

# Notes on “On the Murder of Eratosthenes: Defense” 10-20-08

## Passages of Interests

- House divided between Males & Females - U-4
- Kills Pimp – U-5
- Wife has child – U-3
- Wife talks about maid – U-3
- City laws – U-5
- Calls witnesses – U-6
- Encouraging thieves – U-6

## Discussion

Was this murder justified?

Instead of taking money, he killed him, but was the murder predetermined?

See this in our justice system today. Harder on pre-meditated murder than a crime of passion.

The family believed that he told the maid to fetch the adulterer and him and his friend planned it. However he pleads this is not the case.

He was more upset that the man was in his house, not the fact his wife was cheating on him.

He felt he was doing a favor to society by killing him.

Since law says you can kill him, it is not taking the law into your own hands, but following the laws already set forth.

Could have taken money, but instead killed the man.

Why would he kill instead of taking the money?

- Take it to the next extreme.
- Felt like a bribe. The man could just do it more. If you kill him, end of problem.

He kept a close watch on his wife until she had a child. It seemed like he needed to assert control and show everyone that she was his wife, until he had a kid, then the child is a proof.

Why two different punishments? Leaves room for interpretation.

Not many people know what the laws of the land are because they have so much trouble finding information on this.

The maid really had no choice. She had to obey her master.

Crazy that he had so much power over the maid. It's like she is a slave. She was told to either tell the truth or be beaten.

Seems he's putting all the blame on the adulterer. None goes to the wife. She will probably never be blamed because women are "easily corrupted".

He's appearing to be as specific as he can as to prove that he had not actually pre-meditated the murder.

Now that he knows his wife has slept with another man, possibility that they are not his. Also, there is a possibility that she will neglect the children more.

At the end, he justifies it by saying that it was "for the city". Brought up valued points.

Excellent testimony. Eloquent. Would declare innocent.

Judicial systems now and then were similar, yet far apart. Orated and witnesses called.

Was there anything else to describing the home? What are we supposed to take from this?

- Shows where they are located. Shows why it was so easy to sneak in.

Justifies killing by saying it wasn't him who was going to punish him, but instead, the city was going to punish the adulterer.

If you walk into a room and catch your wife committing adultery, do you go into a long Shakespearean soliloquy, or do you just kill him?

- Most likely the second

No for a fact he is guilty, what about the speech is made up?

- Pre-meditation. He went around and pulled people out of the bed.
- Covered up about his friend. They had indeed planned to kill him.

If women don't have an opportunity to meet new guys, is adultery really a problem?

- No, not really.
- That is why blame is put more on man. He had to actively pursue her.