Nothing is more characteristic of the Homeric respect for public opinion than those speeches within speeches that project what people might say after a given turn of events. So Hector in the Iliad addresses his spirit as he awaits the onrush of Achilles. If he retreats now, Poulydamas will be the first to reproach him for not having ordered a withdrawal earlier. But the reproach will also be general (22.105–108):

... αἰδέομαι Τρώως καὶ Τριφάδος ἐλκεσιπέπλους,
μὴ ποτὲ τις εἴπησι κακώτερος ἄλλος ἐμεῖο.
"Εκτῷρ ἦπι βίῃφι πιθήσοις ἀλέσε λούν.'
ὡς ἐρέοσιν ... 

In Homer this procedure of projecting future opinion is a conspicuous part of the hero’s armory, and its formal characteristics are a suitable object of parody. Thus Hegemon, the fifth century epic parodist, vows never again to venture abroad in search of lucre, but will scoop up money at home in Thasos. Never again will anyone be indignant when his wife bakes a holiday loaf of meagre dimensions,

καὶ ποτὲ τις εἴπη σμικρὸν τυροῦντ’ ἕαιδοῦσα:
"ὤ φίλη, ὦνὴρ μὲν παρ’ Αθηναίοισιν ἀείσοις
πεντήκοντ’ ἔλαβε δραχμᾶς, ὁδ’ δὲ μικρὸν ἐπέφω.

(P. Brandt, Corpusculum poesis epicae ludibundae, p. 44, 15–17 = Athenaeus 15.698 f.). The history of a device that is so recognizably Homeric and so linked to the values of a shame culture is of ethical as well as stylistic interest. In each case the approach to an Homeric pattern, or the deviation from it, to some extent defines the moral attitude of the speaker as well as the stylistic affinity of the writer.

Since in Homer these speeches express public opinion, as voiced by an
anonymous *tis* or “someone,” they belong to the general category of what Anton Fingerle has called *tis*-Reden.¹ As potential *tis*-Reden (expressions of what people might say), they are to be distinguished from actual *tis*-Reden (expressions of what people actually said). Formally the difference is reflected in introductory and capping formulas. Actual *tis*-Reden are introduced in the past tense directly from the narrative, by the phrase ὅδε δὲ τις εἰπεικε(ν),² and are capped by the phrase ὅς ἄρα τις εἰπεικε(ν),³ ὅς ἄρ’ ἐφαν,⁴ or the like.⁵ Potential *tis*-Reden, on the other hand, in their capacity as speeches within speeches that refer to the future, have an introductory formula that is either purposive⁶ or predictive,⁷ and a capping formula that is invariably future.⁸ The content of a potential *tis*-Reden is either shameful or glorious and reflects the psychology of the speaker who projects it. This is in contrast to actual *tis*-Reden, which are more often than not morally neutral.

In Homer the opinion expressed in a potential *tis*-Rede is usually negative, and the speaker projecting this negative opinion is often attempting to dissuade himself or others from a certain course of action. Hector’s soliloquy before the onrush of Achilles is an example. Similarly, in the funeral games of Patroclus, Menelaus urges impartial adjudication of his dispute with Antilochus so that no Achaean can accuse him of pressure tactics. The anonymous Achaeans’ potential accusation is fully quoted, giving Menelaus ample cause to settle his dispute peaceably (II. 23.575–578). In the *Odyssey*, Eurymachus fears the consequences to the suitors’ reputation if the beggar in the palace is given a chance of joining the contest with the bow. Here, as in Hector’s soliloquy, the imagined speaker

---

¹ Tyypik der homerischen Reden, unpublished dissertation, Munich, 1944, 283–294 (I wish to thank the Institut für klassische Philologie of Munich University for supplying me with a copy of these pages). See also C. Hentze, “Die Chorreden in den homerischen Epen,” Philologus 64 (1905), 254–268.


³ II. 4.85; 17.423; 22.375. Od. 4.772; 13.170; 23.152.


is baser than they (Od. 21.324). Nausikaa, too, takes seriously the potential reproaches of her inferiors, should she be seen entering the town with a strange man (Od. 6.275–285). She admits that she herself would feel the same way about another girl in the same circumstances.9 The truth is that in Homer there is no such thing as non-valid public opinion.10

But *tis-Reden* are not always negative, and their function can at times be to encourage and to persuade. For example, in the *Iliad* Sarpedon encourages Glaukos to fight in the front rank (12.317–321):

... ὀφφρα τις ἀδήτως ἐπη Ἀυκίων πῦκα θωρηκτάων· ὅω μᾶν ἀκλέεις Ἀυκίων κάτα κοιρανέουσιν ἱμέτεροι βασιλῆς, ἐδοούς τε πίωνα μήλα οἶνον τ' ἐξαιτὸν μεληδέα: ἀλλ' ἄρα καὶ ἦσθλή, ἐπεὶ Ἀυκίων μέτα πρώτων μᾶχοντα·

The third function of *tis-Reden* in Homer is predictive. An anonymous speech can bring fame or shame in the future without demanding an immediate response. So in a mood of fatalism Hector imagines what will be said about his wife Andromache after the fall of Troy (II. 6.459–462):

καὶ ποτὲ τις ἔπησον ἄδων κατὰ δάκρυ χέοςον· Ἐκτόρος ἠδὲ γυνῆ, ὦ ἀριστεύσει μαχεθαὶ Ἀριστεύσει ὑποδόμοι, ὅτε Ἡλιος ἀμφιμάχοντο· ὅς ποτὲ τις ἔρειε...

But, he continues, may I be dead and buried by then.11 More optimistic is Hector’s idea of an epitaph for one of his own prospective victims (II. 7.87–91):

καὶ ποτὲ τις ἔπησοι καὶ ὀψιγόνων ἀνθρώπων, νηὶ πολυκλήιδι πλέων ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον· ἀνδρός μὲν τόδε σῆμα πάλαυ κατατεθνήσκοι, ὅν ποτ’ ἀριστεύσαντα κατέκτανε φαίδιμος Ἐκτωρῷ. ὅς ποτὲ τις ἔρεει τὸ δ’ ἐμόν κλέος οὐ ποτ’ ὀλεῖται.12

9 Nausikaa’s *tis-Reden* is the longest in Homer and serves to depict her ambiguous attitude to the local suitors. See Norman Austin, *Archery at the Dark of the Moon*, Berkeley, 1975, 194.


11 Hector’s despair about Andromache is matched by Andromache’s own despair about Astyanax. At II. 22.496–498, she imagines what more fortunate boys will say to her orphaned child (the gnomic aorist at 496 is applied in the future to Astyanax, as 499 ff. show).

12 There is perhaps an element of persuasion here, in that Hector’s prospective victim will become famous by association. Conversely, there is an element of dissuasion at II. 4.176–182, where Agamemnon encourages Menelaus not to die.
After Homer this contemplation of posthumous fame is applied by the writer of personal poetry to his own poetic achievement. So Theognis (22 ff.), enlarging the Homeric τις to πᾶς τις,¹³ looks forward to his own fame as a poet:

\[
\text{ὡς δὲ πᾶς τις ἐρεῖ: 'Θεύνιδος ἐστιν ἐπὴ
tοῦ Μεγαρέως: πάντας δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός.'¹⁴
\]

In the same tradition is a fragment falsely attributed to Epicharmus.¹⁵

But even in Homer not every projection of opinion is a τις-Rede. When, in Iliad 8.145 ff., Diomedes considers retreating before the thunderbolt of Zeus, he imagines not what “someone” will say but what Hector in particular will say if he draws back.¹⁶ One might add that the “someone” of τις-Reden is usually further qualified as an Achaean, a Trojan, a suitor, or the like. So in Semonides (7.29–31 West), who provides the earliest example of projected future opinion after Homer, it is the ignorant visitor, and not just anyone, who praises a woman whom he has only seen on one of her good days:

\[
\text{ἐπαινέσει μὴν ξεῖνος ἐν δόμους ἰδών:
οὐκ ἐστιν ἄλλη τήδει λωτῶν γυνὴ
ἐν πάσιν ἀνθρώπουσιν οὐδὲ καλλίων.}
\]

Closer to the dramatic context of Homer is the use of projected opinion by Solon in his Salamis poem. This work of about 100 lines is conceived as a messenger speech delivered to the Athenians by a herald fresh from Salamis, which the Athenians are in danger of abandoning to the Megarians. According to Diogenes Laertius, the poem reaches a climax of scorn when the herald wishes he were the citizen of the obscurest island rather than of Athens (Solon 2.3 f. West):

\[
\text{αἶffa γὰρ ἄν φάτις ἓδε μετ' ἄνθρωποις γένοιτο:
'Ἀττικὸς οὖτος ἄντρ, τῶν Σαλαμιναφετέων.'}
\]

By projecting the scorn that will be heaped upon them, the herald attempts to dissuade the Athenians from letting go of the island.¹⁷

---

¹³ See Rudolf Führer, Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik (Zetemata 44), Munich, 1967, 54.
¹⁴ For this punctuation see Felix Jacoby, “Theognis,” SBBA 1931, 115 f.
¹⁵ Fr. 86.12 ff. in Colin Austin, Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta (= CGFPop.).
¹⁶ At 152 ff. Nestor argues that even if Hector should call him a coward, the Trojan men and women he has widowed would disagree. The authority of their collective judgement would naturally be expressed by a τις-Rede, and this general judgement would outweigh any individual judgement.
¹⁷ Even more interesting is Solon’s projection of actual public opinion, in fr. 33 West. The vulgar crowd consider him a fool for not having abused his powers as arbitrator to
Chronologically, the next example of projected future opinion is an oracle in Herodotus, which is dated by Parke to around 494 B.C.¹⁸

ως ποτε τις ἑρεία καὶ ἐπεσομένων ἀνθρώπων·
‘δεινός ὥς τρειλικτος ἀπώλετο δουρί δαμασθεῖσ.’

(Parke–Wormell 84.4 = Hdt. 6.77). The predictive function of the tis-Rede follows naturally from Homer, though the author of the oracle mistakenly applies an Homeric capping formula to introduce it.

It is, however, the dramatic use of the device in Solon that points the way to Greek tragedy.¹⁹ Proportionally, tragedy contains as many instances of projected opinion as Homeric epic itself. This is partly due to the inherently dramatic nature of the device, which is always thought of as a speech within a speech. In drama, though, we must distinguish between non-argumentative projections of opinion developed from Homer, and the argumentative projections of opinion known in rhetoric as prokatalepsis, where an opinion is set up for the purpose of being demolished. Prokatalepsis is the rule in oratory, whereas poetic examples occur for the first time in Euripides.²⁰

In Aeschylus the power of public opinion is typically very different than in Homer. In Homer it has a quasi-objective force because every one subscribes to it. In Aeschylus there is an element of religious compulsion (Agamemnon 456 f.):

βαρεία δ' ἀστῶν φάτις σὺν κότῳ,
δημοκράτου δ' ἀράς τίνε χρέος.

become tyrant. But elsewhere (fr. 32 West), in a hitherto unparalleled defiance of public opinion, Solon defends his own position.


²⁰ For Euripidean examples see Christopher Collard’s edition of Euripides’ Suppliants, ad v. 184 (but the pre-Euripidean examples he cites are all tis-Reden and are not procataleptic). The earliest dated example of prokatalepsis in Old Comedy is Ar. Aech. 540 (425 B.C.), but this is itself a parody of Eur. Telephus 708 N. A possibly earlier example is Pherecrates fr. 154 Edmonds = Athen. 3.122 e. For Middle Comedy cf. Philiscus in Austin, CGFapa., fr. 215.1.—Usually there is no danger of confusing the two types of projection, but at Ba. 204 ff., where the opinion to be rejected is a shaming judgement, the first two lines by themselves could pass as an indirect tis-Rede:

ἐρεῖ τις ωγὸ ἔγκραη ὡν ἀλοχύνομαι,
μέλλων χορεῖν κράτα κισσάνας ἐμόν.

The very next line, however, shows that the opinion was presented for instant rebuttal (hence, as in Murray’s text, one should read 204 f. with an interrogative intonation: “will someone say . . . ?”).
Whether their rulers listen or not, what the people say can be effective. It is perhaps the fear of a divinely backed curse that helps Pelasgus in the *Suppliants* to his decision of consulting the people before granting asylum to the Danaids (398–401):

$$
\text{εἰπον δὲ καὶ πρὶν, οὐκ ἄνευ δῆμου τάδε πράξαιμ' ἄν, οὐδὲ περ κρατῶν, μὴ καὶ ποτὲ}
\text{ἐνὴ λεώς, εἰ ποὺ τι μὴ τοῖν τύχοι, 'ἐπιήλυσας τιμῶν ἀπώλεσας πόλιν'}. \\
$$

The projected accusation, epigrammatic in its assonance and its evenly split line, is an enhancement of Homer’s (*II*. 22.107)

"Εκτωρ ἦφι βίηφι πιθήσας ὀλεσε λαῶν."

Note, however, that it is the people as a group, and not a generalized “someone” who speaks.

Closer both in form and feeling to an Homeric *tis*-Rede is Orestes’ tribute to Athena after his acquittal in the *Eumenides*. In that play honour is a matter for the gods, whether Olympian or chthonic. Orestes, the only human being in the play other than the priestess at the beginning and the silent citizens of Athens, is preoccupied with survival. But now that for him at least the storm has cleared and he can return into society, he expresses his thanks by an imagined tribute to the Olympian triad (*Eumenides* 756–760):

$$
καὶ τις 'Ελλήνων ἐρεῖ·
\text{Ἀργεῖος ὄνηρ αὕθις, ἐν τε χρήμασιν οἴκει πατρίφους, Παλλάδος καὶ Λοξίου}
\text{ἐκατ' καὶ τοῦ πάντα κραίνουτος τρίτου Σωτήρος'.} \\
$$

Equally Homeric and specifically Odyssean is the passage in the *Libation Bearers* where Orestes seeks to manipulate public opinion in order to assure his admittance to the palace (567–570):

$$
\text{μενοῦμεν ὄφτως ὄσον ἐπεκάλεσεν τινὰ}
\text{δόμους παραστέλοντα καὶ τᾶς ἐννέπεν·}
\text{τί δὴ πύλησι τὸν ἰκέτην ἀπείρεται}
\text{Αἰγισθός, εἰπερ ὁδεῖν ἐνδήμος παρῶν';}^{21}
$$

In fact, Orestes gains admission with ease and is at once faced with his mother—a moral, not a technical problem. In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus also

---

21 Alexander Sideras, *Aeschylus Homericus* (*Hypomnemata* 31), Göttingen, 1972, 228, notes that the nemesis that would be aroused in such a situation is actually felt by Telemachus at *Od*. 1.119 f.
thinks of manipulating public opinion to achieve his ends. After the killing of the suitors he orders the household to engage in song and dance (23.135 f.):

\[\ldots \dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa\varepsilon \nu \tau \iota \varsigma \ \phi \acute{a} \iota \eta \ \gamma \acute{a} \mu \omicron \nu \ \acute{e} \mu \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \varsigma \varsigma \nu \omega \varsigma, \]  
\[\eta \ \dot{\alpha} \nu \ \delta \delta \omicron \ \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \chi \omega \nu \ \eta \ \dot{o} \ \iota \ \pi \epsilon \rho \nu \alpha \iota \epsilon \tau \alpha \omicron \nu \omicron.\]

But Odysseus’ potential tis-Rede (given in reported speech) is soon converted into an actual tis-Rede (Od. 23.148–151), thus confirming the hero’s mastery of the plot.22

In a frankly imitative context, Sophocles provides an even more direct reflection of an Homeric tis-Rede. Just as, in Book Six of the Iliad, in the final scene between Hector and Andromache, Hector imagines the words that will be spoken about Andromache after her captivity, so in Ajax, in the final scene between the hero and Tecmessa, Tecmessa imagines what her husband’s enemies will say about her to his own discredit (505) once she gets into their power (500–504):23

\[\kappa \alpha i \tau \iota \varsigma \ \pi \iota \kappa \rho \omicron \ \pi r \acute{o} \sigma \phi \theta e \gamma \mu \alpha \iota \delta e \sigma {\varsigma} \pi \omicron \pi \omicron \tau \omicron \iota \omicron \nu \ \dot{e} \rho e \iota \ \lambda \dot{o} \gamma \omicron \iota \varsigma \ \iota \alpha \pi \omicron \tau \omicron \nu \ \iota \dot{\alpha} \iota \tau \iota \varsigma \varsigma \nu \omega \varsigma, \]  
\[\tau \omicron \omega \iota \alpha \omicron \nu \iota \ \dot{e} \rho e \iota \ \tau \iota \varsigma \ldots \]

Sophocles even imitates the ring form of the Homeric framing formulas, by repeating the verb of speaking. But the difference in speaker and intention is also important. In Sophocles the tis-Rede is spoken by the woman as an instrument of persuasion, while in Homer it is spoken by the man in a vision of despair.24

Characteristically, Ajax rejects Tecmessa’s premiss out of hand (560 ff.). The situation she envisages simply will not arise. As for his own future, any further humiliating possibilities will be forestalled by suicide. One of the rejected possibilities is a reunion with his father Telamon. It is this same possibility that his half-brother, Teukros, envisages in detail, as he laments

22 Among Aeschylean examples we should also note Ag. 575 ff. However we interpret 575 f., 577–579 project a boast that is recapitulated in Homeric style by τοιαύτα, at 580.


24 For the exaggerated masculinity of Ajax compared to Hector see Michael Shaw, “The female intruder,” CPh 70 (1975), 257 f.
over the hero’s corpse. If Teukros returns home without Ajax he will get a grim reception indeed (1012–1018):

οὗτος τί κρύψει; ποίον ούκ ἔρει κακὸν,
τὸν ἐκ δορὸς γεγώτα πολεμίου25 νόθον,
τὸν δειλὰ προδοτὰ καὶ κακανδρίᾳ
σὲ, φιλτατ’ Ἁιᾶς, ἢ δόλοισιν, ὡς τὰ σὰ
κράτηθαντὸς καὶ δόμας νέομιμοι σοὺς.
τοιαῦτ’ ἀνὴρ δύσοργος, ἐν γῆρα βαρύς,
ἔρει . . .

As with Tecmessa’s τίς-Rede, this indirect projection of Telamon’s opinion is capped by a return to the verb of speaking. The formality of the frame contrasts with the supple modulation into a direct address of Ajax (1015), who thus remains the centre of attention.26

It is not accidental that there are two projected speeches in Ajax, since the whole plot revolves around reputation, and in this respect is the most Homeric of Sophocles’ plays. The only other speech of projected opinion in Sophocles is in the much later Electra. There the heroine evokes the glory that she and her sister will gain if (now that their brother is dead) they take it on themselves to avenge their father (975–985):

τὶς γάρ ποτ’ ἄστων ἢ ξένων27 ἡμᾶς ἰδὼν
τοιοίδ’ ἐπαίνοισ υἱὶ δεξιώσεται;
ἰδεοθε τῶ δέ τῶ κασιγῆτω, φίλοι,
ὅ τὸν πατρίων οίκον ἔξεσωσάτην,
ὦ τοίς ἐχθροῖς ἐν βεβηκόσιν ποτὲ
ψυχῆς ἀφειδήσαντε πρωτστήτην φόνου.
τοῦτω φιλεῖν χρῆ, τῶδε χρῆ πάντας σέβειν;
τῶδ’ ἐν θ’ ἑόρταις ἐν τε πανθήμω πόλει
τιμῶν ἀπαντάς οὖνεκ’ ἀνδρείας χρεών.’
τοιαῦτα τοι νῦ πᾶς τὶς ἔξερει βροτῶν,
ζώσαις βανούσαις θ’ ὡστε μὴ κλιπεῖν κλέος.

But this heady vision does not sway Chrysothemis. What good is reputation if one has to face an infamous and protracted death (1005 ff.)?

Interestingly enough, the praise that Electra imagines is actually given to Antigone (though she never knows it). At Antigone 692 ff., Haemon, in the hope of swaying his father, tells Creon what the city is surreptitiously saying in praise of Antigone. But Creon is unmoved, and this report of

25 To stress the alienation of Teukros, I interpret πολέμως as hostilis (its normal sense) rather than as bellicos.
26 Note at 1015 f. the expressively repeated pronominal forms σὲ . . . τὰ σὰ . . . σοῦς.
27 The polar expression here is equivalent in its inclusiveness to Theognis’ πᾶς τις, which duly appears in the capping line (984).
actual public opinion has no effect. We may note that in Sophocles pro-
jections of future opinion are equally ineffective.28

In Euripides there are twelve examples of projected future opinion,29
proportionately more than the number in Aeschylus or Sophocles. Half of
these are tis-Reden of the Homeric type, except that in Euripides the
hypothetical speaker is usually a completely generalized tis or “someone,”
and is not even a member of such a broad group as “the Greeks.” The
imitation of Homer produces an archaizing effect, but at the same time
the extreme anonymity of the speaker gives the broadest possible currency
to what he says. The remaining half dozen projections of opinion are not
tis-Reden and show little or no Homeric influence.

The most simplistic examples of tis-Reden in Euripides are to be found
in the two patriotic plays, the Heracleidae and the Supplicants. In the prologue
to the Heracleidae Iolaos, the nephew of Herakles, gives his reasons for shar-
ing in the misery and exile of the children of Herakles as follows (28–30):

... ὅκνων προδοθαι, μή τις ὃδε εἶπη βροτῶν'
'.opend' ἐπεὶδὴ παισίν οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ,
'Ἰάλαος οὐκ Ἦμινε συγγενῆς γεγοῖς.'

The ostentatious rectitude of his position, somewhat old-fashioned in its
Homeric dress, contrasts with the confident modernism of the Argive
herald, whose system of morality is quite different.

Later in the same play, one of the children, Makaria, argues for sacrifi-
cing herself to save Athens. Part of her argument consists in envisaging
what would happen should she survive the fall of the city that had offered
her protection (516–519):

κόσκιναι ἀλχυνοῦμαι δήτ', ἡν δή τις λέγη:
τι δεῦρ' ἀφίκεσθ' ἱκανίως σὺν κλάδοις
ἀυτῷ φιλοψυχοῦντες; ἐξείτε χθονός:
κακοῦ γὰρ ἡμεῖς οὐ προσωφελήσομεν.'

The feeling anticipated is of shame, yet the thought behind it is practical
and quite in accordance with the overall rationality of her speech. If she
fails to assist her benefactor now, she can expect no help in the future.

In the Supplicants Theseus is shamed by his mother Aethra into helping
the Argives gain permission from the Thebans to bury their dead. If he

28 To the Sophoclean examples we might add O.R. 1496–1500, where a catalogue of
family woes is transformed into a speech of projected opinion by the capping τοιαύτης
διοδίεται (1500, cf. 1494).
29 The tis-Reden are Herae. 28–30; 516–519; Supp. 314–319; Ph. 580–582; Alc. 954–
960; 1000–1005. Formally distinct are HF 1289 f.; 1378–1381; Tr. 1188–1191; IA 462–
466; 790–800; 1177–1179.
does help, he will be supporting a principle of international law, while if
he doesn’t (314–319):

ἐρεῖ δὲ δὴ τίς ὡς ἀνανθαρία χερῶν,
πόλει παρόν σοι στέφανον ἐυκλείας λαβεῖν,
δεῖας ἀπέστης, καὶ σωσ μὲν ἄγριον ἄγωνος ἡμῶν φαύλον ἀθλήσας πόνων,
οὐ δὲ ἐς κράνος βλέψαντα καὶ λάγχης ἅρμην χρην ἐκποιήσαι, δειλὸς ὄν ἐφηνρέθης.

Theseus only needs a mild prod to agree. He is, after all, the representative
of Athens and as such he is, in all extant Greek tragedy, beyond reproach
and sure to succeed.

In these morality plays Honour is unproblematic. This is very different
from the tragic world of Hippolytus, where the two major characters,
Phaedra and Hippolytus, both passionately espouse honour and the re-
nown it brings, but are victims of their internal enemies or of circumstance.
It is very different, too, from those plays, particularly in the later period,
where the claims of honour, if they are made at all, are not heeded. So in
the Phoenissae Jocasta suggests to her son Polynices that he is in a moral
dilemma. If he succeeds in capturing his native city, how will he inscribe
the dedicatory shields (575 f.)?

‘Θῆβας πυρώσος τάσοδε Πολυνέικης θεοῖς ἀσπίδας ἐθηκε.’

If, on the other hand, he fails and returns to Argos (580–582):

ἐρεῖ δὲ δὴ τίς· ὅ κακὰ μυστείματα
"Ἀδραστε προσθείς, διὰ μιᾶς νύμφης γάμον ἀπωλόμεσθα.”

But her plea is not even considered, for Eteocles cuts short the debate by
threatening to withdraw Polynices’ safe conduct (for he is only in Thebes
on sufferance). In the discussion between the brothers, as in the more
desperate parts of Thucydides, Fear and Ambition are the motivations,
and Honour is expendable.

Alcestis provides a more sophisticated use of projected opinion. In that
play there is a conspiracy of silence between Admetus, Alcestis and the
chorus about the seamy side of Admetus’ transaction with his wife, in
which he had allowed her to give him a new lease on life by dying for him.
After her death, this silence is broken by Pheres, the father of Admetus,
who under provocation goes so far as to call Admetus his wife’s murderer.
The chorus remains unaffected by this outburst, and does not really com-
ment on it. After the funeral, though, Admetus does change his attitude,
but this is only because he realizes that the bargain he had made with
death was not such a good one after all, and that Alcestis in death is actually better off than he is in life. For Alcestis had a noble death and is now free of pain, while life without her, as he has just discovered, is no pleasure, and on top of that his reputation has suffered. What Pheres has already said to Admetus reappears as the projection of what his enemies will soon be saying (954–960):

\[\text{ερεῖ δὲ μ' ὅσις ἐχθρός ὡν κυρεῖ τάδε:} \]
\[\text{ιδοῦ τὸν αἰσχρῷς ζώνθ', δὲ οὐκ ἐτήθ θανεῖν,} \]
\[\text{αὐτῷ ἦν ἐγγεμεν ἀντίδους ἀμυνχία} \]
\[\text{πέψευγεν "Αἰδήν, εἶτ' ἀνὴρ ἐναι δοκεῖ;} \]
\[\text{στογεῖ δὲ τοὺς τεκόντας, αὐτὸς οὗ τέλων} \]
\[\text{θανεῖν,} \text{ τοῖόνδε πρὸς κυκοῖσι κληδόνα} \]
\[\text{ἐξο.} \]

But in imagining what people will say, Admetus by no means subscribes to their views. The key difference from the Homeric model is that it is not just any one who will speak out against him, but rather his enemies, his echthroi, whose opinion can be at least partially discounted. His public image may be damaged (a regrettable occurrence), but his self image is relatively unscathed.30

In the chorus that follows this episode, the bad reputation of Admetus is implicitly contrasted with the good reputation of Alcestis. Impromptu tributes at the tomb are already familiar from Homer, and just as in the Iliad Hector imagines what will be said at the tomb of one of his prospective victims, so the chorus imagine a visit to the tomb of Alcestis (1000–1005):

\[\text{kai tis doximian kelenouv} \]
\[\text{ἐκβαίνων τόδ' ερεί:} \]
\[\text{ἀυτῷ ποτὲ προβάδαν ἀνδρόσ,} \]
\[\text{νῦν δ' ἐστι μάκαρα δαιμών:} \]
\[\text{χαίρ', ὃ πότνι', εὖ δὲ δοῖς.' τοῖαί νν προσεροῦσι φήμαι.} \]

As in Sophocles, the tribute to Alcestis follows the Homeric pattern down to the ring form repetition of the verb of speaking. But though the chorus is supposed to be consolatory, the projected speech of praise for the wife, coming on the heels of a projected speech of blame for the husband, has an ironic effect.

Of the six remaining examples of projected opinion in Euripides, three occur in Iphigenia in Aulis, two in Herakles, and one in the Trojan Women. At I.A. 462–464, Agamemnon contributes to his dilemma by imagining

30 By contrast, in Homer even an enemy's opinion is fully respected (as Diomedes' respects Hector's opinion at II. 8.147–150).
the speech of supplication that his daughter will make. At I.A. 1177–1179, Clytemnestra tries to influence Agamemnon by projecting what she will keep on saying to herself back in Argos, if Iphigeneia is killed. At I.A. 790–800, the chorus imagine what the Trojan women will say at the prospect of slavery. At Troades 1189 ff., as a variation on what people will say, Hekabe imagines what a poet will write on the tomb of Astyanax.31

More remarkable is the sequence in Herakles. In the pathetic aftermath to his madness, during which he has killed his wife and his children, the hero at first resolves to kill himself too. Like Makaria in the Heracleidae, he wonders how he could honourably survive as an exile. He will be bitterly goaded as follows (1289 f.):

\[\text{'ο} ω\text{ ω} \delta \text{ o} \delta \text{ τ} \delta \text{ λ} \text{ώ} \text{ς} \text{ ς} \text{ τ} \text{έ} \text{k} \text{v} \text{v} \text{ή} \text{π} \text{t} \text{e} \text{w} \text{e} \text{v} \text{v} \text{έ} \text{t} \text{ο} \text{τ} \text{ος} \text{ ἀ} \text{π} \text{o} \text{f} \text{f} \text{θ} \text{a} \text{r} \text{ή} \text{s} \text{e} \text{t} \text{a} \text{i} \text{;} \text{ σe} \text{ω} \text{π} \text{ή} \text{ς} \text{ τ} \text{ύ} \text{σ} \text{δ} \text{ο} \text{i} \text{δ} \text{ή} \text{p} \text{ή} \text{s} \text{τ} \text{α} \text{ρ} \text{ή} \text{σ} \text{τ} \text{α} \text{;} \text{ ὅ} \text{w} \text{ς} \text{ τ} \text{ή} \text{o} \text{δ} \text{ή} \text{ς} \text{ ἀ} \text{πo} \text{φ} \text{θ} \text{α} \text{r} \text{ή} \text{s} \text{τ} \text{α} \text{;}\]

What distinguishes this from conventional projections of shame (apart from the lack of a formal introduction), is the horrible gravity of the charge. If the charge is true, as it incontrovertibly is, the shame before others is almost forgotten before the horror of the fact itself. That Herakles is not just thinking of what people will say, is shown by the succeeding lines (immediately succeeding, if we follow Wilamowitz). The very elements, so he imagines, will reject him (Herakles 1295–1298):

\[\phiωνινά γάρ ᾿ ἰσει χθων ἀπενεποννά με \μή θεγγάνειν γής καὶ πάλασα μή περᾶν πηγαί τε ποταμῶν, καὶ τον ἀρματήλατον Ἰχίον ἐν δεσμοῖσαν ἐκμιμήσομαι.\]

And yet this blend of shame and guilt is not intellectually assented to, for, as he says at the end of this very speech, it is the goddess Hera and not himself who is to blame.

In the end, under the influence of Theseus, Herakles decides to steel himself to live rather than to die, perhaps in part as a testimony of innocence. In tears he laments his shattered past, and as he prepares to leave the scene of the killings he hesitates to take up his weapons (1378–1381):

\[άμηθανό γάρ πότερ ῖ χω τάδ’ ἣ μεθώ, ἃ πλεύρα τάμα προσπίπτοντ’ ἐρεί τάδε: ἦμιν τέκν’ εἰλες καὶ δάμαρθ’ ἦμᾶς ἐχεις παιδοκτόνως σοις.’\]

31 For shameful writing, as opposed to shameful speech, cf. E. Ph. 573 f.
The surreal picture fits his fevered condition. Here a device that properly expresses the values of a shame culture is adapted to express feelings of guilt, by having the weapons rather then the public speak.\textsuperscript{32} These last passages from \textit{Herakles} boldly realize such hypotheses as that of the watchman in the prologue of \textit{Agamemnon}, who imagines what the house would say “if it could give voice.”\textsuperscript{33} Yet another possibility is to imagine what the dead would say if \textit{they} could give voice. So in \textit{Orestes} (408 B.C.), the hero asks his uncle Menelaus to imagine that his dead father Agamemnon is speaking through him (674–677).\textsuperscript{34} Nine years later we find a similar conceit in Andocide (1.148), and thereafter it becomes a commonplace.

In rhetorical theory, the non-real projection of opinion from the past is a form of \textit{prosopopoeia}, which in principle could also include projections of future opinion such as the Homeric \textit{tis}-Reden. But, as we have noticed, in Greek oratory projections of future opinion are usually argumentative and procatletic in nature. The one exception is a passage in Hyperides’ \textit{Defence of the sons of Lycurgus} (ca. 324 B.C.): τίνα φήσουν οἱ παριόντες αὐτοῦ τὸν τάφον; οὗτος ἔβιω μὲν σωφρόνως, ταχθεῖς δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ διωκήσει τῶν χρημάτων ἤπει πόρους, ἰκοδόμησε τὸ θέατρον, τὸ θεῖον, τὰ νεώρια, τριήρεις ἐποιήσατο, λιμένας τοῦτον ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν ἱτίμωσε κἂν τοὺς παιδᾶς ἐδησεν αὐτοῦ.’ (Hyperides fr. 118 Kenyon). The passerby at the tomb in Hyperides’ projection of opinion harks back to Hector’s \textit{tis}-Rede for his prospective victim in the \textit{Iliad}, and the chorus’ \textit{tis}-Rede for the heroine in \textit{Aleestis}. The projection of an epitaph as a shaming device is paralleled by Hekabe’s epitaph for Astyanax in the \textit{Trojan Women}.

The passage from Hyperides is unusual in other ways. Down to the end of the Hellenistic period, there are only two other instances of a moralizing use of projected future opinion.\textsuperscript{35} One occurs in Apollonius Rhodius’ \textit{Argonautica}, in a passage where Medea considers the possibility of first aiding Jason and then killing herself.\textsuperscript{36} She is dissuaded by the reflection that even suicide would not help her posthumous reputation. Even after death

\textsuperscript{32} Reproachful weapons also speak in an epitaph by Antipater of Sidon for the tomb of Ajax (Page 7 = \textit{A.P.} 7.146):

\begin{quote}
tέχνης δ’ αὖ λέγειν Ἀχιλλέως· ἀρέσεως ἄλκας, οὐ σκολίων μίθων ἀμμες ἑφιέμεθα.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{33} Aesch. \textit{Ag.} 37; cf. Eur. \textit{Hipp.} 418; \textit{Andr.} 924.

\textsuperscript{34} Compare also the virtuosity of Menelaus at \textit{Hel.} 962 ff., where he attempts to influence Theonoe by invoking her dead father.

\textsuperscript{35} Post-Euripidean tragedy, had it survived, might have provided further examples.

\textsuperscript{36} This is the only example of projected opinion in Appollonius Rhodius. His epic, however, contains several actual \textit{tis}-Reden, e.g., at 2.144–154; 4.1457–1461.
she will be mocked and become the talk of the town (3.793–797):

καὶ κέν με διὰ στόματος φορέσωμαι
Κολχίδας ἀμυνός ἄλλα δείκετα μοιχήσουνται;
ητίς κηδεμόνες τόσον ἀνέρος ἀλλοδοποιοῦν
κάθισαν, ἡτίς δώμα καὶ οὐς ἱσχύειν τοκῆς,
μαργαρισμή εἰςα. — τι δ’ οὐκ ἔσται ἀἰσχός;

The other occurs in an anonymous papyrus fragment attributable to Cercidas. A modest and virtuous existence is preferable to excessive meddling, which can expose one to shipwreck and to the gibes of one’s enemies (Powell, Coll. Alex., p. 218, 37–40):

εἰς μὲν οὖν, ὦ Πάρνη, βουλοίμην εἰναι
tάρκευν’ ἐμαυτῷ καὶ νομίζοσθαι χρηστός,
ἡ πολλὰ πρήσεις, καὶ ποτ’ έιπέων τοὺς ἕχορούσι−
ἀλών δὲ φόρτος εἶθεν ἥλθεν ἐνθ’ ἥλθεν.

The remaining instances of projected opinion in Hellenistic literature are confined to predictions of or wishes for praise. Wishes find their Homeric exemplar in Hector’s hopes for Astyanax (II. 6.479 f.):

καὶ ποσὲ τις εἴποι 'πατρός γ’ ὅδε πολλόν ἀμέινων’
ἐκ πολέμου ἀνέντα.

So Hegemon wishes that the passerby of the tomb of the Spartans at Thermopylae will praise them (Hegemon i page = Α.Π. 7.436):

Εἴποι τις παρὰ τύμβου ἰόν ἀγέλαστος ὀδίτας
τοῦτ’ ἔποσ: 'άγων ποιοῦ' ἐνθαδε μυριάδας
Σπάρτας χίλιοι ἄνδρες ἔπεαξον αἵμα τὸτ’ Περσῶν
καὶ θάνου 'αστρεπτεί Δώριος ἀ μελέτα.’

Similarly, Eratosthenes wishes that people will respond to his dedication at the temple of Ptolemy (fr. 35, 17 f. Powell):

... λέγοι δὲ τις ἄθεμα λεύσων’
τοῦ Κυρηναίου τοῦτ’ 'Ερατοσθένεος.’

Also a wish, though different in form, is Theocritus 12.10–16. But the other examples of projected opinion in Theocritus are flat predictions. So, at 15.126 f., the sources of wool for the blankets of Adonis will proclaim themselves:

ἄ Μίλατος ἔρει χῶ τῶν Σαμίων καταβόσκων,
'ἐστρωται κλίνα τυιδόνδι τῷ καλῷ ἀμιν.’

37 Because of the parallel with Homer, Gow–Page are probably wrong to interpret the optative here as potential. Their reference to the speeches of legendary characters introduced by the lemma τι ἄν λέγοι; or τινας ἄν εἴποι λόγος; (as at Α.Π.9. 449–480), is misleading. Aside from the fact that the lemma is not part of the poem, the speaker is a particular “historical” character, not a generalized τις, and he speaks on a particular historical occasion in the past, not some hypothetical occasion in the future.
More decidedly Homeric is the conclusion of the idyll to the distaff (28.24 f.), where the introductory formula is modelled on Il. 6.459, and the comment on a gift is perhaps suggested by the tis-Rede at Il. 7.299 ff.:

\[ \text{kēro γάρ tis ἐρετάπος ἵδων σ'. } \]
\[ \text{ἡ μεγάλα χάρις } \]
\[ \text{δῶρῳ σὺν ὀλίγῳ πάντα δὲ τίμητα τὰ πάρ φιλῶν.} \]

From the examples I have been able to collect we can draw the following conclusions. In the literary tradition, the most durable of the Homeric tis-Reden are those that predict praise. On the other hand, persuasive and dissuasive tis-Reden are not found beyond the fifth century. Later projections of opinion with these functions are rare and are non-Homeric in form. Even in tragedy, where projections of opinion are as frequent as in Homer, dissuasive or persuasive tis-Reden of the Homeric type are: associated with Homeric situations (A. Ch. 567–570; S. Ajax 500–504), are romanticizing (S. El. 975 ff.), or are deliberately archaic (Eur., passim). This progressive restriction in the scope of an Homeric device is most probably due to the development of a private ethic that rejects the appeal to a generalized tis.
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