic. By restoring the particle pattern associated with clarity, rationality, and measured self-presentation, the speaker signals that the emotional turbulence of the narrative has been fully contained. The jurors are invited to evaluate the case not as a story of passion but as a matter of civic principle, with the same steadiness and clarity the speaker claims to embody (ss.37–50).

As the argument enters its final movement, the connective texture becomes increasingly restrained, and the particles that remain active take on heightened structural importance. Within this section, δέ continues to guide the progression of thought, marking transitions between successive claims about law, citizenship, and the dangers posed by adulterers. Its steady rhythm reinforces the impression of a speaker who proceeds calmly and logically, leading the jurors through a sequence of principled considerations. Γάρ introduces the explanatory and justificatory material that grounds these claims in shared civic norms, presenting Euphiletos' reasoning as anchored in the values of the polis rather than in personal grievance. With no μὲν...δέ pairings to articulate explicit oppositions,

contrasts and shifts in emphasis arise instead from the cumulative organisation of the argument, which moves deliberately between general principles and their specific application. This understated connective texture supports the speaker's shift from personal defence to civic reasoning, reinforcing the ethos of rationality and public-spiritedness that Lysias has been cultivating throughout the speech. Seen in this light, the behaviour of the particles is not an incidental stylistic flourish but a structural mechanism through which that ethos is continually renewed and made legible to the audience. The analysis thus returns to the chapter's central claim: particles function as indispensable cues that organise the argument, guide the listener's inferences, and sustain the persuasive character of Lysias' voice. They are the means by which the speech achieves its effects of credibility, clarity, and emotional pacing. By attending to the particle system, we gain insight into how Lysias constructs a narrative that feels both natural and compelling, and how he uses the smallest elements of language to shape the jurors' experience of the case. In this way, the chapter positions particles as the micro-level instruments that enable the macro-level coherence of the speech, revealing the subtle artistry that underlies its apparent simplicity.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

The analysis of *Lysias I* has shown that the speech's persuasive force arises from the interplay of spatial imagination, culturally embedded reasoning, and finely calibrated stylistic texture. The tripartite framework developed across the dissertation, portals, premises, and particles, reveals the speech not as a straightforward narrative of justified homicide but as a deliberately constructed rhetorical architecture in which each dimension supports and intensifies the others.

The study of portals, chapter 3, demonstrated that spatial structures are integral to the speech's logic. As the analysis showed, the doors of the house and bedroom function as charged thresholds, marking the shift from secrecy to exposure and transforming a private violation into a publicly intelligible offence. Their recurrence marks them as sites of moral and legal significance, culminating in the moment of discovery that activates the category of *μοιχεία*. The narrative's movement through rooms and thresholds guides the jury's imaginative reconstruction of events and aligns their moral evaluation with Euphiletos' perspective.

The study on premises, chapter 4, showed that the speech relies on a dense network of implicit cultural assumptions concerning household authority, vulnerability, honour, and gender. As the analysis showed, the speech's persuasive force depends on prompting the jury to activate these cultural assumptions themselves rather than having them spelled out. Euphiletos' narrative is shaped so that the jury supplies the evaluative links themselves, judging the killing as both lawful and morally required. This mode of persuasion situates *Lysias I* within broader patterns of democratic 'common sense', where jurors reasoned through shared ideology rather than technical legal doctrine.

The analysis of particles, chapter 5, revealed how micro-stylistic texture underwrites the speech's spatial and cultural architecture. Greek particles regulate

information flow, emotional tone, and inferential guidance, creating a tone of unforced candour that reinforces Euphiletos' ethos as an ordinary and transparent citizen.

The speech's stylistic plainness is thus strategic in that it invites the jury to supply the moral judgments the narrative leaves implicit. Taken together, these dimensions show *Lysias I* to be a unified rhetorical design. Spatial cues activate cultural premises; cultural premises give meaning to spatial transitions; and stylistic markers guide the jury through the narrative with clarity and emotional precision. The speech persuades not through isolated arguments but through the construction of an experiential world in which Euphiletos' actions appear lawful, proportionate, and morally compelled.

This integrated model has broader implications for the study of Athenian forensic rhetoric. The analysis emphasised that Athenian speeches must be understood as composite structures in which spatial, cultural, and linguistic elements work together rather than in isolation. The framework developed here offers a method for tracing these interactions and for understanding how orators shaped the cognitive and emotional experience of their audiences. The symbolic use of space, the mobilisation of implicit cultural knowledge, and the deployment of micro-stylistic cues are not unique to *Lysias I* but characteristic of Athenian rhetoric more generally. Extending this approach across the Lysian corpus reveals recurring patterns. For example, *Against Simon* uses spatial cues to frame a contested encounter as a violation of civic order, while other speeches use elements of urban topography to structure aspects of their accounts. In each case, persuasive force depends on the audience's ability to map physical movement onto moral evaluation. Likewise, the implicit premises that structure *Lysias I*, assumptions about gender, honour, and civic prerogatives, reappear across speeches on assault, inheritance, and political misconduct.

The micro-stylistic dimension also invites comparative study; the restrained connective texture of *Lysias I* contrasts with the denser, more assertive patterns of political

orations and the more emotive textures of private suits. Beyond Lysias, the framework resonates with the rhetorical practices of Antiphon, Demosthenes, and Isaeus, whose speeches similarly integrate spatial symbolism, cultural premises, and stylistic texture to shape audience perception (Gagarin, 2002, pp.73–88; Worthington, 1994, pp.112–25; Edwards, 2007, pp.29–41). A systematic comparison across authors could illuminate how different rhetorical traditions negotiate the relationship between narrative, cultural norms, and linguistic form. Seen in this light, Athenian forensic oratory emerges as a form of cultural performance in which speakers and audiences collaboratively negotiate legitimacy, responsibility, and civic identity. *Lysias I* does more than recount events; it constructs a moral topography, activates shared assumptions, and shapes the speaker’s persona at the level of linguistic texture, embedding argument within familiar structures of domestic space, cultural expectation, and conversational texture. The chapter concludes that *Lysias I* is not merely a persuasive case study but a lens through which to re-examine the broader ecology of Athenian rhetorical practice. Its intricate interplay of space, premise, and particle exemplifies a mode of persuasion deeply embedded in its cultural moment yet strikingly sophisticated in design. Future work that extends this integrative approach promises to deepen our understanding of how classical oratory shaped, and was shaped by, the social, spatial, and linguistic worlds of democratic Athens.

(16,146 words).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allan, R.J. (2014) 'Clause Combining and Discourse Structure in Classical Greek', *Journal of Greek Linguistics*, 14(1), pp. 1–45.
- Allan, R.J. (2022a) *Narrative and Greek Rhetoric: Narratological Approaches to Classical Oratory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Allan, R. J. (2022b) 'Persuasion by immersion: the *narratio* of *Lysias* 1, on the killing of Eratosthenes', *Trends in Classics*, 14(2), pp. 271–298.
- Allen, D. (2000) *The World of Prometheus: The Politics of Punishing in Democratic Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Apostolakis, K. (2017) 'Pitiable dramas on the podium of the Athenian law courts', in Karakantza, E. (ed.) *The Theatre of Justice: Aspects of Performance in Greco–Roman Oratory and Rhetoric*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 133–156.
- Aristophanes (2007) *Vespae*. N. G. Wilson (ed.), Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford: Oxford University Press, lines 975–977.
- Aristotle (1959) *Ars Rhetorica*. Edited by W.D. Ross. Oxford: Oxford Classical Press.
- Bianchi Mancini, S. (2018) *Shame in Athenian Oratory*. PhD thesis. University of Wales Trinity Saint David.
- Bonifazi, A. (2012) 'The Pragmatics of Particles in Greek Oratory', *Classical Philology*, 107(2), pp. 115–142.
- Bonifazi, A., Drummen, A. & de Kreij, M. (2021) *Particles in Ancient Greek Discourse: Exploring Particle Use across Genres*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter.
- Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek (BDAG)* (2015) edited by F. Montanari. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Bury, R.G. (1893) 'The Use of Prepositions in *Lysias*', *The Classical Review*, 7, pp. 394–396.
- The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek (CGCG)* (2019) by E. van Emde Boas, A. Rijksbaron, L. Huitink and M. de Bakker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press..
- Carey, C. (1989) *Lysias: Selected Speeches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carey, C. (1990) 'Rhetorical Means of Persuasion', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, Supplement 15, pp. 26–46.
- Carey, C. (1994) 'Rhetorical Means of Persuasion', in Worthington, I. (ed.) *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 26–45.
- Carey, C. (2020) 'Lysias and his Clients: Money, Ethics and Politics', in Liatsi, M. (ed.) *Ethics in Ancient Greek Literature*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 147–158.
- Cohen, D. (1991) *Law, Sexuality, and Society: The Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- de Jong, I. (1999) 'Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide', in de Jong, I., Nünlist, R. and Bowie, A. (eds.) *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 1–27.
- Denniston, J.D. (1954) *The Greek Particles*. 2nd edn, revised by K. Dover. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Denniston, J.D. (1954) 'The Greek Particles: Notes on μήν and its Pragmatic Force', *Classical Quarterly*, 48(1), pp. 65–78.
- Dillon, M.J.P. (2016) 'Households, families, and women', in Eidinow, E. and Kindt, J. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 241–256.
- Dover, K.J. (1974) *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Drummen, A. (2013) 'Discourse Cohesion in Lysias', in Coulson, M. and Verhage, L. (eds.) *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 63–92.
- Edwards, M. (2007) *Isaeus*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Edwards, M. (2020) 'Moral and Social Values in the Speeches of Isaios', in Liatsi, M. (ed.) *Ethics in Ancient Greek Literature*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 159–178.
- Fisher, N. (1998a) 'Violence, Masculinity and the Law in Classical Athens', in Foxhall, L. & Salmon, J. (eds.) *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 68–97.
- Fisher, N. (1998b) 'Hybris, Dishonour, and Thinking Big', in Fisher, N. and van Wees, H. (eds.) *Kosmos*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 67–84.
- Foxhall, L. (1989) 'Household, Gender and Property in Classical Athens', *Classical Quarterly*, 39, pp. 22–44.
- Fredal, J. (2017) 'The Enthymizing of Lysias', *Advances in the History of Rhetoric*, 20(1), pp. 1–27.
- Fredal, J. (2020) *The Enthymeme: Syllogism, Reasoning, and Narrative in Ancient Greek Narrative*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Fühner, T. (2018) 'Discourse particles in Greek drama: interaction, stance, and dialogic structure', *Glotta* 94, pp. 45–92.
- Gagarin, M. (2002) *Antiphon the Athenian: Oratory, Law, and Justice in the Age of the Sophists*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Gagarin, M. (2024) 'Nonverbal Communication in Athenian Forensic Oratory', in Serafim, A. and Papaioannou, S. (eds.) *Nonverbal Behaviour in Ancient Literature: Athenian Dialogues III*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 139–150.

- Goldberg, M.Y. (1999) 'Spatial and behavioural negotiation in Classical Athenian city houses', in Allison, P.M. (ed.) *The Archaeology of Household Activities*. London: Routledge, pp. 142–161.
- Hansen, M.H. (1991) *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Harris, E.M. (2013) 'Adultery and the Law in Classical Athens', in *The Rule of Law in Action in Democratic Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 205–223.
- Jameson, M.H. (1990a) 'Domestic Space in the Greek City–State', in Kent, S. (ed.) *Domestic Architecture and the Use of Space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 92–113.
- Jameson, M.H. (1990b) 'Private Space and the Greek City', in Murray, O. and Price, S. (eds.) *The Greek City*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 171–195.
- Johnstone, C. (1999) *Disputes and Democracy*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Kapparis, K. (1999) *Apollodoros Against Neaira (Demosthenes 59)*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.
- Kerr, D. M. (2019) *Gods, Ghosts and Newlyweds: Exploring the Uses of the Threshold in Greek and Roman Superstition and Folklore*. PhD thesis. University of Birmingham.
- Kurland, M. (2019) *Ideology and Argumentation in the Speeches of Lysias*. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley.
- Lamb, W.R.M. (1930) *Lysias*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lanni, A. (1999) 'Precedent and Legal Reasoning in Classical Athenian Courts: A Noble Lie?', *American Journal of Legal History*, 43(1), pp. 27–51.
- MacDowell, D.M. (1978) *The Law in Classical Athens*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Mirhady, D. (2005) 'Procedure in the Athenian Courts', in Gagarin, M. and Cohen, D. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 112–128.
- Morgan, J.E. (2007) 'Space and the notion of final frontier: searching for ritual boundaries in the Classical Athenian home', *Kernos*, 20, pp. 113–129.
- Nevett, L. (1999) *House and Society in the Ancient Greek World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ober, J. (1989) *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- O'Connell, P.A. (2017) 'Enargeia, persuasion, and the vividness effect in Athenian forensic oratory', *Advances in the History of Rhetoric*, 20(3), pp. 225–251.

- Scafuro, A.C. (2015) 'Greek sexual offences and their remedies', in Gagarin, M. and Cohen, D. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 121–142.
- Sicking, C.M.J. and van Ophuijsen, J.M. (eds) (1993) *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage: Lysias and Plato*. Leiden: Brill.
- Steadman, G. (2016) *Lysias 1 and Plato's Crito*. Dunstable: Steadman.
- Todd, S.C. (2007) *A Commentary on Lysias: Speeches I–II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Usher, S. (1999) *Greek Oratory: Tradition and Originality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Emde Boas, E. (2022) 'Mind Style, Cognitive Stylistics, and Ēthopoia in Lysias', *Trends in Classics*, 14(2), pp. 233–254.
- Viidebaum, L. (2021) 'Lysias in Athens', in A. Kapellos (ed.) *Creating the Ancient Rhetorical Tradition*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 19–31.
- Wakker, G.C. (1997) 'Conditional and Causal Particles', in Rijksbaron, A. (ed.) *New Approaches to Greek Particles*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, pp. 229–257.
- Wakker, G.C. (2009) 'Greek Particles in Legal Argumentation', *Mnemosyne*, 62(4), pp. 534–556.
- Webb, R. (2019) 'As if you were there: Enargeia and spatiality in Lysias 1', in *Forensic Narratives in Athenian Courts*. London: Routledge, pp. 157–169.
- Winkler, John J. (1990) *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York: Routledge.
- Wohl, V. (2010) *Law's Cosmos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolpert, A. (2001) 'Lysias 1 and the Politics of the Oikos', *Classical Journal*, 96(4), pp. 415–424.
- Worthington, I. (1994) *Demosthenes: Statesman and Orator*. London and New York: Routledge.