



**HAL**  
open science

## Herodotus 1.66 And Demosthenes 19.231: The Case Against *Ευθηνεομαι* / *Ευθενεομαι*

David-Artur Daix

► **To cite this version:**

David-Artur Daix. Herodotus 1.66 And Demosthenes 19.231: The Case Against *Ευθηνεομαι* / *Ευθενεομαι*. *Classical Quarterly*, 2020, pp.1-10. 10.1017/S0009838820000269 . hal-02555466

**HAL Id: hal-02555466**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02555466>**

Submitted on 27 Apr 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0  
International License

HERODOTUS 1.66 AND DEMOSTHENES 19.231:  
THE CASE AGAINST ΕΥΘΗΝΕΟΜΑΙ/ΕΥΘΕΝΕΟΜΑΙ\*

David-Artur Daix, *The Classical Quarterly*, Volume 70, May 2020, pp. 1–10, accepted version  
doi:10.1017/S0009838820000269

In Demosthenes' speech *On the False Embassy* (oration 19), we read an obelized infinitive at §231, †εὐθενεῖσθαι†, 'to be flourishing', in an imaginary dialogue designed to captivate and persuade the judges through its striking antitheses and dramatic tone:<sup>1</sup>

- τί οὖν μετὰ ταῦτα;
- Ἀθηναῖοι λαβόντες – ἤδεσαν μὲν γὰρ πάλαι —
- τί δέ;
- τοὺς μὲν χρήματ' εἰληφότας καὶ δῶρα καὶ καταισχύναντας ἑαυτούς, τὴν πόλιν, τοὺς ἑαυτῶν παῖδας, ἀφεῖσαν καὶ νοῦν ἔχειν ἠγοῦντο καὶ τὴν πόλιν †εὐθενεῖσθαι† —
- τὸν δὲ κατηγοροῦντα τί;
- ἐμβεβροντῆσθαι, τὴν πόλιν ἀγνοεῖν, οὐκ ἔχειν ὅποι τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ρίπτῃ.
- And then what?
- The Athenians got hold of them – in fact they'd known for quite a while...
- Well?
- Those who really had taken money and bribes and shamed themselves, the city, their own children, they let off! Those men were prudent, they thought, and the city †was flourishing†...
- And what of their accuser?
- They thought he was nuts, didn't understand the city, and didn't know what to throw his money at!

This athetisation brings into question the only other recorded mediopassive<sup>2</sup> use of the verb εὐθηνέω (Ionic)/εὐθενέω (Attic) by a classical author, the passive aorist indicative εὐθηνήθησαν/εὐθενήθησαν in Herodotus' *Histories* at 1.66.1:

οὕτω μὲν μεταβαλόντες εὐνομήθησαν, τῷ δὲ Λυκούργῳ τελευτήσαντι ἱρὸν εισάμενοι σέβονται μεγάλως. οἷα δὲ ἔν τε χώρῃ ἀγαθῇ καὶ πλήθει οὐκ ὀλίγῳ ἀνδρῶν, ἀνά τε ἔδραμον αὐτίκα καὶ εὐθενήθησαν.

---

\* I would like to thank the anonymous referee, whose comments have been very useful, as well as M. Trédé, C. Hunzinger, S. Gotteland, D. Petit, J. Yvonneau, M. Rashed, R. Hancock and P. Finglass for their help and advice. The place of publication of editions of ancient authors that belong to the series Bibliotheca Teubneriana (Leipzig), Oxford Classical Texts (Oxford), Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.) and Collection des Universités de France, Les Belles Lettres (Paris) is referred to in the footnotes with the acronyms BT, OCT, LCL and CUF respectively.

<sup>1</sup> On my theatrical arrangement of the text, cf. L. Pernot, 'Un rendez-vous manqué', *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 11 (1993), 421–34, at 427–8; V. Bers, *Speech in Speech: Studies in Incorporated Oratio Recta in Attic Drama and Oratory* (Lanham, 1997), 195–6; P. Chiron, 'Le dialogue entre dialogue et rhétorique', *Ktèma* 28 (2003), 155–181, at 177–81; S. Gotteland, 'Du discours au dialogue: Démosthène et ses interlocuteurs fictifs' in S. Dubel & S. Gotteland (edd.), *Formes et genres du dialogue antique* (Pessac, 2015), 87–106 (with bibliography); and n. 32 below.

<sup>2</sup> According to LSJ s.v. εὐθενέω and εὐθηνέω, both εὐθενεῖσθαι and εὐθηνήθησαν are passive in form and sense. But according to A. Bailly, *Dictionnaire Grec-Français*, rev. P. Chantraine (Paris, 2000<sup>4</sup>), s.v. εὐθηνέω-ῶ (hereafter Bailly), they are used in the middle voice, the aorist εὐθηνήθησαν being passive only in form, probably to account for the problematic fact that the mediopassive sense and construction of this stative verb are supposed to be identical to the regular active and intransitive ones (see also nn. 12 and 19).

Having thus changed their institutions, the Lacedaemonians were ruled by good laws, and when Lycurgus died, they built him a shrine and greatly revere him. And as they had good land and many men, they progressed at once and flourished.

This article makes a case against both examples of εὐθηνέομαι/εὐθενέομαι in extant classical Greek literature and suggests emendations which correct the misspelling in εὐθηνήθησαν/εὐθενήθησαν and provide a suitable replacement for †εὐθενεῖσθαι†.

#### EYΘHNEΩ/EYΘENEΩ

The verb εὐθηνέω/εὐθενέω is very rare. In addition to the only known example in archaic poetry, *Hom. Hymn* 30.10 (εὐθηνεῖ), before Aristotle, there are only ten occurrences of the word:<sup>3</sup> three in Herodotus' *Histories* (εὐθενήθησαν, 1.66.1; εὐθηνέειν, 2.91.3 and 2.124.1),<sup>4</sup> two in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* (εὐθενοῦντα, 908 and 943), two in Hippocratic texts (εὐθηνέειν, *Aer.* 12; εὐθηνεῖ, *Epid.* 6.4.20), one in Pseudo-Xenophon's *Constitution of the Athenians* (εὐθηνούσης/εὐθενούσης at 2.6)<sup>5</sup> and two in Demosthenes' speeches (εὐθενεῖν, 8.20; εὐθενοῦντων, 18.286), excluding the obelized infinitive at Dem. 19.231.

Yet Herodotus does use it three times. And so does Demosthenes at least twice. However, in their works, except for εὐθενήθησαν and †εὐθενεῖσθαι†, the other four occurrences of the verb, which are irreproachable, are all in the active voice. In fact, in archaic and classical Greek literature, except for those two mediopassive forms, the meaning of which is identical to their active equivalents, all the other instances of the verb – twenty-nine in total (94%), including nineteen in Aristotle – are active.

The spelling of the verb is also an issue. LSJ divides it into two different entries: Ionic εὐθηνέω should be used in Homer, Herodotus, Pseudo-Xenophon and Hippocrates; Attic εὐθενέω in Aeschylus, Demosthenes and Aristotle. Bailly and Chantraine reach the same conclusions.<sup>6</sup> However, editors have not always made choices that match those recommendations.<sup>7</sup> In Herodotus' *Histories*, both Hude and Legrand use εὐθενήθησαν at 1.66.1 and εὐθενέειν at 2.91.3 and 2.124.1,<sup>8</sup> and Rosén and Wilson still write εὐθενήθησαν at 1.66.1 (see n. 4 above). In Dem. 19.231, from the *editio princeps* (1504) till Dobson's edition (1828),

---

<sup>3</sup> See the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*: TLG® Digital Library, ed. M.C. Pantelia, University of California, Irvine, <http://www.tlg.uci.edu> (hereafter TLG).

<sup>4</sup> See H.B. Rosén, *Herodoti Historiae* (BT, 1987), 1.42, 1.191, 1.217; N.G. Wilson, *Herodoti Historiae* (OCT, 2015), 1.37, 1.176, 1.200.

<sup>5</sup> For the manuscripts' εὐθηνούσης, see L. Dindorf, *Xenophontis scripta minora* (BT, 1863<sup>2</sup>), 194; D. Lenfant, *Pseudo-Xénophon: Constitution des Athéniens* (CUF, 2017), 11, and 113 *ad loc.* n. 1. For the correction εὐθενούσης, see L. Dindorf, *Xenophontis opuscula* (Oxford, 1866), 52; E.C. Marchant, *Xenophontis Opera Omnia* (OCT, 1920), 5.228; G.W. Bowersock, *Pseudo-Xenophon: Constitution of the Athenians* (LCL, 1968), 7.490.

<sup>6</sup> See P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris, 1999<sup>2</sup>), s.v. εὐθενέω (hereafter Chantraine). The etymology of the verb is uncertain: see also R. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leiden, 2010), s.v. εὐθενέω.

<sup>7</sup> See n. 5 above. In Aristotle, the TLG reports only one occurrence with the Attic spelling (*Mete.* 352a: εὐθενεῖ) and eighteen with the Ionic spelling, dominant in the *koinē* (see n. 26 below).

<sup>8</sup> K. Hude, *Herodoti Historiae* (OCT, 1928<sup>3</sup>), Vol. 1, *ad loc.*; P.-E. Legrand, *Hérodote: Enquêtes* (CUF, 1930–55), 1.70, 2.124, 2.153. About Attic and false Ionic forms in Herodotus, see A.M. Bowie '7. Language and dialect' in A.M. Bowie, *Herodotus: Histories Book VIII* (Cambridge, 2007), 22–7, at 22–3.

the verb was spelled εὐθηνεῖσθαι:<sup>9</sup> it is only around 1840, starting with Baiter's and Sauppe's *Oratores Attici*, that εὐθενεῖσθαι, attested in the best manuscripts (SAFY),<sup>10</sup> has been used systematically.<sup>11</sup>

#### THE CASE AGAINST EYΘHNEOMAI/EYΘENEOMAI

Classically, whether spelled εὐθηνέω or εὐθενέω, this verb should behave like all the other similar contract verbs in -εω compounded with εὔ which denote a 'good' state of being, such as εὐδοξέω and εὐδοκιμέω ('to be well-regarded'), εὐδαιμονέω and εὐτυχέω ('to be fortunate'), εὐσεβέω ('to be pious'), etc. These stative verbs and their antonyms prefixed with ἀ-, δυσ- or κακο- (κακοθηνέω, ἀδοξέω, κακοδοξέω, κακοδαιμονέω, ἀτυχέω, δυστυχέω, ἀσεβέω, δυσσεβέω, etc.) are all denominatives of adjectives, which determine their meaning, and are used almost exclusively in the active voice – virtually never in the middle voice,<sup>12</sup> very rarely in the passive one – and not only intransitively but absolutely.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, as a rule, these verbs have 'persons' as their subject, because, properly, only persons can have good or bad luck, be devout or impious, etc. 'Things', on the other hand, are usually their cognate accusative in the active voice or their subject in the very rare cases when they are used in the passive voice.<sup>14</sup>

In that regard, the verb εὐθηνέω/εὐθενέω looks like an exception, because not only animals, plants and men can be flourishing, but 'things' too – lands and cities in particular, but also events, for instance in Demosthenes:

ἃ γὰρ εὐθενούντων τῶν πραγμάτων ἤρνεϊσθε διομνύμενοι, ταῦτ' ἐν οἷς ἔπταισεν ἡ πόλις ὠμολογήσατε.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Manutius, Lambin, Wolf, Reiske, Schaefer, Bekker (Oxford, 1823 & Berlin, 1824), Dobson.

<sup>10</sup> S (Paris, gr. 2934), f. 223v; A (Munich, gr. 485), f. 200v; F (Venice, gr. 416), f. 103v; Y (Paris, gr. 2935), f. 172v. On their merit and importance, see M.R. Dilts, *Demosthenis Orationes* (OCT, 2002), 1.xiv-xvii; and 1.xxxi for the *conspectus siglorum*.

<sup>11</sup> Baiter & Sauppe, Voemel (Paris, 1843 & BT, 1862), Shilleto, Dindorf, Bekker (Leipzig, 1854), Whiston, Heslop, Blass; as well as Weil, *Les Plaidoyers politiques de Démosthène* (Paris, 1883<sup>2</sup>), 1.337; S.H. Butcher, *Demosthenis Orationes* (OCT, 1903), 1.412–13, *ad loc.*; K. Fuhr, *Demosthenis Orationes* (BT, 1914), 1.3.489; G. Mathieu, *Démosthène : Plaidoyers politiques* (CUF, 1946), 3.95; D.M. MacDowell, *Demosthenes: On the False Embassy (Oration 19)* (Oxford, 2000), 154; M.R. Dilts, *Demosthenis Orationes* (OCT, 2005), 2.74.

<sup>12</sup> Excluding εὐλαβέομαι, 'to be cautious', which is always middle, often transitive, and used as a verb of fearing, the sole exception is found at Eur. *Med.* 91 where we read the middle – so LSJ and Bailly – present participle δυσθυμουμένη. However, the atypical passive usage of εὐθυμέομαι (see n. 18 below) makes a passive form much more likely here (see also Bailly's mistake about εὐπορέομαι: n. 19 below).

<sup>13</sup> A notable exception are the verbs meaning 'to do anything to' (εὐεργετέω, κακουργέω, κακοποιέω: cf. εὖ/κακῶς ποιέω) or 'say anything of' (εὐλογέω, κακηγορέω, κακολογέω: cf. εὖ/κακῶς λέγω) a person, which are also used transitively. Chantraine s.v. δίκη asserts that ἀδικέω has been derived 'accidentellement' from δικέω and δίκησις (i.e. not from ἄδικος), but ἀδικέω behaves just like its antonym εὐεργετέω: intransitive, it means 'to be unjust' (cf. 'to be a benefactor'); transitive, 'to wrong' with accusative of person (cf. 'to do a kindness to one'); and passive, with the 'victim' as its subject, 'to be wronged' (cf. 'to have a kindness done one'). See H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, MA, 1920), §1591 (hereafter Smyth); R. Kühner & B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache: Satzlehre* (Hannover, 1898), 2.1.295, at §409, A.a.2 (hereafter K.–G.).

<sup>14</sup> See Smyth §§1573, 1749; W.W. Goodwin, *Greek Grammar* (London, 1892), §1240 (hereafter Goodwin; only 'things' can be cognate accusatives: see §§1051–4).

<sup>15</sup> Dem. 18.286. This antithetical sentence, by contrasting εὐθενέω and ἡ πόλις, brings them together and makes the reading τὴν πόλιν †εὐθενεῖσθαι† at 19.231 look deceptively appealing.

In fact, what you denied under oath when the situation was flourishing, you then admitted when the city stumbled.

However, even there synecdoche is at work, so that happy turns of events actually represent the *city's* successes, as opposed to its failures, which in turn means that the *Athenians* are thriving, or not.

Keeping those few points in mind, if the mediopassive εὐθηνήθησαν/εὐθενήθησαν and †εὐθενεῖσθαι† are construed as middle (Bailly), they are virtually unique in classical Greek (n. 12 above), which seems very unlikely. And if they are construed as passive instead (LSJ), excluding the verbs listed in n. 13 above, as well as εὐνομέομαι: ‘to be ruled by good laws’, which functions exclusively as a passive verb,<sup>16</sup> there are very few potential classical parallels, none of which, in the end, explain their use by Herodotus and Demosthenes.

First, there are six unusual passive occurrences of ἄδοξέομαι,<sup>17</sup> εὐθυμέομαι<sup>18</sup> and εὐπορέομαι,<sup>19</sup> which are not related to the regular active and intransitive usage of those verbs but are categorized by both Bailly and LSJ as an uncommon transitive use. Here, exceptionally, ἄδοξέω means ‘to hold in ill esteem’ (Josephus, Plutarch), εὐθυμέω ‘to cheer’ (Aeschylus, Democritus), and εὐπορέω ‘to supply’ (Hippocrates, Isaeus, Demosthenes, Diodorus Siculus). That is why this rare passive usage produces the same meaning as the regular active and intransitive one (‘to be in ill repute’, ‘to be of good cheer’, ‘to be prosperous’) and becomes frequent in late antique writers, as sense and voice now seem to agree.<sup>20</sup> However, it cannot explain the two mediopassive forms of εὐθηνέω/εὐθενέω since that verb, even though its active and passive senses are supposed to be identical, is never used transitively.

Second, there are thirteen passive voice examples, all of which involve the same five frequent verbs based on just two stems: εὐτυχέω (1), δυστυχέω (2), ἀτυχέω (1), εὐσεβέω (1)<sup>21</sup> and ἄσεβέω (8). Aside from the fact that εὐθηνέω/εὐθενέω is infrequent and unrelated to either group, in eleven of those cases,<sup>22</sup> the subjects designate things, not persons, since most would be cognate accusatives in the active voice (see n. 14 above). Therefore, these examples do not apply, both because in Hdt. 1.66.1 and by synecdoche in Dem. 19.231 the subjects are persons, and because the change of subject and construction ensures that the passive meaning of the verbs is different from the regular active meaning. As for the two exceptions, where persons are still the subjects in the passive constructions, they are not suitable parallels either since, just

---

<sup>16</sup> The sole active form is dubious: Ast reads εὐνομος οὐσα rather than εὐνομοῦσα at Pl. *Leg.* 927b. See Bailly s.v. εὐνομέω-ῶ (LSJ does not list the active verb).

<sup>17</sup> Xen. *Oec.* 4.2.4.

<sup>18</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.36; *Cyr.* 4.1.19; Arist. *Rh.* 1379b18.

<sup>19</sup> Arist. [*Oec.*] 1347b4, misinterpreted as middle by Bailly s.v. II; 1348a2.

<sup>20</sup> The TLG lists eighty instances of εὐπορέομαι after the first century A.D. See also n. 26 below.

<sup>21</sup> Εὐσεβηθῆ in Pl. [*Ax.*] 364c is not classical.

<sup>22</sup> Thuc. 7.77.3; [Lys.] 2.70, 6.5, 6.6; Andoc. 1.1, 1.71; Pl. *Leg.* 877e; Aeschin. *In Ctes.* 221; Dem. *De Cor.* 212; [Dem.] 59.74. Six examples are neuter passive participles, common ‘in the case of verbs ordinarily intransitive but allowing a cognate accusative in the active’ (Smyth): see n. 14 above. Six involve the passive perfect of ἄσεβέω. And six contain an agent (four include ἡσέβηται/τὰ ἡσεβημένα), which would be the subject in the active. The example in Pl. *Leg.* 877e is exceptional because the subject τις τῶν οἴκων would be an *external* object in the active: ἄσεβηθῆ, combined with δυστυχηθῆ in an hendiadys, makes the estate the unfortunate victim of its owner’s sins (cf. [Lys.] 2.7 below and in the active voice with accusative of thing, Pl. *Leg.* 941a, misclassified by LSJ: see K.–G. 2.1.293, at §409, A.a.1).

like in the other eleven examples, the passive and the active senses of the verbs cannot remain the same. In Ps.-Lys. 2.7, ἀσεβεῖσθαι mimics ἀδικεῖσθαι, and the gods are the ‘victims’ of sacrilege: in the corresponding active construction, which is also exceedingly rare, ἀσεβέω would be used transitively as a dynamic verb and would mean not ‘to *be* impious’ but ‘to *treat* impiously’.<sup>23</sup> And in Antiph. 2.3.11, the sentence is very strained, and the passive present potential optative εὐσεβοῖντ’ ἄν, though accepted as such by Gernet and by Dilts and Murphy,<sup>24</sup> is obelized by Maidment because it cannot be understood by using ἀσεβεῖσθαι in Pseudo-Lysias as a model.<sup>25</sup>

In short, εὐθηνήθησαν/εὐθενήθησαν and †εὐθενεῖσθαι† are uniquely problematic. Instead of being modified by the atypical use of the passive voice, the meaning they convey and the nature of their subjects are exactly the same as they would be with εὐθηνέω/εὐθενέω in the active voice, so that these two mediopassive forms are not only unparalleled but serve no purpose. Herodotus and Demosthenes, each of whom, despite its rarity, employed this verb twice in the active voice and absolutely, in accordance with its normal usage, had no reason to use it in such a distinctively irregular and gratuitous manner. Therefore, even though copyists and editors have not reacted to their erroneous nature before,<sup>26</sup> both mediopassive forms, rather than being unique, are merely barbarisms that must be emended.

#### HERODOTUS 1.66.1

In Hdt. 1.66.1, the Attic spelling εὐθενήθησαν is found in A, the best manuscript, especially in Book 1,<sup>27</sup> while the Ionic spelling εὐθηνήθησαν is read in B, which Wilson lists among the ‘rarius citantur’ in his edition.<sup>28</sup> Accordingly, Hude, Legrand, Rosén and Wilson write εὐθενήθησαν, while only Rosén and Wilson switch to the Ionic spelling εὐθηνέειν at 2.91.3 and 2.124.1 (see nn. 4 and 8 above), which is what A itself does (ff. 76v and 86v), this time concurring with B (ff. 68r and 78r). Sleeman and Godley, on the other hand, prefer to follow B in 1.66.1, where they write εὐθηνήθησαν, and Godley also uses εὐθηνέειν at 2.91.3 and 2.124.1,<sup>29</sup> thus avoiding the inconsistencies in A and agreeing with LSJ, Bailly and Chantraine: in Herodotus, one should read the Ionic forms of the verb.

<sup>23</sup> The only classical occurrence c. acc. pers. is at Aesch. *Eum.* 271 (lyr.). See Smyth §1558, as well as n. 13 above about ἀδικέω. When intransitive, ἀσεβέω, εὐσεβέω and ἀδικέω behave in the same way (εἴς, πρὸς or περὶ τινα): K.–G. 2.1.294, at §409, Anmerk.1.δ-ε; see also Smyth §1592.

<sup>24</sup> See L. Gernet, *Discours & Fragments d’Antiphon le Sophiste* (CUF, 1923), 81; M.R. Dilts & D.J. Murphy, *Antiphontis et Andocidis Orationes* (OCT, 2018), 42.

<sup>25</sup> K.J. Maidment, *Minor Attic Orators* (LCL, 1941), 1.106, n. a: ‘Verba εὐσεβοῖντ’ ἄν ut corrupta obelis inclusi’; and n. 1: ‘εὐσεβοῖντ’ ἄν could only mean “would be revered”; and that clearly gives an impossible meaning to the passage.’

<sup>26</sup> According to the TLG, until the first century A.D., there are sixty occurrences of εὐθηνέω/εὐθενέω, only three of which are mediopassive (5%). After that date, though, the verb becomes much more common in both the active (about 275 instances) and the mediopassive voices (180 instances: 35%), which could explain how copyists may have become inured to this usage (the Ionic spelling is pervasive: almost 415 examples).

<sup>27</sup> A (Florence, plut 70.3), f. 16v. See Wilson (n. 4), ix: A ‘is often rated the best manuscript overall, and certainly in Book 1, if not elsewhere, its superiority is evident’; and 2 for the *conspectus siglorum*.

<sup>28</sup> Wilson (n. 4), ix: B (Rome, Ang. gr. 83), f. 13r.

<sup>29</sup> J.H. Sleeman, *Herodotus: Histories I* (Cambridge, 1909), 41; A.D. Godley, *Herodotus: The Persian Wars* (LCL, 1926), 1.76, 1.374, 1.424.

However, eliminating the misspelling in the passive aorist indicative εὐθενήθησαν/εὐθηνήθησαν is not simply a matter of choosing between the Ionic and the Attic forms, but of suggesting a convincing emendation that is consistent with the two instances of εὐθηνέειν in Book 2, namely the regular Ionic *active* aorist indicative εὐθήνησαν.

Palaeographically, this ancient corruption, which is certainly present in the ‘archetype’ from which our manuscripts are descended,<sup>30</sup> is easily explained when one considers the following: the close proximity of εὐνομήθησαν at the very beginning of Hdt. 1.66.1, which is the aorist indicative of εὐνομέομαι, a verb used only in the passive voice (see n. 16 above) but otherwise very similar to stative verbs like εὐθηνέω; the ‘η’, and even the ‘θη’, alliteration omnipresent in the Ionic form εὐθηνήθησαν (if it were not the regular passive suffix, the repeated syllable ‘θη’ could look like a dittography); the fact that this stative verb’s active and passive senses and constructions are supposed to be identical; and, last, its rarity, which makes it an easy prey for textual corruption.

### DEMOSTHENES 19.231: THE PROBLEM

In Dem. 19.231, the corruption is also very ancient and τὴν πόλιν εὐθηνεῖσθαι/εὐθενεῖσθαι has been the accepted reading for centuries.<sup>31</sup>

Weil, however, pointed out that using εὐθενεῖσθαι – which he did not *athetise* – with τὴν πόλιν as its subject in the context of 19.231 is problematic because it weakens the effect of the paratactic antithesis upon which that passage is built. Starting at 19.229 (Ἀθήνηθεν κτλ.), Demosthenes uses two of his favourite figures of speech, which he likes to combine for dramatic effect: hypophora and dialogism,<sup>32</sup> to strongly set his own behaviour as a generous, trustworthy and patriotic ambassador off against the behaviour of his avaricious and traitorous opponents: Philocrates, Phrynon and Aeschines. Sections 19.229–30 rely on a recurring and alternating adversative parataxis which Demosthenes hammers into his audience to create a brilliant example of ethopoeia: ὁ μὲν (Demosthenes) [...] ὁ δὲ (Philocrates) [...] ὁ μὲν (Phrynon) [...] ὁ δὲ (Demosthenes) [...] ὁ μὲν (Demosthenes) [...] ὁ δὲ (Aeschines).

At 19.231, the dialogue continues, and the paratactic antithesis now juxtaposes τοὺς μὲν χρήματ’ εἰληφότας, ‘those who have indeed taken money’, whom the Athenians chose to trust, with ‘their accuser’, τὸν δὲ κατηγοροῦντα, who, in their view, ‘did not understand the city’: τὴν

---

<sup>30</sup> Bowie (n. 8), 22.

<sup>31</sup> See nn. 9, 10 and 11 above.

<sup>32</sup> As a figure of speech, hypophora consists in ‘supposing’ (ὑποφέρω, ὑποβάλλω, ὑποτίθημι) an anticipated objection or suggestion (§229: τίς ἔσται λόγος περὶ ὑμῶν) which one places on the lips of an interlocutor, usually one’s opponent, but sometimes a third party, or even oneself, in order to immediately reply – and often lay waste – to it. Thus, hypophora shares much with procatalepsis and usually comes in the form of a sequence of short questions and answers which Demosthenes often turns into an imaginary dialogue, i.e. the figure called dialogism. See n. 1 above, as well as Tiberius, *De figuris Demosthenicis*, §§19, 39; [Longinus], *Subl.* 18.1 on Dem. 4.10–11; J.D Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1950<sup>2</sup>), s.v. Ἀλλά, I.3.iii, 8–9, and II.1.iv, 10–11; G. Ronnet, *Étude sur le style de Démosthène dans les discours politiques* (Paris, 1951), 122–31; S. Usher *Demosthenes: On the Crown* (Warminster, 1993), 25, 180–1, 273; H. Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric* (Leiden, 1998), 341–3 (‘*subiectio*’); MacDowell (n. 11), 29, 295, and *Demosthenes the Orator* (Oxford, 2009), 404–5; C. Wooten, *A Commentary on Demosthenes’ Philippic I* (Oxford, 2008), 63–4; D.-A. Daix & M. Fernandez, *Démosthène : Contre Aphobos I & II, Contre Midias* (Paris, 2017), xxxv (with n. 98) and 85 (with n. 205); J. Herrman, *Demosthenes: Selected Political Speeches* (Cambridge, 2019), 18.

πόλιν ἀγνοεῖν. Because this clause is perfectly parallel to τὴν πόλιν εὐθeneῖσθαι, Weil believes that εὐθeneῖσθαι must be wrong since the change of subject from the corrupt officials who ‘were prudent’, νοῦν ἔχειν, to the city which ‘was flourishing’, εὐθeneῖσθαι, undermines the antithesis unacceptably: the city’s prosperity is not a proper foil for the accuser’s supposed cluelessness.<sup>33</sup> The expression should mean instead, according to Weil, with Aeschines and his accomplices as its subject, that they knew their city very well: he suggests εὖ σταθμαῖσθαι or εὖ συννοῆσαι;<sup>34</sup> or, according to MacDowell, who agrees with Weil’s objection, that they had done the city a favour: εὖ ποιῆσαι or εὐεργετῆσαι.<sup>35</sup>

#### DEMOSTHENES 19.231: VARIANTS & CONJECTURES

Butcher was the first to obelise †εὐθeneῖσθαι† in his edition (1903) and, even if Fuhr and Mathieu did not follow his lead, both MacDowell and Dilts have athetized the word once and for all (though not on morphological grounds).<sup>36</sup>

In addition to the Ionic spelling εὐθeneῖσθαι written in the manuscripts L and P,<sup>37</sup> which is incorrect in Demosthenes and does not solve anything, there are two other variants found at 19.231. In A<sup>2</sup>, one reads εὐσθeneῖσθαι [sic] for εὐσθeneῖσθαι,<sup>38</sup> but εὐσθενέω is even rarer than εὐθενέω,<sup>39</sup> nearly its synonym, and belongs to the same group of stative verbs, so that this correction is entirely unsuitable. In O, one reads εὐθuneῖσθαι,<sup>40</sup> a nice palaeographical solution adopted by Wolf in his second edition (1604)<sup>41</sup> but morphologically very difficult to accept because it can only be a middle future infinitive, whereas εὐθύνω is only used in the active voice.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, the verb is mainly poetic and quoted twice by Demosthenes himself a little later in his oration when a speech from Sophocles’ *Antigone* (175–90) and one of Solon’s elegies are read to the judges.<sup>43</sup> Although these echoes make εὐθuneῖσθαι look like a clever correction, it is actually wholly unconvincing, coming *before* the poetic quotes in which the verb occurs in the *active* voice, as expected. Last, the technical use of εὐθύνω in Athens, where it means subjecting an official to an audit, with the city as its subject, the corrupt ambassadors as its object and the verb used extraordinarily in the middle voice, while it would successfully

<sup>33</sup> Weil (n. 11), n. about lines 6–8: ‘Καὶ τὴν πόλιν εὐθeneῖσθαι, et que la cité prospérait. Mais il ne s’agit pas de cela, et le changement de sujet est très choquant. Il faudrait quelque chose qui fit antithèse à τὴν πόλιν ἀγνοεῖν.’

<sup>34</sup> Weil (n. 11), ‘note critique’ on line 8.

<sup>35</sup> MacDowell (n. 11), 154; and 299, at §231, s.v. εὐθeneῖσθαι: ‘What is required is a verb giving the sense that Ais. and his friends are patriotic.’

<sup>36</sup> See Butcher, Fuhr, Mathieu, MacDowell and Dilts (n. 11). Like Fuhr and Mathieu, J.H. & C.A. Vince *Demosthenes: Orations 18–19* (LCL, 1939<sup>2</sup>), 2.392–3, and H. Yunis, *Demosthenes: Speeches 18–19* (Austin, 2005), 182, accept εὐθeneῖσθαι and translate the text accordingly. As does T. Paulsen, *Die Paraprosbeia-Reden des Demosthenes und des Aischines* (Trier, 1999), 233, who merely finds it ‘surprising’ (‘D. ist oft für überraschende Wendungen gut’).

<sup>37</sup> L (Florence, conv. sopp 136); P (Florence, plut 59.9), f. 27v; see Dilts (n. 10).

<sup>38</sup> Dilts (n. 10): A<sup>2</sup> (Munich, gr. 441).

<sup>39</sup> Before Aristotle, it is a *hapax legomenon*: Eur. *Cyc.* 2 (εὐσθένει).

<sup>40</sup> O (Brussels, 11294–5): see n. 10 above.

<sup>41</sup> H. Wolf, *Demosthenis et Aeschinis Opera* (Frankfurt, 1604), 328 (cf. εὐθeneῖσθαι in his original edition of 1572: see n. 9 above).

<sup>42</sup> The only passive example in Thuc. 1.95.5 hardly counts.

<sup>43</sup> See Dem. 19.247: Soph. *Ant.* 178 (ὅστις πᾶσαν εὐθύνων πόλιν κτλ.); and Dem. 19.255: Solon, fr. 4.36 (εὐθύνει δὲ δίκας σκολιάς).



involve Aeschines and his accomplices in the expression, would also ruin the meaning of the passage, since that is exactly how the accuser wishes the Athenians to proceed.<sup>44</sup>

As for conjectures, Weil's and MacDowell's have already been quoted above, and, according to MacDowell himself, 'none of these suggestions explains the corruption convincingly' (see n. 35 above). Hernández Muñoz proposed to read εὐνομεῖσθαι,<sup>45</sup> but it is passive and frequent, so that the venal officials are still not involved in the clause and the textual corruption not easily explained. The most interesting conjecture, however, comes from Madvig, who, following Weil's lead,<sup>46</sup> suggested εὖ διαθεῖναι with the officials as the subject: 'to dispose in a good way', which is exactly what is required, but which makes the corruption very hard to explain since εὖ διαθεῖναι is common and palaeographically quite different from †εὐθενεῖσθαι†. Madvig himself was well aware of those issues and would have read εὖ θέσθαι instead, which is much more convincing and very close to my own conjecture, had he not found the use of the middle voice less appropriate here because, in his opinion, it would mean that the subject sets things right for his own gain.<sup>47</sup>

#### DEMOSTHENES 19.231: THE SOLUTION?

Taking our cue from Weil's objection to †εὐθενεῖσθαι†, MacDowell's preferred meaning for the clause and Madvig's two suggestions: εὖ διαθεῖναι and εὖ θέσθαι, we can offer a conjecture which is palaeographically and morphologically sound, and which provides the requisite meaning so that the paratactic antithesis at work in 19.231 is fully restored. Here, one should read:

[...] νοῦν ἔχειν ἠγοῦντο καὶ τὴν πόλιν εὖ τεθεῖσθαι —

Those men were prudent, they thought, and had actually put the city in good order...

In Attic Greek, for the passive perfect indicative of τίθημι, one uses κείμεαι. But the middle perfect indicative τέθειμαι exists as well and is perfectly correct, though it is exceedingly rare and thus easily subject to textual corruption. In fact, if one excludes an example of the middle perfect infinitive τεθεῖσθαι in a fragment of Aristophanes,<sup>48</sup> Demosthenes is the only classical writer who makes use of the verb τίθημι in that tense and voice, which is unsurprising

---

<sup>44</sup> For those 'audits', called εὔθυναί, see Demosthenes' speech at §§2, 17, 69, 81–2, 104–9, 132, 182, 211, 223, 256, 273, 334–5; and MacDowell (n. 11), 15–20.

<sup>45</sup> F.G. Hernández Muñoz, 'Demosthenica', *CFC(G)* 16 (2006), 269–82, at 270. He only mentions Dem. 24.139, not Hdt. 1.66.1, to support his conjecture.

<sup>46</sup> See J.N. Madvig, *Adversariorum criticorum volumen tertium* (Copenhagen, 1884), 36, on 19.231: 'Non quaeritur, quid Athenienses de statu rei publicae iudicaverint, sed quid de illorum hominum rei publicae administratione. Itaque ubi scribitur εὐθενεῖσθαι, necessario requiritur activae significationis verbum ad illos homines pertinens, quemadmodum in altero membro omnia pertinent ad τὸν κατηγοροῦντα.'

<sup>47</sup> Madvig (n. 46), 36: 'Sententiae satisfacit καὶ τὴν πόλιν εὖ διαθεῖναι, litterarum vestigiis minus, ad quae propius accederet εὖ θέσθαι; sed id de rebus bene suo usui accommodandis dicitur, quod hoc loco minus aptum est.'

<sup>48</sup> See Poll. *Onom.* 9.36: Ἄμφοδον ἐχρῆν αὐτῷ τεθεῖσθαι τοῦνομα (see also *FCG*, 2.2.1083, fr.9; *CAF*, 1.478, fr.327). Cobet, however, preferred to read the middle present infinitive τίθεσθαι and is followed by F.W. Hall & W.M. Geldart, *Aristophanis comoediae* (OCT, 1907), 2.291, fr.327, and Kassel–Austin, *PCG*, 3.2.193, fr.342. In [Demades] *On the Twelve Years* 12, one reads the middle perfect participle τεθειμένους used as a passive form, contrary to Attic usage, but that work is not classical: see I. Worthington, 'The Context of [Demades] *On the Twelve Years*', *CQ* 41 (1991), 90–5, at 91 (with n. 12) and 95; J.O. Burt, *Minor Attic Orators* (LCL, 1954), 2.334.

considering his love for the perfect: it is one of the most distinctive traits of his style. In 21.49 and 39.40, he writes the middle perfect indicative: τέθεινται and τέθειται. And in 34.16, he uses the middle perfect infinitive of ἐντίθημι: ἐντεθειῖσθαι.

Moreover, palaeographically, εὔ τεθειῖσθαι (EYTEΘΕΙΣΘΑΙ) is very similar to †εὐθενεῖσθαι† (EYΘENEΙΣΘΑΙ), even more so than Madvig's εὔ θέσθαι. The number of letters remains exactly the same and there are only two minor differences: the Θ shifts position and Ν replaces Τ.

As for the meaning of the expression τὴν πόλιν εὔ τεθειῖσθαι, Madvig's reservations about the use of the middle voice are not justified since it is not as significant as he makes it out to be, especially when used in so general a statement.<sup>49</sup> In *Op.* 22–3, Hesiod mentions 'the rich man who hastens [...] to put his house in good order': οἶκον εὔ θέσθαι. Though the expression is poetic, its usage here is indistinguishable from the classical and prosaic one. Moreover, 'to put one's estate in good order' belongs to the same area of activity as 'to put one's city in good order' while showing the difference between the use of the middle voice to emphasize the subject's personal involvement in the management and prosperity of 'his own property' and its use in a more general utterance to note that the subject works to improve the lot of 'his city'. Most of all, if one translates οἶκον εὔ θέσθαι in Hesiod as Mazon does ('pour faire prospérer son bien'),<sup>50</sup> and then applies the same meaning to τὴν πόλιν εὔ θέσθαι ('to make one's city prosper'), one can see at once how †εὐθενεῖσθαι†: 'to be prosperous', with τὴν πόλιν as its subject, may be understood as the 'passive' equivalent of the middle perfect εὔ τεθειῖσθαι, which also denotes an achieved state: 'to have made prosperous', with τὴν πόλιν as its object. As a result, except for the disappearance of the corrupt officials from the construction, which is made easy by the word order, replacing τὴν πόλιν εὔ τεθειῖσθαι with τὴν πόλιν †εὐθενεῖσθαι† leaves the meaning of the passage unchanged: the city prospers.

In fact, given the rarity of the middle perfect τέθειμαι in classical Greek and, on the contrary, its frequency in late antique writers,<sup>51</sup> who often treat it as passive,<sup>52</sup> it would have been even easier to mistake εὔ τεθειῖσθαι for an erroneous post-classical passive perfect: 'to have been made prosperous'. In which case †εὐθενεῖσθαι† would certainly have looked like a clever 'correction' based on the apparent synonymy of the verbs, on their graphical similarity (the regular Attic passive perfect εὔ κείσθαι is markedly different), on the rarity of εὐθενέω (not to mention εὐθενέομαι), on its two irrefragable instances in Demosthenes' speeches

---

<sup>49</sup> See Goodwin §1244; Smyth §1728. For numerous examples with diverse objects, if not τὴν πόλιν, some personal (τὰ ἴδια, τὰ οἰκεῖα, τὰ αὐτοῦ πράγματα), some general (τὸ παρόν, τὰ πάντα, πάντα, τὸν πόλεμον), see: LSJ s.v. τίθημι, 'Med.', VII; Bailly s.v. τίθημι, 'Moy. τίθειμαι', III.1. Many are found in Thucydides' *Histories* (1.25, 1.31, 1.82, 4.17, 4.59, 4.61, 6.11, 8.84), which Demosthenes greatly admired: see L. Pernot, *L'Ombre du Tigre. Recherches sur la réception de Démosthène* (Naples, 2006), 222–3, with nn. 113–15; S. Gotteland, 'Conseiller et persuader: Quelques échos thucydidiens dans les harangues de Démosthène' in V. Fromentin, S. Gotteland, P. Payen (edd.), *Ombres de Thucydide* (Pessac, 2010), 35–50; G. Mader, 'Literary readings of oratory', in G. Martin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes* (Oxford, 2018), 19–23, at 20, and G. Westwood, 'Views on the past', in G. Martin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes* (Oxford, 2018), 179–90, at 183–4.

<sup>50</sup> See P. Mazon, *Hésiode* (CUF, 1928), 87.

<sup>51</sup> At least eight hundred occurrences since the first century A.D. vs. only thirty-five or so before, according to the TLG.

<sup>52</sup> E.g. [Demades] in n. 48 above.

(especially 18.286: see n. 15 above) and on the existence of a passive aorist indicative in Herodotus' *Histories* at 1.66.1.

Therefore, not only is the corruption of εἶ τεθεῖσθαι into †εὐθενεῖσθαι† easily explained, but there is no reason to object to the usage and meaning of τὴν πόλιν εἶ τεθεῖσθαι in the middle voice. The officials are once again the subject of the verb while the expression keeps almost the same sense and works very well as a foil for τὴν πόλιν ἀγνοεῖν in the second part of the parataxis where the accuser is the subject, thus fully restoring the antithesis between the good ambassador and the treasonous ones.

#### CONCLUSION

Both corrections – εὐθήνησαν instead of εὐθηνήθησαν/εὐθενήθησαν at Hdt. 1.66.1 and εἶ τεθεῖσθαι instead of †εὐθενεῖσθαι† at Dem. 19.231 – are palaeographically, morphologically and semantically sound, prove convincing, and deserve the full consideration of editors.

*École Normale Supérieure (Paris) – PSL*

David-Artur Daix  
[david-artur.daix@ens.psl.eu](mailto:david-artur.daix@ens.psl.eu)