

SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA

YEARBOOK OF THE ISRAEL SOCIETY
FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

VOLUME XLV

2026

ISSN 0334-4509 (PRINT)

2731-2933 (ONLINE)

The publication of this volume has been made possible by the support of

Bar-Ilan University
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
The Open University
Tel Aviv University
University of Haifa

PUBLISHED BY
THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
<http://www.israel-classics.org>

Manuscripts in the form of e-mail attachments should be sent to the e-mail address scriptaclassica.editors@gmail.com. For reviews, contact fassberg@tauex.tau.ac.il.

Price \$50

© 2026 The Israel Society for the Promotion of Classical Studies
All Rights Reserved

Camera-ready copy produced by the editorial staff of *Scripta Classica Israelica*
Printed in Israel by Magnes Press, Jerusalem

SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA

YEARBOOK OF THE ISRAEL SOCIETY
FOR THE
PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

Editor-in-Chief: ORNA HARARI

Editorial Board:
ORY AMITAY
ALEXANDER YAKOBSON
TEDDY FASSBERG

Assistant Editor: HILA BROKMAN

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD
OF *SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA*

François de Callataÿ, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris
Hannah M. Cotton, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Ephraim David, University of Haifa
Werner Eck, Universität zu Köln
Denis Feeney, Princeton University
Margalit Finkelberg, Tel Aviv University
Erich Gruen, University of California, Berkeley
Benjamin Isaac, Tel Aviv University
Ranon Katzoff, Bar-Ilan University
Jaap Mansfeld, Utrecht University
Doron Mendels, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Maren Niehoff, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Brent Shaw, Princeton University
Greg Woolf, The Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, NYU

THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION
OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

OFFICERS 2025–2026

<i>President:</i>	YULIA USTINOVA
<i>Secretary:</i>	MERAV HAKLAI
<i>Treasurer:</i>	BAR LESHEM

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Stephanie Binder
Moshe Blidstein
Yaakov Dolgopolsky-Geva
Merav Haklai
Yakir Paz
Karolina Sekita

HONORARY MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

Hannah Cotton	Ranon Katzoff
Joseph Geiger	

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FILIP DE DECKER, Aspectual Distinctions in the Future Passive: Lysias 19.61.....	1
ROBERT MAYHEW, Eudemos' Objection to the Ash-Argument for the Existence of the Void.....	21
WERNER ECK AND ANDREAS PANGERL, Zwei neue Konstitutionen für das Heer von Iudaea in der Zeit Domitians.....	31
RIVKA ELIZUR-LEIMAN, A Roman Military Bread Stamp from Ḥorbat Naḥal Yatir.....	49
MATAN SCHAPIRO, Eternal Recurrence and the Identity of Indiscernibles.....	59
MARIE-LAURE REBORA, From the Four Corners of the Mediterranean Sea: Testimonies of Non-Roman Jews in Late Ancient Rome (2 nd –4 th cent. CE)	73
OFER POGORELSKY, The Date of Eusebius' Onomasticon Revisited.....	87
ZOHAR SLANEY, The Palmette Decoration on Galilean Oil Lamps: Transformation of a Classical Motif.....	105
GIACOMO LOI, There is no Analogy in History: On the Use of Myth in Early Hebrew Holocaust Fiction.....	127
BOOK REVIEWS	
Fotis Georgiadis and Anastasia Gadolou, <i>In the Cave: Stories from Darkness Brought to Light</i> (by Erica Angliker).....	153
Bernardo Ballesteros, <i>Divine Assemblies in Early Greek and Babylonian Epic</i> (by Nathan Wasserman).....	156
Sebastian Scharff, <i>Hellenistic Athletes: Agonistic Culture and Self-Presentation</i> (by Michael Poliakoff).....	159
Merav Haklai, <i>Money in Imperial Rome: Legal Diversity and Systemic Complexity</i> (by Amit Gvaryahu).....	163
James Q. Whitman, <i>From Masters of Slaves to Lords of Lands: The Transformation of Ownership in the Western World</i> (by Punsara Amarasinghe).....	166
Alexander Treiger, <i>The Church Fathers in Arabic Translations</i> (by Tanja Werthmann)	168
Vered Lev Kanaan and Patricia A. Rosenmeyer, <i>Classics Transformed in Jewish, Israeli, and Palestinian Receptions</i> (by Reviel Netz).....	172
OBITUARIES: NURIT YAARI (BY YAIR LIPSHITZ).....	
ROSA LAST (BY ORNA HARARI).....	175
DAME AVERIL CAMERON (BY GUY G. STROUMSA).....	179
DISSERTATIONS IN PROGRESS.....	
PROCEEDINGS: THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES.....	
	185
	193

Aspectual Distinctions and Variants in the Future Passive: Lysias 19.61

Filip De Decker

Abstract: In this article, I will discuss the variants ὠφελήσεσθε (a middle future form with passive meaning, found in manuscript C and printed by Bekker) and ὠφεληθήσεσθε (a morphologically passive future form, attested in all other manuscripts and printed by most editors), both found in Lysias 19.61. I first provide a critical assessment of the scholarship on the alleged differences between these two types of ‘passive’ future forms. I then list all the morphologically passive forms in Lysias. I then discuss the meaning of the verb ὠφελέω (and its opposite ζημιόω) and assess how the meaning could have influenced the use of the future form. After that, I take a look at elements that could play a role in deciding which variant to choose, namely the value of manuscript that has the variant reading ὠφελήσεσθε, the presence of other aorist and/or present forms in the passage and two parallel passages with the future passive forms of ὠφελέω, namely 18.20 and 29.4. Finally, I discuss the instance under discussion. Although there are elements that can be used in favour of both variants, I nevertheless argue that the middle form has preference: it is the lectio difficilior because Lysias rarely used middle forms with passive meaning, there is an aspectual distinction between the two forms (the middle form confers a duration) and the middle form can have middle meaning in this passage.¹

Keywords: textual criticism; Lysias, tempus, aspect and Aktionsart; future passive and future middle; Greek verbal morphosyntax.

PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP ON THE ASPECT IN THE FUTURE PASSIVE

There are essentially five approaches to understanding the middle future form with passive meaning: One assumes that there is a difference between the forms; another denies any difference; the third argues that the middle forms have genuine middle meaning and the morphologically passive forms passive meaning; the fourth explanation assumes that for certain verbs ending in a vowel only the middle form was the correct one; and the final approach only mentions that the middle future can have passive meaning but does not address a possible difference in meaning.

¹ This article is part of my ongoing investigations into the aspect of Classical and Post-Classical Greek. I thank the journal’s anonymous reviewers and the editor, Professor Orna Harari, for their observations, improvements and suggestions and Dr. Scott Nelson (Vienna Symposium & Webster University) for correcting my English. It goes without saying that all infelicities, shortcomings, inconsistencies and/or errors are mine and mine alone. I dedicate this article to the memory of one of my predecessors in Firenze, Professor David Asheri, born David Bonaventura (1925–2000), a specialist in Classical Culture, History and the Greek Language.

1.1. There is a difference between the forms

The first explanation is that the middle forms have a durative meaning and the passive ones are aoristic and perfective. This was first explicitly stated by Schaefer, discussing the verbs διαφθαρήσεται and διαλυθήσεται in Demosthenes 8.17,² and Stallbaum, addressing the occurrence of γενήσομαι and γενηθήσομαι in Plato *Parmenides* 141e6.³ This distinction was accepted by some grammars⁴ and thoroughly elaborated upon by Blass. In his discussion of the difference between φανοῦμαι and φανήσομαι in Demosthenes, he added a detailed analysis of the middle future forms with passive meaning and the difference in meaning with the morphologically passive forms.⁵ After this study, the aspectual distinction was generally accepted and adopted in most standard grammars, often with the caveat that some exceptions remained.⁶ Recent investigations into certain specific forms confirmed this,⁷ and Van Emde Boas et al. codified this distinction in their new grammar but limited it to the 5th century BC, adding that it apparently ceased to exist by the 4th century BC.⁸ Before this grammar was written, Allan had already doubted that there was a difference in use between the 5th and 4th century BC.⁹

This rule has not always been universally accepted, and in the next subsections I discuss the other opinions.

1.2. No difference in meaning can be found

Several grammars of the early 19th century, such as those by Buttmann and Bernhardt, denied the aspectual distinction because they either assumed that there was a close connection between middle and passive,¹⁰ or because they argued that the middle forms were used instead of the morphologically passive forms because of the avoidance of forms that would otherwise become too long (as Kühner initially held).¹¹ In addition, several

² Schaefer (1824), 500.

³ Stallbaum (1848), 401–2.

⁴ Krüger (1861), 151, Kühner (1870), 102, who recanted his earlier rejection of this theory (see footnote 11).

⁵ Blass (1892), 273–85.

⁶ Kühner & Blass (1892), 111–12, Kühner & Gerth (1898), 114–17, 170–71, Smyth & Messing (1956), 220, 395.

⁷ In his work on the Greek middle, Allan (2003), 179–202 treated the difference between φανοῦμαι and φανήσομαι and confirmed Blass' results, with some restrictions (see below for more on Allan's analysis). In his discussion of σχήσω and ἔξω, George (2016), 600 also agreed with the distinction for the middle and passive forms (although that was not exactly what his article intended to investigate).

⁸ Van Emde Boas et al. (2019), 461–2.

⁹ Allan (2003), 197. I owe the reference to this passage to an anonymous referee of the journal.

¹⁰ Buttmann (1810), 315, Bernhardt (1829), 345, (1862), 39–40.

¹¹ Kühner (1835), 19, state (but cf. supra): *Nur dann darf man dem Fut. Med. passive Bedeutung zuschreiben, wenn ein Verb das Fut. Med. allein, oder das Fut Pass. nur sehr selten bildet. Die Dichtersprache hat sich freilich öfter die Freiheit genommen, statt der langen und unbequemen Form des Fut. P die kürzere und bequemere Form des Fut. Med. zu brauchen. In allen übrigen Fällen setzen die Griechen wenn sie den passiven Begriff ausdrücken wollen, das Fut. Pass..*

See also Buttmann & Lobeck (1839), 86–7, Wackernagel (1926), 204, Hartmann (1934), 128, Schwyzler & Debrunner (1950), 266.

scholars listed and discussed the considerable number of exceptions to this rule and concluded that the mere number of the exceptions rendered the rule incorrect.¹² More recently, the aspectual distinction between the two types of futures has been denied by Bornemann & Risch,¹³ and Tronci.¹⁴ In his study of Sophocles' syntax, Moorhouse also denied the aspectual distinction but noted that most middle forms with passive meaning in Sophocles had nonetheless durative meaning.¹⁵

1.3. Middle is middle and passive is passive

This maxim, taken from Allan's book on the middle voice in Greek,¹⁶ refers to the theory that argues that, in the future, middle forms have middle meaning and passive forms passive meaning, and that the difference between the forms is not an aspectual distinction but one based on the diathesis. Stahl most explicitly makes this argument. In his analysis, he illustrated this with the verb ἀπαλλάττω: ἀπαλλάττομαι meant 'I will free myself' and ἀπαλλαγῆσομαι 'I will be liberated'.¹⁷ Allan agreed to a certain extent and stated that for several verbs the distinction between the middle and passive forms was aspectual but in many more cases based on the diathesis.¹⁸ While he confirmed to a large extent the results obtained by Blass, he nevertheless added that a form such as φανοῦμαι contained the notions 'I will show for myself' and 'I will show myself', and from that latter meaning also 'I will be shown, I will appear'. He also showed that the orators especially preferred the passive form φανήσομαι over the middle φανοῦμαι when the meaning was passive.¹⁹

I have two observations to make. First, my main test for this theory is that it can be maintained only if the aorist of these verbs makes the same distinction. If a verb has a middle and passive aorist, then it is feasible to assume that the diathesis distinction present in the aorist-stem was also present in the future, but in case the verb only displays a passive aorist form, it is difficult to maintain that the diathesis distinction that was absent in the aorist would suddenly appear in the future. I will perform this test below when I discuss the meaning of ὠφελέω and its opposite ζημιόω.

¹² Stahl (1907), 84–6, Wackernagel (1926), 200–4, Magnien (1912), 279–82, Prévot (1934), 80–85, Hartmann (1934), 122, 125–9, Schwyzer & Debrunner (1950), 265–6, Bornemann & Risch (1973), 125, Wackernagel & Langslow (2007), 257–8.

¹³ Bornemann & Risch (1973), 125 state *Neben diesen medialen Formen kommt meist auch ein gewöhnliches Passivfutur auf -θήσομαι vor, (...) Beide Bildungen haben dann die gleiche Bedeutung (keinen Aspektunterschied)* (underlining is mine).

¹⁴ Tronci (2017a), 83–6, 90–7 (especially 90–92), 111, (2017b), 196–203, (2017c), 385–7, (2020), 114–18. In Tronci (2017c, 2020), she discussed how the middle forms, with semi-deponent or passive meaning, almost completely disappeared in the Bible and were replaced by either active or passive forms. This is an issue that cannot be addressed here.

¹⁵ Moorhouse (1982), 176–7 argues *[i]t is true that in most of these futures (sc. the middle ones used in a passive sense, FDD) a durative sense appears (...) but it cannot be upheld that there is a special association of such function with the forms* (underlining is mine).

¹⁶ Allan (2003), 200–2, section 4.3.

¹⁷ Stahl (1909), 84–7.

¹⁸ Allan (2003), 183, 185, 200–202.

¹⁹ Allan (2003), 196–8.

Second, if this theory were correct, instances such as διαλέξομαι and διαλεχθήσομαι (both with middle meaning ‘I will speak’) should not exist but the fact that they do, indicates that this theory cannot be the only possible explanation.

1.4. The middle forms are in some cases the only ones possible

Some scholars, such as Cobet and Dindorf, did not discuss any differences in meaning but argued that the middle forms were the oldest ones and that the morphologically passive ones had to be substituted by the middle ones, regardless of the meaning and transmission.²⁰ Their analysis seems to be based on the assessment by post-classical and Byzantine scholars that only the middle forms were used in Classical Greek. One can refer e.g. to the grammarian Moeris (2nd–3rd century AD),²¹ who stated the following: τιμήσεται Ἀττικοί· τιμηθήσεται Ἕλληνες: ‘the Attic speakers use τιμήσεται “he shall be honoured” and the Hellenistic speakers τιμηθήσεται “he shall be honoured”’. That this theory was only applied to certain verbs ending in a vowel and never to verbs ending in a consonant (even in cases where these verbs had both a middle future form with passive meaning and a morphologically passive form, as e.g., βλάψομαι and βλαβήσομαι from βλάπτω) seriously undermines its value. The fact that the morphologically passive future existed for many verbs makes it unlikely that it would not have existed for an entire class of verbs and that all the instances would have been the result of errors during the transmission. Finally, the scholars advocating this theory failed to notice that certain verbs they changed had morphologically passive forms in Attic inscriptions (where no transmission problems could have occurred). A case in point is τιμάω, which *never* has a middle future form in passive meaning in the Attic inscriptions and always uses τιμηθήσομαι.²² All these elements argue against an automatic correction of the transmitted morphologically passive forms.

1.5. An Agnostic or Ignorant Stance

A few grammars note that the middle future forms can have passive meaning but do not mention the alleged aspectual distinctions.²³

After this brief discussion of the existing scholarship, I now turn to the disputed passage and the issues that need to be investigated before deciding which variant to choose.

²⁰ Cobet (1858), 567, 697, Dindorf (1862), 135.

²¹ In agreement with the editorial guidelines of the journal, I use (contrary to other publications) the Latin variant of the Greek names and works, with the exception of Euripides’ tragedy *Trojan Women*, for which the English title was used.

²² See Meisterhans & Schwyzer (1900), 193 and Albini (1961), 97. This issue is not discussed explicitly in Threutte, but he did state that the morphologically passive forms were used as *true passives* and mentioned two cases of τιμηθήσομαι from the 4th century BC (1996, 561–2). He did not treat the use of middle forms as passives in her section on *Future (active and middle)* (1996, 524–8) nor did he include the verb τιμάω in his *List of Verbs* (Threutte (1996), 653–4 went from τίκτω to τίνω).

²³ Goodwin (1900), 268, Krüger & Cooper (2002), 2341, adding that the morphologically passive future is a relatively late formation and pointing out that while there were many examples in the middle future form in Attic and Homeric Greek, this middle use would eventually gradually die out), Basile & Radici-Colace (2001), 334–5, Lachawitz (2022), 86.

THE DISPUTED INSTANCE LYSIAS 19.61 AND ISSUES TO RESOLVE

The speech Lysias 19 was delivered by the relatives of Aristophanes, who was executed and whose property confiscated. When the confiscation took place, the state considered the quantity of goods to be too small and accused the relatives of having hidden a large part of the goods. The defendant contests neither the death sentence nor the legality of the confiscation but argues that a dead man's property is always smaller at death than when he was still alive and that his father was in the habit of financing many state activities.²⁴ In addition, he tries to convince the jury that if he is acquitted, the city will benefit from it much more than when he is convicted and his property is also confiscated. In doing so, he refers to his family's past financial support to the city: his father was in the process of equipping a warship and so is the accused at this moment. The passage in which we find the contested form is the following:

οὐκ οὐν ἄξιον τοῖς τῶν κατηγορῶν λόγοις πιστεῦσαι μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ἔργοις, ἃ ἐπράχθη ἐν ἅπαντι τῷ βίῳ, καὶ τῷ χρόνῳ, ὃν ὑμεῖς σαφέστατον ἐλεγχον τοῦ ἀληθοῦς νομίζατε. εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἦν τοιοῦτος, οὐκ ἂν ἐκ πολλῶν ὀλίγα κατέλιπεν, ἐπεὶ εἰ νῦν γε ἐξαπατηθεῖντε ὑπὸ τούτων καὶ δημεύσαιθ' ἡμῶν τὴν οὐσίαν, οὐδὲ δύο τάλαντα λάβοιτ' ἂν. ὥστε οὐ μόνον πρὸς δόξαν ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς χρημάτων λόγον λυσιτελεῖ μᾶλλον ὑμῖν ἀποψηφίσασθαι· πολὺ γὰρ πλείω ὠφελήσεσθ' / ὠφελήθησεσθ', ἔάν ἡμεῖς ἔχωμεν.

It is not fair, then, to credit our accusers' words rather than the deeds that marked his whole life, or than time, which you are to regard as the clearest test of truth. If he had been of another stamp, he would not have left but a small remnant of his estate; for if you should now be utterly deceived by these people, and should confiscate our property, you would receive less than two talents. So not only with a view to repute, but also in respect of money, it is more to your advantage to acquit us; for you will get far more benefit if we keep it.²⁵

Most manuscripts have the morphologically passive future form, whereas manuscript C has the middle form. Bekker printed the middle form,²⁶ whereas the other editions preferred the passive form.²⁷ In their Lysias commentaries (which do not treat Oration 19), Bizos and Carey argue that the main manuscript for Lysias is manuscript X and that the other manuscripts are mere copies of it and that only C has its own value, describing it as *une seule* (sc. *une copie du manuscrit X*, FDD), *celle du Laurentianus* 57,4 (C) *du XVe siècle, contient des variantes méritant d'être utilisées quelquefois*,²⁸ and a *fifteenth century manuscript which contains some intelligent scribal conjectures*.²⁹

²⁴ Lamb (1930), 415–17.

²⁵ Translation by Lamb (1930), 451, 453.

²⁶ Bekker (1823), 385, followed by Shuckburgh (1882), 94. He did not discuss this form and the variants in the commentary (1882), 166, and Scheibe (1897), 154.

²⁷ Thalheim (1901), 225, Adams (1905), 210 where the variant is not discussed, Hude (1912), 177, Gernet & Bizos (1926), 54 where the variant is not discussed, Lamb (1930), 450, Albini (1955), 179, Edwards (1999), 46, he did not discuss the meaning of the form or the variants in the commentary, (1999), 142, Carey (2007), 197. Rauchenstein & Fuhr (1897), 31, 121 also printed the passive form, although they stated that the middle form was more common in Greek. They also pointed out that manuscript C had the middle form and that Cobet changed the passive forms into middle ones in 18.20 and 29.4.

²⁸ Bizos (1967), 12.

²⁹ Carey (1989), 12. A similar judgement could already be found in Gernet & Bizos (1924), 17–18, who criticised Bekker and Hude for having placed too much confidence in C.

In deciding what form to use we should consider the following questions:

- What is Lysias' preference concerning the future forms? Is he more inclined to use middle forms with passive meaning or to use the morphologically passive forms?
- How should we interpret the fact that only C has the middle form and only in this oration? Does the argument of the *lectio difficilior potior* apply here?
- Can the explanation *middle is middle and passive is passive* shed any light on the issue? Related to this is the question whether the meaning of ὠφελέω could have played a role here.
- Does the aspect use of the other forms in the passage reveal anything about the aspectual choice to make here? Related to this are the issues of a possible aspectual attraction and the interpretation of the aorist-stem-forms as expressing anteriority and the present-stem-forms as being simultaneous.
- The morphologically passive form ὠφελήθῃσμαι is unanimously transmitted in Lysias 18.20 and in 29.4. What do these passages reveal about the use and can they shed any light on the passage under discussion? In this discussion, we need to address the aspect of the other verb forms in the passage as well.

The next subsection discusses Lysias' preferences in using future forms with passive meaning.

MORPHOLOGICALLY PASSIVE AND MIDDLE FORMS IN LYSIAS

Morphologically passive future forms are very common in Lysias, while the middle forms are exceptional. In the *corpus Lysiacum*,³⁰ we have 57 morphologically passive forms. Of these 57, 3 belong to ὠφελέω and 3 to its opposite ζημιόω (and the transmission in the instance here has both the middle and the passive form).³¹ These 6 will not be considered in our catalogue of forms as they are the ones under investigation, but in 5 of the 6 instances all manuscripts have the passive form.

Of the 51 remaining forms, there are 14 deponent forms. We find:

- 3 morphologically passive future forms from verbs that do not use middle future forms in Classical Greek: μνησθήσμαι (3.45), ἀναμνησθήσεσθαι (26.1), ἡσθήσονται (the form occurs in 233e4 in the *Erotikos*-speech transmitted in Plato's *Phaedrus* as if it were pronounced by Lysias).
- 11 instances, in which a verb that uses both the passive and the middle forms in Classical Greek, used the morphologically passive form [φανήσεται (12.50, 13.79, 13.87, 18.2, 19.63, 25.15, 29.2), φανήσμαι (7.27, 25.16), φανήσεσθε (18.15), ὀργισθήσεσθε (21.21)] and in only 2 instances the middle form [φανείσθε (26.11), ὀργιούμενοι (15.9)].

³⁰ Dover (1968) argued that one could only be certain that speech 12 was really written by Lysias and by Lysias alone, but that it was often also very difficult to *disprove* the authorship of a given Lysias speech. For practical reasons, I therefore consider all the speeches delivered in his name to be genuine (including speech 6, which Dover (1968), 78, 194, considered to be undoubtedly spurious).

³¹ The instances of ὠφελέω are 18.20, 29.4 and 19.61 (the instance under discussion here and the only one in which a middle form has also been transmitted) and for ζημιόω, 6.15, 8.18, and 29.4.

- No instances in which deponent verbs that use both the morphologically passive and middle future forms in Classical Greek have only a middle future form in Lysias (for δημοκρατέομαι and ἡττάομαι, see below).

The same distinction can be made for the 37 passive forms with passive meaning. We have:

- 27 morphologically passive forms from verbs that do not use middle forms with passive meaning in Classical Greek: ἀναγκασθήσομαι (3.3), ὀφθήσεσθαι (3.34), συγκοπῆσεσθαι (3.34), ἀποτμηθήσεσθαι (6.26), ἐξελεγχθήσεται (6.34), σωθήσομαι (12.15), ἀφεθήσεσθαι (12.15), σωθήσεσθαι (12.85), ὀφθήσεσθε (12.90), τιμωρηθήσεται (13.1), παραδοθήσονται (13.15), ἀναγκασθήσεται (13.25), σωθήσεσθαι (13.37), ταφήσεσθαι (13.45), σωθήσεσθαι (13.79), σωθησομένης (14.10), ἀναγνωσθήσονται (17.8), ἐλεγχθήσεσθαι (20.22), ἀτιμωθήσονται (20.34), ἀναγκασθησόμεθα (21.25), ἀπορρηθήσεσθαι (22.14),³² σωθήσεσθαι (25.21), διαβληθήσεσθε (26.15), εὔρεθήσεται (29.3),³³ δοκιμασθησόμενον (31.1), τιμωρηθήσεται (31.24, 31.26);
- 7 instances, in which a verb that uses both the passive and the middle form with passive meaning in Classical Greek, only used the passive form in Lysias: οἰκοδομηθήσεται (12.63), πραχθήσεσθαι (12.77), καταλυθησόμενον (13.16), κριθήσόμενοι (13.38), πραχθήσοιτο (23.9), ὑπολειφθήσεται (25.18) and διοικηθήσεται (30.35) are found, whereas οἰκοδομήσομαι, κρινούμαι, πράζομαι, λύσομαι,³⁴ λείψομαι and (δι)οικήσομαι are not attested with passive meaning;
- 3 morphologically passive forms for which both the passive and the middle forms were used in Classical Greek and attested in Lysias: ἡττηθήσονται (20.32) and ἡττήσεσθε (28.9, cf. infra), ἀποστερηθήσεσθε (12.70) and στερήσομαι (19.1), καθαιρεθήσεται (12.63) and περιαιρησόμεθα (34.4 – I take this form to be passive);³⁵
- No verbs in Lysias that lack a morphologically passive future form and only use a middle future form with passive meaning (instances such as ἔασομαι and ἀδικήσομαι are not found in Lysias).

There are two forms that I included here and not with the deponent forms. They are:

δημοκρατήσεσθε (34.4): I am inclined to consider δημοκρατέομαι to be a passive verb, but this verb can be considered as a middle or a passive form, depending on how one interprets the meaning ‘having a democratic constitution’ or ‘being ruled under democratic government’. The meaning is the same, but the grammatical categorisation

³² I consider this form to be only passive as the middle form λέξομαι with passive meaning is only found in tragedy and only linked to this root by suppletivism and is not actually related to it.

³³ The verb εὔρισκω only uses a morphologically passive future form (Veitch (1879), 283–4), as the form εὔρήσεται as quoted in Photius’ gloss εὔρήσεται· ἀντί τοῦ εὔρεθήσεται can be a future perfect as well. The gloss can be found in Theodoridis (1998), 218.

³⁴ I believe that in Xenophon *Cyropaedia* 1.6.9 the transmitted future middle form καταλύσεται can be maintained, as was also stated in Veitch (1897), 427 (implicitly) and LSJ *sub uoce καταλύω*. It does not need to be changed into a future perfect καταλελύσεται as was suggested by Cobet and adopted by Marchant (1910 *on this passage*) and Gemoll & Peters (1968), 48.

³⁵ I agree with Veitch (1879), 28 that ἀφαιρήση (Euripides *Trojan Women* 1278) and περιαιρησόμεθα (Lysias 34.4) have passive meaning.

may differ. This verb is only attested in the middle form in Lysias and it seems that the morphologically passive future form of this verb was not found in Classical Greek, although it is attested as a variant in Thucydides' *Historiae* 8.75.2. Passive aorist forms of this verb are not attested in Classical Greek (the only exception being a fragment of the historian Megasthenes (4th–3rd century BC).

ἡττηθήσονται and ἡττήσεσθε: the meaning of ἡττάομαι can be 'be overpowered, be vanquished' (passive) or 'be inferior', but also here I am inclined to catalogue the forms as passives, although the active ἡττάω is only attested in post-Classical Greek.

The figures show that Lysias prefers the morphologically passive forms for the deponent verbs, although in many cases, a middle form was available as well. When we look at the forms with a passive meaning, we note that in more than two thirds of the cases, Lysias used a verb that had no middle future form with passive meaning. This does not rule out that these forms had perfective meaning, but as there was no middle form available, their evidentiary value is limited. In 7 cases, Lysias opts for a morphologically passive form, although a middle was available as well, and in only 4 unanimously transmitted cases Lysias used a middle future form with passive meaning. To this we should add that in 5 cases, Lysias also used the passive futures ὠφελθήσομαι and ζημωθήσομαι, but as they are under investigation here, I have not included them in the list. These data seem to confirm Allan's view, according to which both in the case of φανοῦμαι and φανήσομαι and in the use of the passive and middle forms, the orators prefer the passive form, whereas other genres, such as tragedy, prefer the middle form.³⁶

Finally, the verb ὠφελέω has 10 unanimously transmitted morphologically passive future forms in Classical Greek,³⁷ 5 middle future forms with passive meaning,³⁸ and 6 instances in which more than one form has been transmitted (5 besides the instance here), but in 5 of the 6 instances the middle form has preference.³⁹ We thus have an equal number of passive and middle forms for this verb. The numbers of the verb ὠφελέω themselves can therefore not shed any light on the issue.

The overall conclusion of this overview is that Lysias clearly preferred the morphologically passive forms and this should be taken into account when discussing the disputed instance.

³⁶ Allan (2003), 197. This was pointed out to me by a referee of the journal.

³⁷ The instances are Isaeus 10.16, Lysias 18.20, Lysias 29.4, Andocides 2.22, Xenophon *Memorabilia* 2.7.8, (pseudo(?)-)Plato *Hippias Maior* 285a7–8, (pseudo(?)-)Plato *Hippias Maior* 285a7–8, (pseudo-)Plato *Theages* 128e7, Aristoteles *Ethica Eudemia* 2.7.11–2, (1224b19), Aristoteles *Ethica Nicomachea* 1.6.16 (Bekker 1097a8).

³⁸ The instances are Thucydides *Historiae* 7.67.3, Xenophon *Oeconomicus* 2.8, Xenophon *Cynegeticus* 12.1, Demosthenes 18.144, Aristoteles *Politica* 2.5.13, (1269a17).

³⁹ The instances are Thucydides *Historiae* 6.18.4, Plato *Res Publica* 1.16 (Stephanus 343.b–c), Xenophon *Memorabilia* 1.6.14, Xenophon *Cyropaedia* 3.2.20. In all these instances, the middle and passive future forms have both been transmitted, Xenophon *Memorabilia* 3.11.2–3, where the middle future form is transmitted besides the middle future form of another verb).

THE MEANING OF ὠφελέω AND ITS OPPOSITE ζημιόω⁴⁰

The verb ὠφελέω (and its opposite ζημιόω) do not only display the problem of the form but also of the meaning. ὠφελέω means ‘help’ but also ‘benefit’. A middle form ὠφελήσομαι could therefore mean ‘will be helped’ if it had passive meaning and ‘will benefit, will find benefits’ if it had middle meaning. The same is true for ζημιόω, which means ‘punish’ but also ‘damage’ and for ἡττάομαι, which means ‘be overpowered, be beaten’ but also ‘be inferior’. One could thus argue that the middle form ὠφελήσομαι should be preferred if the meaning was ‘will benefit’ and the passive ὠφεληθήσομαι when ‘will be helped’ (mutatis mutandis one could apply the same rationale when deciding between ζημιώσομαι and ζημιωθήσομαι, but this matter is beyond the scope of this article). This case is a specific instance of the theory *middle is middle and passive is passive* and can be solved by looking at the aorist forms. If we can discern a similar distinction between ὠφελισάμην and ὠφελήθην, the explanation can be applied to the future; if not, the meaning cannot be a deciding factor. As the middle aorist forms of ὠφελέω are very rare (if not nearly non-existent) and the passive aorist forms much more common, it is more reasonable to assume that the distinction was one based on aspect and not on diathesis. This will become clear in the discussion of the instances of Lysias 18.20 and 29.4 below.

Ultimately, this matter is related to the discussion of the interaction between aspect / grammatical aspect and *Aktionsart* / lexical aspect, i.e. to the question of whether there is a one-on-one relationship between the meaning of the verb form and the grammatical expression of the form. In my opinion, the two need to be separated at least for Greek, as there are forms in which both the present and the aorist-stem can be used. I refer, for instance, to the Homeric iterative forms in -σκ-, which can be used in the imperfect *and* the aorist,⁴¹ and to instances in Classical Greek of the type ἔπαισεν ἄν and ἔπαιεν ἄν, both meaning ‘he would beat’, but having a different aspectual expression. If *Aktionsart* were the main deciding factor, such doublets would not exist. Similarly, I believe that aspect would be better suited than *Aktionsart* to decide between ὠφελήσομαι and ὠφεληθήσομαι, and to explain the differences between, for instance, διαλέξομαι and διαλεχθήσομαι, both forms with a middle meaning. As this is an issue that has been discussed almost since the beginning of comparative philology as a discipline, it would need a much longer discussion and cannot be solved here in a single paragraph.

MANUSCRIPT C AND THE *LECTIO DIFFICILIOR POTIOR* ARGUMENT

The morphologically passive form ὠφεληθήσομαι is unanimously transmitted in Lysias 18.20 and in 29.4 and in both passages the passive form was changed into the middle one by Cobet but otherwise preserved by all the editors. (These two passages will be discussed later). The presence of the morphologically passive forms quoted above indicate that the middle form ὠφελήσεσθ’ is a rarity. One might therefore be inclined to adopt this reading, but is *lectio rariores potior* a valid principle? At first, one could argue that this is a special case of *lectio difficilior potior* and that this would be sufficient to follow Bekker and print the middle form. This argument can, however, also be reversed and be used *against* the form.

⁴⁰ This was pointed out to me by a reviewer of the journal.

⁴¹ I refer to my research in De Decker (2023) and (2024).

As manuscript C contains *lectiones* that seem to be the fruit of the scribe's own conjecturing and attempting to correct what he had in front of him, we cannot exclude the possibility that the middle form ὠφελήσεσθ' is his correction of the form ὠφελήθησεσθ', found in the other manuscripts.⁴² This raises the question where he would have found this form. If he copied other Greek prose writers, it is perfectly possible that he knew that this verb had a middle future with passive meaning.

The value of the manuscripts itself and the concept of *lectio difficilior potior* are insufficient to decide on the problem but the following consideration argues in favour of manuscript C. If the copyist had known that the verb ὠφελέω had a middle future with passive meaning and considered this the correct form, would he not also have changed the passive form on the two other occasions? The fact that he did not correct the two other instances thus seems to argue against a correction by a copyist who knew that this verb could also use a middle future form with passive meaning.

Next, I will analyse all the verb forms in the passages under discussion. I start with 19.61 and then treat 18.20 and 29.4. To do this, I must first treat two other issues in Greek aspect: Temporal reference and of aspectual attraction.

AORIST FOR ANTERIORITY AND PRESENT FOR SIMULTANEITY?

Most standard grammars of Greek assume that the difference between the present-stem and the aorist-stem is one of aspect and not of tense/temporal reference. Some scholars, most recently Ruijgh and Hettrich, argue that the distinction is not aspectual but temporal and that the present-stem expresses simultaneity and the aorist(-stem) anteriority.⁴³ The temporal meaning (anteriority or simultaneity) can more easily be deduced from the aspectual than vice versa – since the aorist describes a completed action, it is more likely to indicate an action that was finished and can thus be used to indicate anteriority, whereas the present-stem indicates an unfinished action and has therefore almost intrinsically the notion of simultaneity in it – but this is a longstanding issue that cannot be discussed here.

ASPECTUAL ATTRACTION?

Another issue that briefly needs to be addressed is the influence of the aspect of other verbs in a passage on a specific verb form. This theory, most explicitly advocated by Hettrich, argues that the aspectual choice of the super-ordinated clause would influence the choice of the subordinated constructions (finite verbs, infinitives and participles).⁴⁴ In his study on the *dynamic infinitive* in Herodotos, Stork noted that an aorist finite verb would take more easily an aorist infinitive, whereas a verb in the present would take one in the present, albeit with much less pronounced preferences; the percentages of an imperfect form taking a present infinitive were even higher than that of an aorist indicative

⁴² Blass (1892), 279 argued that C did indeed change the passive into the middle future form.

⁴³ Ruijgh (1971), 231 stated [*i*]l n'est donc pas correct de dire, comme on le fait souvent, que les thèmes du présent, de l'aoriste et du parfait n'expriment pas le temps mais l'aspect and later argued [*a*]près tout, nous avons donc le droit de conclure que le système des thèmes temporels du grec sert à l'expression des rapports temporels (1971, 233; Hettrich (1976 *passim*). This had been argued by scholars before them already, but I cannot treat this in detail here. For a discussion of previous scholarship on this issue, see De Decker (2025a), 71–2.

⁴⁴ Hettrich (1976), 77–81. He was not the first to argue for this. I refer to my brief overview of earlier scholarship and discussion of this issue in De Decker (2025a), 71–2.

taking an aorist infinitive. This indicated, in his opinion, that some connection between the use of the aspect stem of the super-ordinated verb form and that of the subordinated form could not be denied. He added, however, that this did not prove that the aspect-use of the infinitive and those of the superordinated finite verbs were the same.⁴⁵

The (alleged) aspectual attraction has received relatively little attention so far and needs a more thorough investigation, but following Rijksbaron, these instances can be explained by starting from the basic aspectual meaning of the present- and aorist-stem. As the aorist marks a completed action, it is logical that in a description of different events, the aorist would be used. This is the case when these events are related in succession in the main clause but also when the events are described with subordinate clauses and participles.⁴⁶ The co-appearance of many aorist forms is therefore not necessarily an indication for aspectual attraction but can be explained from the nature of the aorist itself. The same is true for the co-occurrence of many present-stem forms.

It is therefore better to assume that the aorist and present are used because of their aspectual meaning and are not determined by temporal or attractional factors.

19.61: THE ANALYSIS

I will now analyse the other aspect-forms in the passage and examine whether they can shed further light on the problem. To do so, I quote again the passage below.

οὐκ οὖν ἄξιον τοῖς τῶν κατηγορῶν λόγοις πιστεῦσαι μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ἔργοις, ἃ ἐπράχθη ἐν ἅπαντι τῷ βίῳ, καὶ τῷ χρόνῳ, ὃν ὑμεῖς σαφέστατον ἐλεγχον τοῦ ἀληθοῦς νομίσσατε. εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἦν τοιοῦτος, οὐκ ἂν ἐκ πολλῶν ὀλίγα κατέλιπεν, ἐπεὶ εἰ νῦν γε ἐξαπατηθεῖητε ὑπὸ τούτων καὶ δημεύσαιθ' ἡμῶν τὴν οὐσίαν, οὐδὲ δύο τάλαντα λάβοιτ' ἂν. ὥστε οὐ μόνον πρὸς δόξαν ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς χρημάτων λόγον λυσίτελεῖ μᾶλλον ὑμῖν ἀποψηφίσασθαι. πολὺ γὰρ πλείω ὠφελήσεσθ' / ὠφεληθήσεσθ', ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἔχωμεν.⁴⁷

It is not fair, then, to credit our accusers' words rather than the deeds that marked his whole life, or than time, which you are to regard as the clearest test of truth. If he had been of another stamp, he would not have left but a small remnant of his estate; for if you should now be utterly deceived by these people, and should confiscate our property, you would receive less than two talents. So not only with a view to repute, but also in respect of money, it is more to your advantage to acquit us; for you will get far more benefit if we keep it.⁴⁸

The meaning of ὠφελήσεσθ' / ὠφεληθήσεσθ' here is 'you will benefit' and not 'you will be helped'. The form has middle and not passive meaning. If the *middle is middle and passive is passive* explanation were valid, we would have to choose in this case the middle form.

In this passage, forms from the present- and the aorist-stem appear besides each other. We note that there is a clear distinction between them. The aorist forms in this passage refer to either a single action: πιστεῦσαι, νομίσσατε, ἐξαπατηθεῖητε, δημεύσαιθ', λάβοιτ' and ἀποψηφίσασθαι refer to the imminent judgement by the court (they can only pronounce a verdict, confiscate the goods or acquit once), or to a completed action:

⁴⁵ Stork (1982), 387–9.

⁴⁶ Rijksbaron (1979), 247–9.

⁴⁷ The forms from the present-stem are printed in boldface and the aorist-stem-forms have been underlined.

⁴⁸ Translation by Lamb (1930), 451, 453.

ἐπράχθη and κατέλιπεν refer to the life of the accused's father who always supported the city financially. The present form λυσιτελεῖ refers to the present and not to the past, so the present indicative is the only form that can be used here, but in the case of the subjunctive ἔχωμεν, we have an action that has a duration 'if we keep our possessions'. For those types of description, the present-stem is used. The fact that the present is used in ἔχωμεν can help in determining whether to choose ὠφελήθησθεθ' or ὠφελήσεσθ'. The speaker's main argument is the lasting advantage for the city if the accused can keep their possessions. This is better expressed by the middle form ὠφελήσεσθ' and not by the passive one ὠφελήθησθεθ'.

There are thus two elements in favour of printing, with Bekker and against the modern editions, ὠφελήσεσθ' and not ὠφελήθησθεθ', namely the *middle is middle and passive is passive* explanation and the aspectual interpretation.

To verify whether this choice can be confirmed by the other passages in Lysias, I will now proceed to the analysis of the two other passages in Lysias where a form from ὠφελέω has been used, 18.20 and 29.4.

LYSIAS 18.20 AS A PARALLEL CASE?

Next, we should address Lysias 18.20–21 as a parallel passage where the verb ὠφελέω is also used but where all manuscripts have the passive form ὠφελήθησθεθ.⁴⁹ The morphologically passive form was changed into the middle form by Cobet.

(20) καὶ εἰ μὲν ἑωρᾶτε, ὧ ἄνδρες δικασταί, σωζόμενα τῇ πόλει τὰ ὑπὸ τούτων δημευόμενα, συγγνώμην ἂν εἴχομεν· νῦν δ' ἐπίστασθε ὅτι τὰ μὲν αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τούτων ἀφανίζεται, τὰ δὲ πολλοῦ ἄξια ὄντα ὀλίγου πιπράσκειται. ἂν δ' ἐμοὶ πειθήσθε, οὐκ ἐλάττω ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὑμεῖς ὠφελήθησθε (cdd.) / ὠφελήσεσθε (Cobet) ἢ ἡμεῖς οἱ κεκτημένοι,

(21) ἐπεὶ καὶ νυνὶ Διόμνηστος καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἐκ μιᾶς οἰκίας τρεῖς ὄντες τριηραρχοῦμεν, καὶ ὅταν ἡ πόλις δέηται χρημάτων, ἀπὸ τούτων ὑμῖν εἰσφέρομεν. ὥς οὖν ἡμῶν ταύτῃ τῇ γνώμῃ χρωμένων, καὶ τῶν προγόνων τῶν ἡμετέρων τοιούτων γεγενημένων, φείδεσθε ἡμῶν.

(20) And if you saw, gentlemen, that the property confiscated by these men was being secured for the State, we should forgive them; but the fact is, as you well know, that some of it is melting away in their hands, while the rest, though of great value, is being sold off cheap. Yet, if you will follow my advice, you will receive no less profit from it than we, the owners.

(21) For at this moment Diomnestus, my brother and I, three of one household, are equipping warships, and when the State requires money, we raise a special contribution on these properties. Since, then, we are of this way of thinking, and our ancestors have evinced the same character, spare us.⁵⁰

In this speech, the relatives of Nicias' brother, who had received the estate of the general killed during the Peloponnesian War, argue in court against the treasurers who wanted to confiscate the property of Nicias' family because they suspected that part of the estate and properties had remained hidden from the state. The family's main argument is that it is

⁴⁹ This was pointed out to me by a reviewer of the journal.

⁵⁰ Translation by Lamb (1930), 411.

more advantageous for the state in the long run neither to acquire the goods nor to expropriate them but to allow the relatives to continue supporting and financing public affairs (this argument is also used in speech 19, cf. *supra*). This argument is most explicitly put forward in paragraphs 20 and 21, which are the passages under discussion.

The meaning of the form ὠφεληθήσεσθε is not ‘you will be helped’ but ‘you will receive benefits’ and is more middle than genuinely passive. If the *middle is middle and passive is passive* explanation were valid, we would expect the middle form, but the morphologically passive one is used here. As a result, this explanation cannot be correct here.

This passage describes the positive effects for Athens for a longer period and thus does not refer to a single action or a limited period. These lasting positive effects for the state are described in the present-stem. That is the reason why all the verbs in these two passages are in the present-stem, including the two verbs that appear in a counterfactual construction (ἔωρᾶτε and εἴχομεν).⁵¹

If the aspectual explanation elaborated above were correct, one would expect the middle form with passive meaning instead of the morphologically passive one. We note, however, that the morphologically passive form ὠφεληθήσεσθε is used. This use contradicts the expected aspectual distinction, and also seems to argue *against* choosing the middle form in 19.61. There are two other forms in this passage that seem puzzling when we take a closer look at the aspect use: the subjunctive πείθησθε and the imperative φείδεσθε refer to the single action the jury has to take and yet, the present-stem is used. This seems to indicate that the speaker had the durative effect of the verdict in mind. This makes the choice for the morphologically passive form even more striking. The context and the aspect of the other verb forms are the same in 18.20–21 and in 19.61.

In this instance, both the *middle is middle and passive is passive* explanation and the aspectual interpretation would argue for a middle form and yet, Lysias used the passive form.

As in other instances, Cobet suggested to change the morphologically passive form ὠφεληθήσεσθε into the middle ὠφελήσεσθε, but no editor followed him.⁵² As was discussed earlier, Cobet argued that certain *verba vocalia* should *always* have a middle future form with passive meaning and never discussed any aspectual implications. As the morphologically passive forms could already be found in the inscriptions, there is no reason to adopt Cobet’s change.

This passage furnishes a strong indication against adopting the middle form, because all the elements ‘advocating’ a middle form are present in this specific passage and yet Lysias used the passive form. Let us now examine the other parallel passage, 29.4.

⁵¹ I assume here that the tense-use in the counterfactual constructions in Greek (Homeric and Classical) was determined by aspect and not by temporal reference, meaning that an imperfect could refer to the past as well and an aorist, theoretically at least, also to the present. I refer to my discussion of the scholarship in De Decker (2025b), 54–5.

⁵² Scheibe (1878), 140, Thalheim (1901), 205 Hude (1912), 162, Albini (1955), 160, Medda (1995), 122, Carey (2007), 181 all printed the morphologically passive form, as did Gernet & Bizos (1926), 34 and Lamb (1930), 410 but they did not even mention the conjecture (which is not surprising in the *Loeb Classical Library* but unusual for the Budé series). Scheibe (1878), xlv did not mention Cobet’s change either in the *Praefatio* of his *Editio Minor*.

LYSIAS 29.4 AS ANOTHER PARALLEL CASE?

In the *Corpus Lysiacum* speech 29 is related to speech 28. That latter speech was pronounced against Ergocles who was accused of embezzling 30 talents. He was eventually convicted, sentenced to death, executed and his property was confiscated. After the confiscation of Ergocles' property, the money could not be found. In speech 29, Lysias' client argues that Philocrates, a friend and associate of Ergocles, was complicit in Ergocles' fraudulent scheme, was responsible for the fact that the money could not be found and should therefore also be sentenced to death.

(3) εἰ γὰρ παρὰ τοῖς κηδεσταῖς καὶ οἷς ἐκεῖνος οἰκειότατ' ἀνθρώπων **ἐχρήτο** μὴ φανήσεται, χαλεπῶς παρὰ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς εὐρεθήσεται. τίνα δὲ Ἐργοκλῆς περὶ πλείονος Φιλοκράτους **ἐποιεῖτο**, ἢ πρὸς τίν' ἀνθρώπων **διέκειτο** οἰκειότερον; οὐ τῶν μὲν ὑμετέρων ὀπλιτῶν αὐτὸν **ἐξήγαγε**, τῶν δ' αὐτοῦ χρημάτων ταμίαν **ἐποίησε**, καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον τριήραρχον αὐτὸν **κατέστησε**;

(4) καίτοι δεινὸν εἰ οἱ μὲν τὰς οὐσίας ἔχοντες ὀλοφύρονται τριηραχοῦντες, οὗτος δὲ οὐδὲν πρότερον κεκτημένος ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐθελοντῆς **ὑπέστη** ταύτην τὴν λητουργίαν. οὐκοῦν δὴ οὐχ ὥς *ζημιωθισόμενον* (*cdd.*) / *ζημιωσόμενον* (*Cobet*) αὐτὸν τριήραρχον **κατέστησεν**, ἀλλ' ὥς *ὠφεληθισόμενον* (*cdd.*) / *ὠφελησόμενον* (*Cobet*) καὶ φυλάξοντα τὰ αὐτοῦ χρήματα, οὐκ ἔχων ὅτῳ χρῆ μᾶλλον τούτου πιστεῦσαι.⁵³

If it shall not appear among his kinsmen and those men he frequented in the most familiar way, it will hardly be found among his enemies. Whom did Ergocles esteem more highly than Philocrates or with what human was he the closest? Did he not send him out of your hoplites abroad? Did he not make him treasurer of his own finances? And finally, did he not appoint him as responsible to equip a warship? Certainly, it is very strange that, whereas men with wealth complain when they [have to] finance the setup of a warship, this man who before did not possess anything now voluntarily stood up to assume that task of public financing. He did therefore not establish him as responsible for financing a warship to make him suffer damages but make him take profit from it and to keep control of his own money, as he had no-one else but that man whom he could trust more.⁵⁴

In this passage, Lysias (or the person accusing Philocrates) focuses on Ergocles' actions to protect his own possessions and how Philocrates entered in this scheme. The goal is to insinuate a close connection between the corrupt Ergocles and the accused Philocrates.

In this passage, the *middle is middle and passive is passive* explanation can account for the use of the morphologically passive forms. The agent is Ergocles and the patient is Philocrates. The idea is 'Ergocles involved Philocrates in his corrupt actions and as a result Philocrates was not damaged but benefitted from Ergocles' actions'. This distinction is clearly visible in the use of the passive forms *ζημιωθισόμενον* and *ὠφεληθισόμενον* and the active *φυλάξοντα*: Ergocles wanted Philocrates to serve his interests, but Philocrates' own advantage was less relevant.

The aspect use in this passage is also intended to hint at an intimate and criminal link between Ergocles and Philocrates. The aorist forms *ἐξήγαγε*, *ἐποίησε*, *κατέστησε* and *κατέστησεν* describe the single actions that Ergocles undertook to improve Philocrates' situation and *ὑπέστη* refers to how Ergocles volunteered himself for the financing of the fleet. In this specific instance, the interpretation of the aorist as the tense of anteriority

⁵³ The aorist indicatives are underlined and the imperfects are printed in boldface.

⁵⁴ My own translation.

could explain the use of the tense as well as each action is succeeded by another (i.e., the action of ἐξήγαγε is anterior to that of ἐποίησε, which is in turn anterior to κατέστησε etc.). On the other hand, the aspectual interpretation is not excluded either as each action is described as completed. The imperfect forms refer to actions that had no endpoint: ἐχρήτο refers to the people with whom Ergocles had a close relationship, ἐποιεῖτο describes how Ergocles held Philocrates in high esteem for a longer period and δέκειτο relates how nobody was closer to Ergocles than Philocrates. As the imperfect is the tense of imperfectivity and indicates that there is no endpoint, the subliminal message is that this relationship between Ergocles and Philocrates existed until the very end and continues even today. Admittedly, a relationship of simultaneity between ἐποιεῖτο and δέκειτο is possible, but that would only explain the use of the imperfect in δέκειτο and not in ἐποιεῖτο. For the latter, only an aspectual interpretation is possible.

Having discussed the aspect of the other finite verb forms in the passage, we can now address the aspect of the future forms here. φανήσεται and εὑρεθήσεται have passive meaning and refer to the unsuccessful search for the money that Ergocles had allegedly stolen. This search has been completed, and the forms can therefore only be aoristic. It is true that the verb εὑρίσκω only uses a morphologically passive future form (cf. *supra*),⁵⁵ but that does not contradict the fact that these two forms refer to completed and single actions.

We now need to examine the aspect of ζημιωθησόμενον and ὠφελθησόμενον. Both forms are morphologically passive and have passive meaning. They are subordinated to a verb in the aorist. If we were to accept an absolute aspectual attraction, their passive and aoristic morphology would be explained, but the existence of this attraction has not been conclusively established. The presence of a super-ordinate aorist form is therefore insufficient to account for the use of the morphologically passive forms.

The accuser divided his short speech in several parts, and in the first section (29.1–4) he focused on Ergocles. After that, he turns to his accusation against Philocrates (29.5–7), provides general advice to the jury (29.8–10) and then returns to Ergocles (29.11–14) to plead for a conviction. In this section (1–4), he describes the events as Ergocles might have wanted them. The focus in this passage is on his advantage and not that of Philocrates. For that reason, Ergocles is the subject of the verb forms. He wanted Philocrates to serve his interests, but Philocrates' own advantage was less relevant. Everything related to Philocrates is therefore described with aorist forms, such as the functions and mandates he bestowed upon Philocrates. The same is true for the forms referring to the future, ζημιωθησόμενον and ὠφελθησόμενον, but which have aoristic meaning.

CONCLUSION

In this article, I discussed the variants ὠφελήσεσθ' (a middle future form with passive meaning, attested in manuscript C and printed by Bekker) and ὠφελθήσεσθ' (a morphologically passive future form, transmitted in all other manuscripts and printed by the other editors), both transmitted in Lysias 19.61. First, I addressed the question of whether there is an aspectual difference between the middle future form with passive meaning and the morphologically passive future form. Then, I raised several questions

⁵⁵ See footnote 33.

that need be addressed in the course of the attempt to determine the correct variant. It is now time to respond to those questions. Lysias clearly prefers the morphologically passive forms, while middle forms with a passive meaning are an exception: only ζημιωθήσομαι is attested, and besides ὠφελήσεσθε, two passive forms of ὠφελήθῃσθαι are unanimously transmitted. Manuscript C is not the most important one in the tradition but it has its value. At the same time, the copyist of manuscript C is known to have made changes to the text on his own initiative. Therefore, one cannot accept the variants of that manuscript at face value, nor can it be held that considering the form ὠφελήσεσθε as *lectio difficilior* is sufficient to print this form. The fact that there are 3 instances of ὠφελέω in the future and that the copyist only changed one of them argues in favour of the form ὠφελήσεσθε, because he would have changed the other 2 instances as well if he had thought that the middle one was the correct form. The theory that middle future forms have middle meaning and morphologically passive forms passive meaning clearly argues in favour of the middle form. When we apply this theory to ὠφελέω, the middle form would mean ‘take advantage of’, whereas the passive form would mean ‘be helped, be benefitted (by someone else)’. This theory has a serious shortcoming, since the distinction between middle and passive is only visible in the future and not in the aorist, where only the passive forms in -θη- are used). The aspectual use of the other forms in the passage argues in favour of the middle form in 19.61 as a duration is envisaged. So far, many elements corroborate the choice for the middle form ὠφελήσεσθε. The comparison with the two parallel passages in Lysias, 18.20 and 29.4, shows a completely different picture. In both passages morphologically passive forms have been transmitted in all manuscripts. In 18.20, the meaning is middle and there is the notion of duration. We would therefore have expected a middle form. This passage contradicts both the ‘middle is middle and passive is passive’ and the aspectual explanations. In 29.4, the situation is somewhat different. The passage contains more completed actions. The meaning is passive and not middle, and as far as the aspect is concerned one can interpret the forms as non-durative, although even in that context some lasting effect cannot be denied. The two parallel passages can therefore not be used to substantiate the choice for the middle form. In the end, the decision needs to be made based on the passage itself. In my opinion, the middle form ὠφελήσεσθε has preference, because it has middle meaning, it has an element of duration and because it is found in a manuscript that is not without value. If the variant in 19.61 had been the result of a copyist who wanted to change or improve a passive form into a middle one, the question is why he did not do this in the other two cases. This makes it less likely that the middle form in manuscript C is due to scribal intervention.

Università degli Studi di Firenze

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, C. (1905). *Lysias Selected Speeches*. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices by Charles Darwin Adams, New York: American Book Company.
- Albini, U. (1955). *Lisia: i discorsi. Testo critico introduzione traduzione e note a cura di Umberto Albini*, Firenze: Sansoni.
- Albini, U. (1961). *Andocide. L’Orazione De Reditu. Introduzione e commento a cura di Umberto Albini*, Firenze: Felice Le Monnier.

- Allan, R. (2003). *The Middle Voice: A Study in Polysemy*, Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Basile, N. & Radici-Colace, P. (2001). *Sintassi storica del greco antico*, Bari: Levante.
- Bekker, I. (1823). *Oratores Attici ex recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri. Tomus I. Andocides. Antiphon. Lysias*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bernhardy, G. (1829). *Wissenschaftliche Syntax der griechischen Sprache*, Berlin: Dublot.
- Bernhardy, G. (1862). *Paralipomena syntaxis Graecae continuata*, Halle an der Saale: Ploetz.
- Bizos, M. (1967). *Lysias. Quatre Discours. Sur le meurtre d'Ératosthène. Epitaphios. Contre Ératosthène. Pour l'invalides*. Édition, introduction et commentaire de Marcel Bizos, Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Blass, F. (1892). 'Demosthenische Studien IV'. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 47, 267–290.
- Bornemann, E. & Risch, E. (1973). *Griechische Grammatik*, Frankfurt: Diesterweg.
- Buttmann, P. (1810). *Griechische Grammatik*, Berlin: Mylius.
- Buttmann, P. & Lobeck, C. (1839). *Ausführliche griechische Sprachlehre*. Berlin: Dümmler.
- Carey, C. (1989). *Lysias. Selected Speeches*. Edited by C. Carey, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carey, C. (2007). *Lysiae Orationes cum Fragmentis recognovit brevisque adnotatione instruxit Christopher Carey*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cobet, C. (1858). *Novae lectiones quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores Graecos*, Leiden: Brill.
- De Decker, F. (2023). 'An Analysis of the Aspect Use in the Epic-Ionic -σκ-Iteratives in the *Iliad*'. *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 23, 1–65.
- De Decker, F. (2024). 'An Analysis of the Aspect Use in the Epic-Ionic -σκ-Iteratives in the *Odyssey*', in C. Viti (ed.), *Latin and Greek in the Context of the Ancient Mediterranean*. Tübingen: Narr – Francke – Attempto, 217–242.
- De Decker, F. (2025a). 'Tense, aspect, iterativity and related textual criticism: a case study based on Herodotos, *Historiai* 4.78', in K. Bentein & M. Bağrıaçık (eds.), *From Greece to Cappadocia. Ancient and Modern Greek Language Studies in Honour of Mark Janse*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 65–99.
- De Decker, F. (2025b). 'Tense and Aspect in the Counterfactual Constructions in Classical Greek: A Case Study Based on Herodotos VIII'. *Humanitas* 85, 51–72.
- Dindorf, L. (1862). *Xenophontis Memorabilia Socratis. Accedit Anonymi Apologia Socratis*. Ex recensione et cum annotationibus Ludovici Dindorfii, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dover, K. (1968). *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Edwards, M. (1999). *Lysias: Five Speeches. Speeches 1, 12, 19, 22, 30*. Edited with Introduction, Commentary and Bibliography, Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
- van Emde Boas, E. et alii (2019) *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gemoll, W. & Peters, J. (1968). *Xenophontis Institutio Cyri. Recensuit Guilelmus Gemoll editionem correctiorem curavit J. Peters*, Leipzig: Teubner.

- George, G. (2016). 'Verbal Aspect and the Greek Future: ἔξω and σχήσω'. *Mnemosyne* IV.69, 597–627.
- Gernet, L. & Bizos, M. (1924). *Lysias. Discours. Tome I (I–XV)*. Texte établi et traduit par Louis Gernet et Marcel Bizos, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Gernet, L. & Bizos, M. (1926). *Lysias. Discours. Tome II (XVI–XXXV et fragments)*. Texte établi et traduit par Louis Gernet et Marcel Bizos, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Goodwin, W. (1900). *A Greek Grammar*. Revised and Enlarged, Boston: Ginn.
- Hartmann, F. (1934). 'Zur Frage der Aspektbedeutung beim griechischen Futurum'. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 62, 116–131.
- Hettrich, H. (1976). *Kontext und Aspekt in der altgriechischen Prosa Herodots*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Hude, K. (1912). *Lysiae orationes: recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Carolus Hude*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Krüger, K. (1861). *Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen. Erster Theil: die attische Prosa. Erstes Heft: Formenlehre*, Berlin: Krüger.
- Krüger, K. & Cooper, G. (2002). *Attic Greek Prose Syntax, After K. W. Krüger*, Ann Harbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Kühner, R. (1835). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil*, Hannover: Hahn.
- Kühner, R. (1870). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweite Auflage, Zweiter Theil*, Hannover: Hahn.
- Kühner, R. & F. Blass, F. (1892). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Erster Theil. Zweiter Band. Elementar- und Formenlehre*, Hannover: Hahn.
- Kühner, R. & Gerth, B. (1898). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Erster Band. Satzlehre*, Hannover: Hahn.
- Lachawitz, G. (2022). *Einführung in die griechische Sprache. 2. Teil: Grammatik*. Wien: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky.
- Lamb, W. (1930). *Lysias, with an English Translation by W. R. M. Lamb*. London: Heinemann.
- LSJ = Liddell, H., Scott, R., Jones, H. & McKenzie, R. (1996). *Greek-English Lexicon, with a Revised Supplement. With the Help of Many Scholars*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Magnien, V. (1912). *Le futur grec. Tome second, emplois et origines du futur grec*, Paris: Klincksieck.
- Marchant, E. (1910). *Xenophontis opera omnia. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit E. C. Marchant. IV. Institutio Cyri*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Medda, E. (1995). *Lisia, Orazioni (XVI–XXXIV) e Frammenti*. Introduzione, traduzione e note di Enrico Medda, Milano: Rizzoli.
- Meisterhans, K. & Schwyzer, E. (1900). *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, Berlin: Weidmann.
- Moorhouse, A. (1982). *The Syntax of Sophocles*, Leiden: Brill.
- Prévot, A. (1934). *L'aoriste grec en θην*. Thèse pour le doctorat ès lettres présentée à la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Paris, Paris (no publisher).
- Rauchenstein, R. & Fuhr, K. (1897). *Ausgewählte Reden des Lysias. Erklärt von Rudolf Rauchenstein. 2. Bändchen. 10. Auflage besorgt von Karl Fuhr*, Berlin: Weidmann.
- Rijksbaron, A. (1979). 'Review Hettrich 1976'. *Lingua* 48, 223–257.

- Ruijgh, C. (1971). *Autour de τε-épique*, Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Schaefer, G. (1824). *Apparatus criticus et exegeticus ad Demosthenem*, London: Black, Young and Young.
- Scheibe, K. (1878). *Lysiae Orationes ad codicem Palatinum nunc denuo collatum recensuit Carolus Scheibe*, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Scheibe, K. (1897). *Lysiae Orationes ad codicem Palatinum nunc denuo collatum recensuit Carolus Scheibe*, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Schwyzler, E. & Debrunner, A. (1950). *Griechische Grammatik. Zweiter Band. Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*, München: Beck.
- Shuckburgh, E. (1882). *Lysiae Orationes XVI. With Analysis, Notes, Appendices and Indices*, London: MacMillan & Co.
- Smyth, H. & Messing, G. (1956). *Greek Grammar*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stahl, J. (1907). *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Stallbaum, G. (1848). *Platonis Parmenides cum quattuor libris prolegomenorum et commentario perpetuo. Cura Godofr. Stallbaumi*, Leipzig: Woeller.
- Stork, P. (1982). *The aspectual usage of the dynamic infinitive in Herodotus*, Groningen: Bouma.
- Thalheim, T. (1901). *Lysiae Orationes recensuit Theodorus Thalheim*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Theodoridis, C. (1998). *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon edidit Christos Theodoridis*. 2. E-M, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Threatte, L. (1996). *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions 2. Morphology*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Tronci, L. (2017a). 'Quelques suggestions pour une nouvelle analyse de la diathèse (et du TAM) dans le système du futur en grec ancien'. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 112, 77–122.
- Tronci, L. (2017b). 'Le futur grec et son rapport au moyen'. In: F. Lambert e.a. (eds.). *The Greek Future and its History – Le futur grec et son histoire*. Leuven: Peeters, 193–210.
- Tronci, L. (2017c). 'Forme del futuro nel greco ellenistico. Note sulla Settanta'. In: F. Logozzo, & P. Poccetti (eds.). *Ancient Greek Linguistics. New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 393–405.
- Tronci, L. (2020). 'Future Forms in Postclassical Greek. Some Remarks on the Septuagint and the New Testament', in: Rafiyenko, D. & Seržant, I. (eds.). *Postclassical Greek. Contemporary Approaches into Philology and Linguistics*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 111–143.
- Veitch, W. (1879). *Greek Verbs. Defective and Irregular*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wackernagel, J. (1926). *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, zweite Auflage. Basel: Birkhäuser.
- Wackernagel, J. & D. Langslow (2009). *Jakob Wackernagel. Lectures on Syntax*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.