Suppliant, Guest, and the Power of Zeus in Homeric Epic

by

Miriam Tworek-Hofstetter, B.A.

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of the University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2009

The Thesis Report committee for Miriam Tworek-Hofstetter

Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:

Suppliant, Guest, and the Power of Zeus in Homeric Epic

APPROVED BY

SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Supervisor: _____

Thomas K. Hubbard

_____

Lawrence Y. Kim

Suppliant, Guest, and the Power of Zeus in Homeric Epic

by

Miriam Tworek-Hofstetter, M. A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2009

SUPERVISOR: Thomas K. Hubbard

This report investigates the theme of supplication in both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* especially in regards to the role of Zeus as protector of suppliants in each of the poems. Although Zeus is never given the epithet *Hikesios* in the *Iliad* as is the case in the *Odyssey*, he nevertheless acts as such in the *Iliad*'s final scenes of supplication. The scenes discussed in this paper include the supplication between Thetis and Zeus, Adrastos and Menelaus, Hektor and Achilles, Priam and Achilles, Odysseus and the Cyclops, and Odysseus and Arete. While Zeus appears indifferent to the battlefield suppliants in the *Iliad* such as Adrastos in the beginning of the *Iliad*, his own interest in justice as well as an increasing value of the suppliant draw Zeus into a more active role in supplications. This phenomenon is further supported by supplication scenes in the *Odyssey* that refer to events of the *Iliad* and in which Zeus is explicitly called "protector of suppliants."

Table of Contents

Figures

1.1 Introduction

For a paper that seeks to find religious meaning and morality in a rather long and complex pair of poems, it is helpful to first look at the symbolism apparent in another craft, one that is *relatively* simple, self-contained and belongs to the same society: namely pottery. With the destruction of Bronze Age palatial centers througout the Aegean, the people of Greece entered an extended period of recovery and rebuilding.[1] Part of this process was marked by the production of what we now call Geometric pottery made during the aptly titled Geometric period. This appellation is mainly due to the circular and maeander designs painstakingly applied to vessels by ancient vase makers. Particularly fine and monumentally sized Geometric vases were used as cinerary urns and grave markers, and an example of these is an amphora[2] originally located in the Dipylon cemetery (fig. 1).

[1] Bohen (1991) 59
[2] Athens NM 804, attributed to the Dipylon Master. For a brief discussion see Coldstream (1991) 47 and Pedley (2007) 119.

The extraordinary length of the Geometric Period, spanning 1100-700 BC with little modification to artistic deocoration demands some explanation.[3] One suggestion, as epitomized by V. R. d'A Desborough, blames this relative stagnance of style on the loss of contact with the Near East and knowledge of Bronze Age crafts, in conjunction with the generally weakened social and political system of the Dark and Geometric ages.[4] This assessment cannot be true first because of indications of a return to prosperity have been noted during the Protogeometric Age.[5] A further difficulty with this argument, and one that is not quick occur to those of us who are so aware of the sublimity of Greek art yet to be developed, lies in the aesthetic potential and symbolism in Geometric style pottery. This characteristic of Geometric pottery, and—at last—its relation to Homer, is described by John Pedley in the following manner:

> The coordination of paint and pot (the bands of paint which set off the lip from the neck, the neck from the shoulder and the narrowing to the foot, the figural scene between the handles emphasizing the broadest part of the pot) and the precise mathematical rendering of the geometric designs are surely the visual counterparts of the formulas of Homeric narrative: *together they seem to articulate an underlying sense of striving for social and political order*.[6]

Pedley's statement brings up two important points: first the connection between Homeric formulae and components of the Geometric style, and second, how both

[3] Bohen (1991) 59
[4] Desborough (1964)
[5] Bohen (1991) 60
[6] My emphasis; Pedley (2007) 119

Geometric art and the Homeric poems reflect their creator's, and hence the contemporary society's interest in creating "social and political order."

Cedric Whitman discovered this relationship between Geometric art and Homeric poems over fifty years ago, and his book *Homer and the Homeric Tradition* discusses both similarities between the structures of each art form (i.e. the functions of Homeric formulae in comparison to Geometric artistic motifs), as well as those between each work—vase and poem—as a whole. In the first analysis, Whitman draws connections between the symbolism of abstract figures on the vases with the symbolism inherent in the burgeoning use of the alphabet, as well as between the changeability of both formulae and Geometric motifs that are adapted to fit either the line of the poem or form of the pot.[7] Here, Whitman concludes that in both art forms "all is done by means of minute, refined motifs which gradually construct a planned and unified total."[8] It is the art which these motifs create that further reflect social code of their creator's society: one interested in building structure.

On a grander scale, Whitman also links patterns between the books of the *Iliad* and the pattern of alternations between wide and narrow elements on Geometric vases: both the *Iliad* and designs on the vases are grouped in a pattern of 2 : 5 : 2 : 5 : 2 : 5 : 2.[9] This pattern displays the ring-composition of the *Iliad* as well

[7] Whitman (1958) 90
[8] *ibid*. (1958) 92
[9] Whitman (1958) 283; Whitman believes that Book X was a later addition and therefore excludes it from his ring-composition study.

as the circular motifs on Protogeometric and Geometric pottery.[10] Although ring-composition is used throughout the poem, the most important example for this paper is the reflection of the first book in the *Iliad* in the final one. Whitman divides the first book into the following parts: (i) rejection of Chryses, plague on Achaeans, funeral pyres; (ii) council of the chiefs and the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon; (iii) Achilles' discussion with his mother; (iv) Thetis' supplication of Zeus; (v) assembly of the gods. The final book then offers corresponding segments in reverse order: (i) dispute among the gods; (ii) Thetis is summoned to Zeus; (iii) Thetis relays the message from Zeus to Achilles; (iv) Achilles accepts the supplication of Priam; (v) the funeral of Hektor at Troy.[11] The following discussion of the theme of supplication will in part show that correspondences between these two books cross boundaries set up by Whitman, specifically in the supplication scene of Priam and Achilles and its allusion to the supplication of Zeus by Thetis in Book I. The purpose of this analysis is not to undercut Whitman's theory, but rather to further expose the multiplicity of meaning in this particular ring-composition.

This paper will also address the second of Pedley's points—that Homeric poetry "articulates an underlying sense of striving for social and political order"—as well as how societal order is being constructed in the *Iliad*, and how this order becomes explicit in the *Odyssey*. Although I suspect that this process exists in other Homeric constructions, this paper focuses on the theme of supplication, and Zeus'

[10] Whitman (1958) 254
[11] *ibid*. (1958) 259

function within this theme. This paper will show that althought Zeus in the *Iliad* is never given the epithet *Hikesios* (the protector of suppliants), as he is called in the *Odyssey*, he still functions as such in the *Iliad*, a development toward this capacity may be found in the *Iliad* nevertheless.

Over the years, the role of supplication in Homer's epics, and in the ancient world in general, has provoked lively discussion from several classical scholars. In these discussions, most topics revolve around what makes a supplication successful—a pertinent point when considering the outcomes of supplication in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: in the *Iliad* all supplications except one are denied, while in the *Odyssey* supplication is quite often successful. In his 1976 article, *Hiketeia*, John Gould contends that it is the physical motions of the suppliant that will either insure or prevent the acceptance of the suppliant by the *supplicandus*:[12] in his analysis, maintained contact is essential. In a response to Gould, Victoria Pedrick denies the importance of Gould's claim, and instead insists that it is the words of the suppliant that matter most. Pedrick here points out the claim on *apoina* made by suppliants in the *Iliad*, and the evocation of Zeus *Hikesios* made by suppliants in the *Iliad*. In her treatment, then, it is the availablity of Zeus as protector of suppliants that ensures success in the *Odyssey*, and not in the *Iliad*. In his *Poetics of Supplication*, Kevin Crotty, in an argument structured similarly to Pedrick's, also considers what the suppliant is appealing to. In this case, supplication does not necessarily imply a future exchange of goods, as is the case with *apoina*, nor any ensured special

[12] Terminology from Naiden, 2006.

protection from Zeus. Instead, Crotty argues that in the final supplication scene of the *Iliad* the audience first sees a suppliant appealing to his supplicandus' *eleos*. This theme of appealing to another's pity is then picked up by the *Odyssey* and applied to its supplication scenes.

This paper will begin with a more thorough discussion of these three treatments of supplication scenes, followed by a brief introduction to problems in interpreting Homer. Issues singled out as for this paper are Homer's use of the "type scene" or "theme" as it is defined by Gregory Nagy, and matters of intertextuality. In regards to the second part I plan to follow the methods of Pietro Pucci as may be found in his book *Odysseus Polytropos*. In the following text analysis, I first examine Zeus and his use of power and involvement in justice in the Homeric poems, particularly in his roles as protector of vows and guarantor of prayers,[13] and secondly look into Zeus' participation (or lack thereof) in supplication scenes of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. This paper culminates in discussions of both the supplication scene of Priam to Achilles in the *Iliad* and the supplication of Odysseus to Arete and Alcinoos in the *Odyssey*. Each of these scenes have stimulated a great deal of discussion on account of seemingly anamolous characteristics. For example, Achilles' behavior at the end of the *Iliad* appears to so to be out of character in comparison to his actions throughout the preceding books of the *Iliad*. Also, the incontruity between the Phaeacians' magnanimity towards strangers and

[13] For an indepth discussion of Zeus and his interactions with both the *Litai* and *Ate* see Arieti, James A. "Homer's Litae and Ate." *CJ* 84.1 (1988): 1-2.

their equally emphasized hostility towards them has similarly sparked controversy amongst Homeric scholars. While this paper does not propose to solve these literary conundrums, it does add to the current literature in taking a new angle to these passages: in the first case it focuses on the influence of Zeus *Hikesios* in the scene, and in the second on intertextual echoes between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

1.2 Introduction to Scholarship on Homeric Supplication: Three Works

Gould's early work on the topic of supplication has proved to be a seminal study on the topic. One of his main focuses is to provide an account of supplication as a ritual act, and its place and significance among Greek social institutions. Gould divides supplication into two types: face to face and person to alter or *temenos*. He also addresses topics including the connection between *hiketeia* and *xenia*, and occurrences of supplication in later literature (i.e. Herodotus, tragedy, etc.)[14] First, however, I will discuss his treatment of those elements of which supplication consists, or his "rules of the game."[15] Gould finds that theire are three physical acts that make supplication complete: crouching or lowering of the suppliant, physical contact with knees or chin, and kissing. He also remarks that "the ritual nature of the act depends essentially upon physical contact with parts of the body which, it has been argued, are regarded as having a peculiar sanctity." Supplication can, however, occur without physical contact—a phenomenon called by Gould

[14] For a more extensive, cross-cultural discussion of supplication see Naiden, F. *Ancient Supplication*.
[15] Gould (1974) 82

"figurative" supplication—which is the case in Odysseus' supplication of Nausikaa[16]. Instances of figurative supplication happen only under some force which prevents physical contact, as, for example, Odysseus' fear of frightening the girl. Gould's third rule for face to face supplication is that the physical contact must be maintained: once this contact is lost or destroyed the ritual "loses its full binding force."

After deciding upon what designates proper supplication, Gould turns to the reactions of the persons supplicated; namely, whether they accept or deny the request, and why. The actions of Achilles and Alcinoos and their respective acceptances of Priam and Odysseus are considered by Gould the "proper ritual response to the act of supplication." The ritual of response includes the physical acts of lifting the suppliant and offering him dinner: Achilles eats a meal with Priam even when he had only just previously finished dinner when Priam entered his hut (*Il*.24.627). As for the unsuccessful acts of supplication, Gould concludes that in each example the contact was broken between the two characters or the act was not completed as in the cases of Adrastus and Menelaus, and Lykaon and Achilles.[17]

Victoria Pedrick's response to Gould, which includes a successful rebuttal to his emphasis on the inclusion or exclusion of certain elements of supplication,[18] considers the difference in attitudes towards supplication in the poems. Under this heading, an assumption made by Gould that Pedrick discredits is "that the *Iliad* and

---

[16] *ibid*. (1974) 76-77
[17] Gould (1974) 77-80
[18] Discussed in greater detail below in 1.3 Methodology: Type Scenes and Intertextuality.

the *Odyssey* share the same belief in the potency of the ritual, so that evidence about it can be drawn indifferently from either poem."[19] Beginning with the suppliant in the *Iliad*, Pedrick notes that he will beg for his life, promise ransom and call upon the *aidos* of the person he is supplicating. In fact, the only characters found pleading for their lives on the battlefield are Trojan. Also, the title of *hiketes* is not applied to every suppliant, and is only attached to Lyakon and Priam (*Il*.21.75, 24.158, 570). Finally, supplications in the *Iliad* are to be between mortals, and the gods will only intervene on behalf of a suppliant on account of a special grievence (i.e. for the burial of Hektor's body).

The *Odyssey*, on the other hand, presents a different view on supplication and suppliants than the one found in the *Iliad*. In the *Odyssey*, it is acceptable for Greeks to supplicate: Leodes, a suitor, and two of his servants ask for mercy, along with Odysseus himself who supplicated an Egyptian king after being defeated. Suppliants are commonly called *hiketes*, and the adjective *aidoios* is often attached to them. The most important claim that suppliants have for their protection is the gaurdianship of Zeus *Hikesios*,[20] a quality that is also linked to the blending of *hiketes* and *xenos*.[21]

---

[19] Pedrick (1982) 125
[20] *ibid*. (1982)133
[21] Gould (1984) 93-94 "The only difference, and in some respects, as we shall see, a crucial one, is that one ritual (*hiketeia*) inverts the procedures of the other. In *xenia* the 'insider extends his protection, and the honour that such protection conveys, to the stranger. In supplication, the 'outsider' enforces a claim to the same honour and protection by a ritual procedure which enacts the total abdication of any such claim."

The final piece of scholarship[22] to be considered in this section of the paper is Kevin Crotty's *The Poetics of Supplication*. Crotty situates the act of supplication in the realm of family interaction and dysfunction, and the suppliant's plea as one that arouses pity. Although Crotty will be discussed in greater depth later in this paper, as he also discusses the supplication of Achilles by Priam, it is important to note here his basic methodology for approaching supplication in the poems. One point that Crotty makes, and which this paper intends to build on, is that the change in attitude towards suppliants and between the poems in general begins with supplication of Hektor to Achilles.[23] In comparison to other supplication scenes in the *Iliad*, this supplication is "marked by its deep pathos"[24] while others appear more as proposed transactions. Hektor's words of supplication also call upon more intimate parts[25] of Achilles rather than simply his knees, or with promises of *apoina*. Later, with Book 24, the poem enters into a kind of "new spirit" especially characterized by a sense of pity: the gods feel pity for Hektor's body, Achilles continues to mourn the loss of Patroklos, and Priam also mourns, rolling in filth(*Il*.24.160-65).[26] Crotty's argument turns on this introduction of increased emotional force at the end of the *Iliad*, in a way not unlike what this paper will

---

[22] Other works dealing with supplication in Homer include: Thorton, Agathe. *Homer's Iliad: its Composition and the Motif of Supplication.* Gottingen: Vanderhoeck and Ruprecht. 1984, and Whitfield, Guy K. *The Restored Relation. The Supplication Theme in the Iliad*. Diss. Columbia, 1967.
[23] Crotty (1994) 3
[24] *ibid*. 9
[25] Psyche and parents. This scene is also discussed in greater depth below.
[26] Crotty (1994) 3

propose to do. However, instead of continuing a focus on the characterization of mortals in the scene, and throughought the poems, this discussion will examine the role of the gods in the act of supplication, and in particular the role of Zeus.

In conclusion to this introduction, the purpose is to pick up on the arguments and methods of Gould, Pedrick and Crotty, and apply them to Homer's poems in a new way. Although Gould's article has been proved flawed in some points regarding his conflation of evidence from the Homeric poems, and in how he reads a type scene, one of his most valuable contributions is the recognition of connections between *hiketeia* and *xenia*. Although the blending of these societal conventions are less explicitly voiced in the *Iliad* than in the *Odyssey*, it is no less present—especially during the supplication between Priam and Achilles. The aspect of the connection between *hiketeia* and *xenia* which is germaine to this paper is Zeus' function as protector of both suppliant and guest, and the close association of the two in Odyssean scenes such as with Odysseus and the Cyclops. Pedrick is quite right to draw our attention to the presence of Zeus *Hikesios* in the *Odyssey*, and how he may influence the power of supplications in that poem. Pedrick's paper, however, does not account for the involvement of Zeus in any *Iliad* supplications. Instead, we see a development of Zeus *Hikesios* beginning in the *Iliad*, and being utilized in a more complete form through the *Odyssey*. What this paper will endeavor to prove is that Zeus *Hikesios* was present in the *Iliad* if only in a undeveloped and inexplicit form. Finally, Crotty's contribution to this paper, as is mentioned above, is the demarcation of the supplication of Hektor as a turning point in the attitude of the

Iliad, and in particular towards an attitude of pity and empathy towards the suppliant.

1.3 Methodology: Type Scenes and Intertextuality

Before continuing to an analysis of supplication scenes in Homer's epics, it is necessary to make two methodological considerations. The first is how to read a Homeric type scene, and the second involves how *Iliad* and *Odyssey* may or may not be connected with each other. For many years, Homeric scholars have studied the epic poems and other forms of oral poetry in order to better understand the oral poet's method of composition. These studies have resulted in a well formulated, and thouroughly debated, typology of composition devices such as the type scene, theme, motif, and formula. The classification of the Homeric type scene began with Walter Arend and his 1933 work *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer*.[27] Arend's definition of type scenes are narratological blocks which use the same verse formulas or parts of formulas. Albert Lord, gives a similar definition, although he calls the collection of blocks a "theme" rather than a type scenes.[28] Gregory Nagy also preferred the term "theme", but did not require that these themes share specific vocabulary and verbal configurations. Instead, Nagy's "theme" is a basic unit of narrative that has developed formulae through time. Finally, Mark Edwards, also turning away from the definitions given by Arend and Lord, adds that each group of

[27] Arend (1933)
[28] Lord (1960) 27

type scene follows a certain sequence, but that there is no standard form for that sequence. Therefore, because there is no standard form, it is in the addition and removal of certain elements in a type scene that the originality or intention of the poet is revealed.[29]

Analyses based on variation in themes have proved quite useful and illuminating when addressing seemingly problematic, or uncharacteristic, actions of Homeric characters. For example, scholars in the past have been baffled by Achilles' behavior as Priam supplicates him in the final supplication scene of the *Iliad*. The outburst of anger and resentment which immediately follows Achilles' compassion towards Priam has been the subject of several works. According to various scholars, this outburst was caused by either dramatic necessity, a reflection of Achilles' internal struggle, a result of Achilles' natural irritation at being hurried, or that Achilles resents Priam's supposition that "mere possessions might have weight with him in such exceptional circumstances."

In her 1986 article "The Interpretation of a Theme in Oral Epic: *Iliad* 24.559-70", Elizabeth Minchin successfully approaches the problem by looking at previous actions of Achilles in the poem. She argues that Achilles' reaction is not unexpected at all, but in fact an Achillean reaction consistent with his Illiadic character, and a theme of contrasting forces in personality.[30] As was the case when Agamemnon took Briseis away, Achilles is again losing a possession—here, Hektor's body—that

[29] Edwards (1992) 287
[30] Minchin (1986) 12

holds great importance to him: by giving up the body, Achilles also will end his mourning process for Patroclus. Therefore, the theme that Minchin is using to make her argument is that of Achilles resentment of others' meddling in his affairs. Achilles' actions are often motivated by an inner turmoil which is in turn driven by his frustration at having to behave like a mortal (i.e. being required to follow Agamemnon's commands) although he has an immortal mother. One element of this theme that Minchin uses to support her argument is the phrase, "Τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς"(*Il*.24.559) that is used to describe Achilles when he is responding to an unfavorable request.[31] Although Minchin's intent is to show how Achilles' character is consistent through the *Iliad*, it is still through variation amongst type scenes or themes, that this consistency in character may be found.

The identification, classification and traits of a type scene also become important when looking into the act of supplication specifically, and is a pivotal point in Victoria Pedrick's reaction to John Gould's *Hiketeia*. At the beginning of her article, Pedrick cites three faulty assumptions made by Gould, the third being "that the poems furnish evidence about customs and religious beliefs which can be lifted from the text without attention to their contexts."[32] In his article, Gould at no point approaches the topic of type scene and how this category of Homeric narratology might affect his interpretation of scenes in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Instead, he

[31] Minchin (1986) 14-15
[32] Pedrick (1982) 125

assumes that supplication scenes (in contrast to Edwards later definition of them) should have all appropriate elements: his so-called "rules of the game."[33] It is the lack of certain elements that cause an improper supplication or reaction from a supplicandus. For example, Gould contends that maintained physical contact between the suppliant and supplicandus is crucial: Menelaus pushes Adrastus away, in denial of the supplication, in the same way that Achilles' does to Lyakon later in the *Iliad.*[34] In Gould's argument, the loss of physical contact also causes the suppliant to be no longer a suppliant, and no protection is owed to him.[35] Gould also uses descriptions of supplication from later literature, such as Herodotus and tragedy, to create his model of supplication in Homer.[36]

Although she does not go into to much detail in her rebuttal, and makes no specific reference to the type scene, theme, or earlier studies on methods used in oral poetry,[37] Pedrick nevertheless successfully argues that the presence or absence of certain elements in the supplication scene are due to the poet's manipulation of the scene for poetic effect.[38] She notes that the descripton of supplications often vary due to the context: in supplications between acquaintances, such as Thetis and Zeus, the scene is fuller. In this case as well, the supplication is more of a formal

---

[33] Gould (1974) 82
[34] *ibid*. (1974) 77
[35] In this respect Gould is also conflating the divinely protected status of certain suppliants in the *Odyssey* with the generally unprotected suppliant of the *Iliad*.
[36] Gould (1974) 82
[37] Although this may be implied because Pedrick does equate supplication with the "ritual" armoring and departure scenes.
[38] Pedrick (1982) 129

request for a favor, and lacks the urgency of a battlefield supplication.[39] Supplications between strangers also share commonalities, as do the supplications of Priam to Achilles and Odysseus to Arete and Alcinoos.[40] The language of supplication is also used in abbreviated form when mortals address gods (See *Il.23.196, Od*.4.433, *Od*.5.445-50).[41] More than anything, these points made by Pedrick reinforce the definition of type scene proposed by Nagy and Edwards, especially in that there is no perfect, or complete supplication scene which others either conform to or deviate from. This definition, and an awareness of poetic convention as a whole, will become rather important in the discussion below. In my discussion of supplication, a great deal of the argument hinges on first the development through the *Iliad* of a sanctified suppliant (not unlike Minchin's explanation of Achilles' outburst through his earlier characterization in the *Iliad*), and the development of Zeus as protector of suppliants in the *Iliad*. Secondly on the presence and absence of Zeus *Hikesios*, in supplication scenes throughout the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. In the second case, although we can assume that there is no prototypical supplication scene in Homeric literature, the poet's choice to include or exclude Zeus in supplications exposes both his manipulation of the scene for effect, and also a change in the poetic, or perhaps ritual, repetoire between the two poems: the role of Zeus that evolves through the *Iliad* is later implemented in supplication scenes in the *Odyssey*.

---

[39] Pedrick (1982) 128
[40] *ibid*. (1982) 127
[41] *ibid*. (1982) 128

A second issue to address at this point in the paper is how to properly compare supplication scenes in the *Iliad* with supplication scenes in the *Odyssey*. The relationship between the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* is not entirely straightforward. While on the one hand the *Odyssey* is a kind of sequel to the *Iliad*, telling the story of events that occurred after those of the *Iliad* in the fictional timeline, the sequence in which both of the poems were composed—not to mention the composition of lost poetry from the epic cycle—remains highly ambiguous. Along these lines, it has also been noted that there are no direct references to the *Iliad* in the *Odyssey*; this is a phenomenon that was first noted by David Monro, and has since been termed "Monro's Law."[42] The acceptance of Monro's Law provoked a school of thought that denied that the *Odyssey* was composed with any knowledge of the *Iliad*. In his book *The Homeric Odyssey*, Denys Page claims that "The Odyssean poet is not only later in time than the *Iliad*: he is also entirely isolated from the *Iliad*; he does not know things which he must have known if he was familiar with the *Iliad* in anything resembling its present form"[43]. This statement is made in reaction to the *Odyssey* not only not referring to events in the *Iliad*, but also, when it does refer to the Trojan war, the poet's choice of events from the time of the *Iliad* are those not included the poem itself. When Odysseus recounts to Penelope the tale of his journeys, he begins with the adventures found at the beginning of the *Odyssey*, and not with any part of the Trojan war. References that are made to the Trojan war, such as Menelaus' story

[42] Pucci (1987) 17
[43] Page (1954)157

of the Trojan horse, or Demodocus' song about the quarrel between Achilles and Odysseus are not found in the *Iliad*, and may have come from other versions of the *Iliad* in the epic cycle.[44] Page's supporting argument for this belief is based the epic poets' choice of vocabulary in each of the poems. Both *phlox*, *poine*, and *apoina* and other forms built on their stems are present in the *Iliad* but are never found in the *Odyssey.* Because contexts in which these words could have been used are present in the *Odyssey* (there are fifty fires mentioned through the *Odyssey*, and the revenge of Odysseus against the suitors one of the poem's central themes), Page speculates that neither *plox, poine*, nor *apoina* were part of the *Odyssey* poet's vocabulary.[45] Page also points out that the subject matter that the poets chose for each poem reflect another fundamental difference in each poet's contemporary society. For the poet of the *Iliad*, the appropriate use of epic poetry is for the explanation of a historical record, while the poet of the *Odyssey* uses epic poetry to tell a fairy tale. Furthermore, the vocabulary problem and disparity of subject matter leads Page to the conclusion that both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were composed in two different regions of Greece, in a tradition that diverged during the early Dark Ages.[46]

Although Page's argument does give cause for some pause, a more reasonable explanation for "Monro's law" has been given elsewhere. In a response to Page, Nagy draws attention to the size of the poems. How could the *Odyssey*, a poem of around 12,000 lines *not* have replicated scenes from the *Iliad*, a poem whose subject

[44] Page (1954) 158
[45] *ibid*. (1954) 152-153
[46] *ibid*. (1954) 157

matter is so close its own? Nagy believes that Monro's law resulted from the epic poet's deliberate choice to exclude *Iliad* subject matter. Because it was a deliberate choice, the poet of the *Odyssey* must have been aware of the *Iliad*. This idea also builds on the traditional, and self-conscious nature of the poems, supposing that there may have been a tradition in the composition of the *Odyssey* to supress incidents from the *Iliad*.[47]

Nagy's interpretation of Monro's law is also taken up by Pietro Pucci in his book *Odysseus Polytropos*. Pucci proposes, in accordance with Nagy, that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were composed simultaneously and in full knowledge of one another. Moreover, because of the stated conditions, scenes in both poems were "intentionally revised to conform to corresponding passages in the other. Clearly, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* presume each other, border and limit each other, to such an extent that one, as it were, writes the other."[48] Pucci offers a useful example of the poems writing each other in his comparison of two scenes: the first between Odysseus and Calypso in the *Odyssey*, and the second between Odysseus and Athena in the *Iliad*. The interaction in question between Odysseus and Calypso takes place during their last meal together. In line 203, Calypso addresses Odysseus as "*Diogenes, Laertiade, polumechan' Odusseu"*. This formula, and the epithet *polumechanos* on its own, is always used within the context of Odysseus contriving

[47] Nagy (1979) 20-21
[48] Pucci (1987) 18

something.[49] Here, Odysseus is planning to leave Calypso, and return home to his wife Penelope, and Calypso uses the formula ironically, indicating that Odysseus is foolish to leave her and an opportunity for immortality. A line identical to 203 of book five of the *Odyssey* is also used by Athena in the *Iliad*, when she is encouraging Odysseus to stay and fight at Troy instead of returning home (*Il*.2.173-75). The line immediately following the address is also matched in both passages: οὕτω δὴ οἶκον δὲ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.

Pucci admits that this shared line may be considered to be a simple, mechanical, formulaic repitition. However, after considering the thematic and contextual similarities between the two passages, more nuanced connections also become apparent. First, both speakers are advising (in effect) Odysseus not to make a "hasty, unconsidered" flight home, running away from a noble goal: Athena warns him against leaving the Trojan war before it is won, and Calypso against choosing a mortal woman over an immortal.[50] Through this comparison, the *Odyssey* scene tries to make Odysseus look foolish: by returning home, Odysseus risks losing the *kleos* he won in the war.[51] Secondly, both passages, in the lines surrounding the shared section, the goals that Odysseus may be turning away from are in the form of a woman. Furthermore, the women are both described with forms of *eukhomai*, instead of being named outright: Helen is the prize or boast that the Achaeans are fighting for in order to gain their own *kleos* (*Il*.2.176), while Calypso's claim to glory

[49] *ibid*. (1987) 34
[50] Pucci (1987) 35
[51] *ibid*. (1987) 39

is her sexual power over men (*Od*.5.203-208). Third, in both passages the speaker implies moral censure of an undesirable action. The Greek army's failure to bring Helen home would be a shameful thing for people of the future to hear, just as it is improper for Odysseus to compare his mortal wife to an immortal goddess. Finally, it is Odysseus' response to both requests that determines the continuation of the poem, and it is also his response that creates the type of story to follow. [52] Because Odysseus chooses to return home to Ithaca, he decides against maintaining the *kleos* that he earned in Troy, as I mentioned above. Therefore, the *Odyssey* becomes a poem that does not concern the achievement of *kleos*. Odysseus' choice in the *Odyssey* leads to the exact opposite course of action taken by Odysseus in the *Iliad*, where he stays with Agamemnon to win back Helen and *kleos*.[53]

This interpretation does however take a position in which the line used by Calypso was added to the *Odyssey* after it was added to the *liad*, which results in an analysis that looks toward the *Iliad* example as the one bearing greater influence over the reading. Calypso, in this explanation, alludes to what Athena said in the "earlier" poem. On finishing his chapter, Pucci states that there is no reason to suppose that these passages could not be interpreted in the opposite direction, and meaning might be found in an approach that assumes Athena is alluding to

[52] *ibid*. (1987) 37
[53] *ibid*. (1987) 39

Calypso.[54] There is a "specular" relationship between the poems and "one text would rewrite the other, but it would simultaneously be written by the other."[55]

In conclusion, both the issues of how to approach a type scene, and how to read the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* together are necessary to consider when launching an examination of Homeric supplication scenes, and in particular, examples that span both poems. In my analysis, I will follow a line of reasoning that presumes the accuracy of a definition of type scene as it is set up by Edwards and Nagy, namely that type scenes are not required to share vocabulary or formula amongst themselves, nor is there any standard sequence or form of supplication scene to which all other supplication scenes should conform. Furthermore, because of this lack of standard, the manipulation of type scene by the poet may at once reveal his motives in changing the effect of a supplication scene and also reveal deeper subtleties of the characters involved. Secondly, in regards to intertextual reading, I also agree with the theoretical view of the relationship between Homer's poems that is proposed by Nagy and Pucci. Despite the lack of shared subject matter between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, it can still be posited that the poets' composing them were yet aware of each others' existence. This awareness has resulted in situations like the

[54] Pucci (1987) 42 suggests that this reversal would lead to a more "ironic" reading of the *Iliad*: "Odysseus—the *Iliad* would suggest—applies his *metis* to the proper deeds only when he is the modest but efficient character of the Iliadic narrative. In the *Odyssey*, his famous *metis* leads him to foolish decisions and makes him pursue ridiculous, unheroic desires."
[55] Pucci (1987) 42

one of shared verbage between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in the Pucci argument summarized above.

2.1 Zeus and Justice, Supplication and *Litae*

Zeus as a general protector of the weak can be seen throughout the Classical tradtion; and his various epithets speak to this capacity. In a very basic role, Zeus is called *Horkios*, "the protector of oaths", and Zeus *Soter.*[56] In Hesiod's *Works and Days*, Zeus is benevolent to those who are just to strangers (225ff.), and similarly in the *Odyssey* Zeus is the gaurdian of beggars and suppliants. Zeus' relationship with *Dike* is somewhat more ambiguous in the *Iliad*, where some believe that Zeus' effect on men is based more in the enforcing of his will, rather than in any sense of right and wrong.[57] At the root of this issue is the question of whether there exists in the *Iliad* an association between religion and morality. An objection to the possibily of this association is put forth by Chantraine, who believes that although Zeus keeps order in the mortal and immortal realms, he does not enforce laws of morality—except in one occasion[58]. Similarly Adkins finds Homeric gods generally lacking concern for justice in the *Iliad*, although they become interested in the *Odyssey*.[59] Other claims are based in the idea that Zeus is concerned with a kind of justice, but not that which gives each person his due.

---

[56] Lloyd-Jones (1983) 5
[57] Cf. Dodds, Chantraine
[58] Chantraine (1952) 75-76, 81
[59] Adkins (1965)

In *The Justice of Zeus*, Hugh Lloyd-Jones also considers the association between religion, or more specifically Zeus, and morality by analyzing terminology and behavior of the actors of the poem. In Homer, action of the poems occur in both the divine and mortal arenae, and interactions between the two consist of the gods' interference in human activity. The gods are not creators of humans, an act credited to Prometheus in Hesiod and not at all mentioned in Homer; Zeus is called "father," but only in the sense of "ruler." Gods do feel pity for mortals but it is a pity mixed with distain. They are very protective of their immortality and demand honor (*time*) from mortals. Furthermore, *dike* in the *Iliad* focuses on the preservation of the established order. Zeus and his will play the largest part in interactions between gods and mortals in Homer. Zeus' "thought is identical with future happenings", and fate (*moira*). Also, as is mentioned above, Zeus is given special roles that designate him as a protector of the basic social conventions of oath-keeping and the relationship between guest and host. The question remains: is Zeus simply playing the role or is he actively enforcing justice?[60]

In answering this question, Lloyd-Jones first remarks on Zeus as protector of contracts and also as an avenger of those who have been wronged by a broken contract. Here, Lloyd-Jones believes that it is more reasonable to suppose that Zeus is on the side of the one who has been wronged, not by coincidence, but because this is in accord with justice. Two episodes of the *Iliad* that back up this assertion, and show Zeus in direct relation to *dike*, are a simile in description of Patroklos'

[60] Lloyd-Jones (1983) 2-5

pursual of the Trojans, and Phoenix' speech[61] on *litae.*[62] In the simile, Patroklos is compared "to an autumn storm sent by Zeus to punish men 'who by violence pronounce in the market-place crooked judgments and drive out justice having no care for the concern of the gods (*Il*.16.384ff.)." It is clear that in this case Zeus sends vengence on behalf of *dike* for the reason that it is being damaged by unjust men—not on account of any simple coincidence. Along similar lines, Lloyd-Jones believes that some of the attributes of Zeus were in fact taken from attributes of early kings: he is a protector of *themistes*, which he has given to kings along with a sceptor that they might protect it as well. Lloyd-Jones also remarks on Minos' responsibility as king of the dead to distribute justice among them (*Il*.16.542).[63]

The capstone of Lloyd-Jones discussion of Zeus in the *Iliad* comes with his analysis of Zeus' role in the conflict between Achilles and Agamemnon as it unfolds throughout the poem. Since this analysis is useful to the *modus operandi* of this paper, I will give a brief summary of it here. This very familiar story begins with Agamemnon's rejection of Chryses' pleas for the return of his daughter, and the ensuing vengence of Apollo at the priest's request in the form of a plague upon the Acheans. Agamemnon is of course ultimately persuaded to return the girl, but in trying to retain the proper amount of *time* as is owed to him and his kingly status,

---

[61] Lloyd-Jones (1983) 6: Both these scenes are taken by some to be interpolations based on their disunity with the presentation of a unjust Zeus in the *Iliad*. Lloyd-Jones, however, convincingly uses them in accordance with his view on Zeus, and it is a view of Zeus that I also subscribe to.
[62] Zeus' relationship with *litae* will be discussed in greater detail below.
[63] Lloyd-Jones (1983) 6-7

Agamemnon insists on taking a new prize and one that had previously been allotted to another king. This leads to the unfortunate prodding of Achilles' rage, and effectively the action of the entire poem. Later, when the tide of war has turned in favor of the Trojans, Agamemnon is at last persuaded to make amends with Achilles.

Controversy clouds the interpretation of Agamemnon's decision: whether he made it simply because the Achaeans were losing and they needed Achilles to return to battle, or because Agamemnon came to realize that his action was morally offensive.[64] Lloyd-Jones finds a solution in the way that Agamemnon was persuaded to come to his conclusion. In an effort to convince Agamemenon to take back what he had done to Achilles, Nestor says, "I was right from the start, when I advised you not to take away Briseis, but you, giving way to your mighty *thymos*, dishonored a mighty man, whom even the gods honor"(*Il*.9.17ff.). Here, Nestor emphasizes Agamemnon's moral *faux pas* in taking the prize from Achilles—if it were the case that the poem was not interested in justice and the punishment of transgressors of justice, presumably Nestor would have advised Agamemnon to return the girl specifically to bring Achilles back into the fray and not as recompense for the dishonor Agamemnon inflicted upon him. On the flip side of this story, the devastation of the army caused by Achilles' refusal to leave the ships has sparked pity in the heart of Patroklos. In an effort to raise moral, and with the approval of Achilles, Patroklos dons the divine-made armor and proceeds to lead the Greeks in battle. Patroklos then unadvisedly pursues the Trojans beyond the bounds of the

[64] The former is a view supported by Adkins (1960) 51

ships, and is killed by Hektor, an event that finally provokes Achilles to re-enter the battle.

Although a sense of culpability exists for the human actors of the poem (i.e. Achilles and Agamemnon both blame their behavior on *ate* which was sent by Zeus, but also feel regret for their own responsibility for the outcome of decisions they made under *ate*'s influence; this is a phenomenon in the *Iliad* that Lloyd-Jones refers to as the "double motivation and double responsibility of human and divine."),[65] it should be remembered that all acts of the *Iliad* occur in accordance to the will of Zeus.[66] It is also in this case that the will of Zeus is concerned with all actors receiving "what they deserved,"[67] and in this way he works in accordance with justice. The *hubris* of Agamemnon is punished[68] by the army's gradual defeat at the hands of the Trojans, and through this damage to Agamemnon Achilles is avenged. When he is at last persuaded to recant his decision, Agamemnon sends an embassy to Achilles to transmit his message. Although Achilles up to this point had behaved if not reasonably, then at least within expectation—considering the degree of Agamemnon's transgression—his refusal of Agamemnon's gifts is outside of the bounds of proper action. Achilles' misdeed in this situtation is later repaid by the death of Patroklos at the hands of Hektor. On account of this Achilles returns to battle to at last gain glory in the eyes of the Achaeans and future generations.

---

[65] Lloyd-Jones (1983) 10
[66] *ibid*. (1983) 5
[67] *ibid*. (1983) 21
[68] This punishment is also an effect of the supplication of Thetis to Zeus which is discussed below.

The importance of Lloyd-Jones' argument for this paper is two-fold. First, the invisibility of Zeus *Hikesios* is paralleled by Zeus' inexplicit and behind-the-scenes involvement in justice in general in the *Iliad*. In both instances of Zeus performs roles that are not specified (i.e. roles that do not have an epithet) in the *Iliad* but are attributed to him in later literature (such as Zeus *Soter*). I would argue that in the circumstances under which the *Iliad* was written Zeus as a defender and enforcer of *dike* was something to be assumed and had yet to be catagorized. Similarly, the lack of the term Zeus *Hikesios* does not necessarily imply that Zeus *Hikesios* does not exist in the *Iliad* nor that Zeus may never act in this way. Secondly, Lloyd-Jones proves that Zeus of the *Iliad* does show an interest in giving humans what they deserve, be it good or bad. Again, Zeus shows an interest in justice in the scenes leading up the supplication of Achilles by Priam. The killing of Hektor at the hands of Achilles may be considered fitting under the social conventions of the time. In killing the man who was responsible for the death of Patroklos, Achilles succeeds in one of the greater honors that he could bestow upon his friend in death.[69] However, as Achilles continues to mourn and relentlessly abuses the body of Hektor, the gods are offended and stirred with pity for Hektor and for Priam. It is with the concern for justice to be paid in return for Hektor's lifetime devotion to the gods that Zeus sends Iris to Priam, summoning him to journey to the tent of Achilles to retrieve the body of his son.

[69] Lloyd-Jones (1983) 21

Transitioning between a discussion of Zeus' interest in justice, and his participation in supplication and prayers, it is useful to note at this point Zeus' characterization of Achilles as it is presented to Priam through Iris. In order to encourage Priam to dare to approach Achilles, Zeus asserts that Achilles is "not foolish or aimless or wicked, but will in all kindness spare a suppliant"(*Il*.24.186-187). Zeus also denies that Achilles, in spite of his unacceptable treatment of Hektor's body, is *aphron*. The significance of these remarks is that Zeus—a god to whom a concern for justice may be attributed—believes that there is value in proper and presumably hospitable treatment of a suppliant: it would be the action of a person who is neither foolish nor aimless nor wicked. Quite early in the *Iliad* Zeus has his own chance to perform as a *supplicandus*, and as we shall see behaves in the same way that he predicts Achilles will when approached by Priam. The second supplication scene in the *Iliad* casts Zeus as *supplicandus* with Thetis as suppliant:

> Ἀλλ' ὅτε δή ῥ' ἐκ τοῖο δυωδεκάτη γένετ' ἠώς,
> καὶ τότε δὴ πρὸς Ὄλυμπον ἴσαν θεοὶ αἰὲν ἐόντες
> πάντες ἅμα, Ζεὺς δ' ἦρχε· Θέτις δ' οὐ λήθετ' ἐφετμέων (495)
> παιδὸς ἑοῦ, ἀλλ' ἥ γ' ἀνεδύσετο κῦμα θαλάσσης.
> ἠερίη δ' ἀνέβη μέγαν οὐρανὸν Οὔλυμπόν τε.
> εὗρεν δ' εὐρύοπα Κρονίδην ἄτερ ἥμενον ἄλλων
> ἀκροτάτῃ κορυφῇ πολυδειράδος Οὐλύμποιο·
> καί ῥα πάροιθ' αὐτοῖο καθέζετο, καὶ λάβε γούνων (500)
> σκαιῇ, δεξιτερῇ δ' ἄρ' ὑπ' ἀνθερεῶνος ἑλοῦσα

λισσομένη προσέειπε Δία Κρονίωνα ἄνακτα·
Ζεῦ πάτερ εἴ ποτε δή σε μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν ὄνησα
ἢ ἔπει ἢ ἔργῳ, τόδε μοι κρήηνον ἐέλδωρ·
τίμησόν μοι υἱὸν ὃς ὠκυμορώτατος ἄλλων (505)
ἔπλετ'· ἀτάρ μιν νῦν γε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων
ἠτίμησεν· ἑλὼν γὰρ ἔχει γέρας αὐτὸς ἀπούρας.
ἀλλὰ σύ πέρ μιν τῖσον Ὀλύμπιε μητίετα Ζεῦ·
τόφρα δ' ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι τίθει κράτος ὄφρ' ἂν Ἀχαιοὶ
υἱὸν ἐμὸν τίσωσιν ὀφέλλωσίν τέ ἑ τιμῇ. (510)
Ὣς φάτο· τὴν δ' οὔ τι προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς,
ἀλλ' ἀκέων δὴν ἧστο· Θέτις δ' ὡς ἥψατο γούνων
ὣς ἔχετ' ἐμπεφυυῖα, καὶ εἴρετο δεύτερον αὖτις·
νημερτὲς μὲν δή μοι ὑπόσχεο καὶ κατάνευσον
ἢ ἀπόειπ', ἐπεὶ οὔ τοι ἔπι δέος, ὄφρ' ἐὺ εἰδέω (515)
ὅσσον ἐγὼ μετὰ πᾶσιν ἀτιμοτάτη θεός εἰμι.
Τὴν δὲ μέγ' ὀχθήσας προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς·
ἦ δὴ λοίγια ἔργ' ὅ τέ μ' ἐχθοδοπῆσαι ἐφήσεις
Ἥρῃ ὅτ' ἄν μ' ἐρέθῃσιν ὀνειδείοις ἐπέεσσιν·
ἢ δὲ καὶ αὔτως μ' αἰεὶ ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι (520)
νεικεῖ, καί τέ μέ φησι μάχῃ Τρώεσσιν ἀρήγειν.
ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν αὖτις ἀπόστιχε μή τι νοήσῃ
Ἥρη· ἐμοὶ δέ κε ταῦτα μελήσεται ὄφρα τελέσσω·
εἰ δ' ἄγε τοι κεφαλῇ κατανεύσομαι ὄφρα πεποίθῃς·
τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξ ἐμέθεν γε μετ' ἀθανάτοισι μέγιστον (525)
τέκμωρ· (*Il.*1.493-526)

But when the sun rose on the twelfth day
all the immortal gods together went to Mount Olympus

And Zeus led the way; but Thetis did not forget the demands
Of her son, but instead she rose like a wave out of the sea,
dawn came to the great sky around Olympus,
And Thetis found the broad browed son of Cronos sitting apart from the others on the highest peak of rocky Olympus.
Then she sad down before him, and laid hold of his knees
With her left hand, and with her right seized his chin
And in supplication she addressed lord Zeus, son of Cronos:
"Father Zeus, if ever I served you among the immortals
either by word or deed, fulfill this prayer for me;
Honor my son who will suffer the speediest fate among other men.
Even now Agamemnon, ruler of men, has dishonored him; for he himself has taken Achilles' prize and carried it off.
In return for this, you honor him, Zeus, the Olympian counsellor;
Give strength to the Trojans until the Achaians pay their respects to my son and make him great in honor."
Thus she spoke; but cloud-gathering Zeus said nothing in reply,
But sat, unwilling to speak. And even then, Thetis held his knees and clung closely to him, and she spoke again a second time:
"Either promise this to me clearly and nod your head,
or refuse, since there is nothing for you to fear, in order that I know well to what degree I am the least honored among all the gods."
Troubled, cloud-gathering Zeus replied to her:
"These are baneful deeds, since you cause me to quarrel with Hera who would trouble me with reproachful speeches.
She always abuses me before the immortal gods,
And says that I am helping the Trojans in battle.
But leave now in order that Hera not suspect something. These matters will be a concern of mine and so I will accomplish them.

Come, I will nod my head so that you may be convinced. (*Il.*1.493-526)

In this scene all components of later supplications are present: Thetis lowers herself, holds Zeus' knees with one arm and reaches towards his face with the other. Also, not unlike later supplications in the *Odyssey*, Thetis has sought Zeus out as the proper god to whom she should make her request. An interesting aspect of this scene is that along with Thetis' plainly obvious use of supplication posture,[70] is the formation of her request as a prayer, which as we shall see is another convention closely associated with Zeus. In the first supplication scene of the *Iliad*, Chryses, after being denied his request to the Greeks, also prays for vengence from Apollo. In these two instances, one can then see supplements to the physicality of supplication in the form of prayers to the gods, and in Zeus' direct involvement. It is also not insignificant that Zeus grants Thetis' request.

Before continuing to discuss the role of Zeus in both supplication and prayer, it is important to first consider the form and use of prayers in Homer in general. In an article on Prayer in Homer, Mable Lang divides addresses between mortals and immortals into two groups: conversational and prayerful. Conversational addresses may consist of the acknowledgement of a god's power, or they may take the place of a soliloquy to show how the human actor may be feeling at a particular time. In neither case does the mortal make a request of the god. Prayerful addresses do make requests that can be divided into two further classes: simple and complex.

[70] Thetis' supplication of Zeus is discussed in greater detail below.

Examples of simple prayer include, for example, Agamemnon's prayer to Zeus that the Achaeans would take Troy before night fall. In the complex prayer two elements are present, the first being either a reason why the god should grant the prayer, or the purpose that prayer will accomplish, and the second part is a request that is added to one of these.[71] Another characteristic of prayer in the interaction between Thetis and Zeus may be found amongst the various formulas used "on the theme of reciprocal favors" such as *do ut des, da et dabo, da si dedi* or *da qua dedi*. In the above case it is clear that Thetis uses the *da si dedi*, reminding Zeus of any general previous acts she committed that were to his benefit. One further restriction on the elements of prayers imposed on Homer by Lang is that prayer cannot occur between gods, and is only used in interactions between humans and gods. Interestingly, Lang does include this prayer as a true prayer although it is between two divinities because "Thetis […] appears here more as Achilles' mother than as a goddess, so we may think of this as a true prayer."[72]

The connection between prayers and Zeus is explained further during the Embassy to Achilles in book nine of the *Iliad*:

> καὶ μὲν τοὺς θυέεσσι καὶ εὐχωλῇς ἀγανῇσι
> λοιβῇ τε κνίσῃ τε παρατρωπῶσ' ἄνθρωποι (500)
> λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβήῃ καὶ ἁμάρτῃ.
> καὶ γάρ τε λιταί εἰσι Διὸς κοῦραι μεγάλοιο
> χωλαί τε ῥυσαί τε παραβλῶπές τ' ὀφθαλμώ,

[71] Lang (1975) 309
[72] *ibid*. (1975) 310

αἵ ῥά τε καὶ μετόπισθ’ ἄτης ἀλέγουσι κιοῦσαι.
ἣ δ’ ἄτη σθεναρή τε καὶ ἀρτίπος, οὕνεκα πάσας (505)
πολλὸν ὑπεκπροθέει, φθάνει δέ τε πᾶσαν ἐπ’ αἶαν
βλάπτουσ’ ἀνθρώπους· αἳ δ’ ἐξακέονται ὀπίσσω.
ὃς μέν τ’ αἰδέσεται κούρας Διὸς ἅσσον ἰούσας,
τὸν δὲ μέγ’ ὤνησαν καί τ’ ἔκλυον εὐχομένοιο·
ὃς δέ κ’ ἀνήνηται καί τε στερεῶς ἀποείπῃ, (510)
λίσσονται δ’ ἄρα ταί γε Δία Κρονίωνα κιοῦσαι
τῷ ἄτην ἅμ’ ἕπεσθαι, ἵνα βλαφθεὶς ἀποτίσῃ. (*Il*.9. 499-512)

And humans win [the gods] over, supplicating them, and offering
Sacrifices and hallowed prayers, libations and sacrificed fat, (500)
Whenever someone has done them wrong and shamed them.
For indeed even prayers are daughters of great Zeus
Who are lame and wrinkled and cast sidelong glances
And who attend to what is right, following after *ate*.
But *ate* is strong, and because of this she runs very quickly (505)
All over, and appears everywhere on earth
Striking humans; But the prayers bring cures for them afterwards.
He who respects the daughters of Zeus as they draw near,
The prayers are of service to him and they listen to his request;
But as for the man who refuses them and roughly denies them, (510)
Going to Zeus, son of Cronos, they supplicate him to make
Ate follow the man who denied them, so that he would be struck and
pay a penalty. (*Il*.9. 499-512)

In this passage we learn that the *litai* are, in fact, daughters of Zeus who are following in the wake of sin to help heal any pain that has been caused. More

importantly, when these *litai* are denied by those they approach, they then make their own prayers to Zeus. The connection between Zeus and prayers in the *Iliad* is not limited to this speech of Phoenix. In his survey of prayers found in the *Iliad*, Eugene Strittmatter comments on the remarkable number that are directed at Zeus, with only three other divinities being prayed to at all. He also points out that when prayers are directed towards other gods they are called upon in precisely defined roles. For example, Odysseus prays to Athena because she is his patron goddess. Similarly, Diomedes calls on Athena because she had aided his father in the past. The Trojan women also pray to Athena because she is the patroness of their city. Furthermore, according to Strittmatter, the epithets used for the gods in prayers differ between those to Zeus and those to others. Zeus' epithets are "of quality" and do not refer to any special attributes: he is called "father", "king", "most glorious", "most great."[73] Athena, Apollo and Poseidon are called on by attributes such as child of aegis-bearing Zeus, god of the silver bow, and the earth-shaker. Zeus is also evoked by anonymous soldiers in "general events" (i.e. those in which the soldiers do not take part) such as the dual between Menalaus and Paris.[74]

3.1 Zeus in Supplications in the *Iliad*

In Book 1.495-530, as is mentioned above, Thetis supplicates Zeus on behalf of her son Achilles, who has just been disgraced by Agamemnon. After unpacking the prayer segment of this supplication, one can also see that this scene offers several

[73] Strittmatter (1925) 86
[74] *ibid*. (1925) 84

useful insights into considering later acts of supplication, especially considering Zeus' presence or absence in them. First, the scene contains a full description of the physical act: Thetis crouches before Zeus, takes hold of his knees with one hand, and reaches for his chin with the other. In other cases this description is neatly packed into words like *gounazomai*, as occurs in Gould's figurative supplicaiton.[75] Secondly, Thetis begins her speech to Zeus with a formula commonly used in prayers: "Father Zeus, if ever I aided you among the immortals, either by word or deed, grant me this prayer." After she makes her request—that honor be restored to Achilles—Zeus is silent. Maintaining her suppliant position, Thetis speaks again, and this time intimates that if her request is denied, she will know that she is the least honored of the gods. In sum, Thetis takes three tacks to make her case: she assumes position of the suppliant, she prays, and she appeals to Zeus' sense of honor.

Zeus' response sheds more light on what led to the success of this supplication. After hearing the first part of Thetis' speech, which includes the prayer formula, and the description of supplication, Zeus does not reply and instead sits in silence. He is moved to talk only after Thetis' second comment claiming to be the least honored of the gods if Zeus should deny her request. With both his silence and his final response, a troubled Zeus makes it rather clear that it is not in his personal interest to carry out Thetis' wish. Zeus is not however clear about why he accepts her proposal. Is he returning a favor, and moved by the prayer? Does he also think that Achilles' honor deserves avenging? Because of Zeus' initial silence, the answer is

[75] See above 1.2.

most likely to lay with Thetis' response, and their shared knowledge of what it means to deny a suppliant. In this instance, then, Zeus has taken the position of a protector of suppliants, inasmuch as he is most compelled to maintain Thetis' honor.

Returning to the world of mortals, it is useful to briefly consider an example of typical battlefield supplication in the *Iliad*. One such scene is the supplication of Menelaus by Adrastus:

> Ἄδρηστος δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα λαβὼν ἐλίσσετο γούνων· (45)
> ζώγρει Ἀτρέος υἱέ, σὺ δ' ἄξια δέξαι ἄποινα·
> πολλὰ δ' ἐν ἀφνειοῦ πατρὸς κειμήλια κεῖται
> χαλκός τε χρυσός τε πολύκμητός τε σίδηρος,
> τῶν κέν τοι χαρίσαιτο πατὴρ ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα
> εἴ κεν ἐμὲ ζωὸν πεπύθοιτ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν. (50)
> Ὣς φάτο, τῷ δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἔπειθε·
> καὶ δή μιν τάχ' ἔμελλε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν
> δώσειν ᾧ θεράποντι καταξέμεν· (*Il*.6.45-53)

> Then Adrastos, taking his knees, supplicated him: (45)
> Son of Atreus, take me alive and you will receive a worthy ransom;
> A great treasure lies piled up in the house of my wealthy father
> Made up of bronze and gold and well-wrought iron,
> And my father would be please to give a boundless ransom from these
> If he learned that I lived on the ships of the Achaeans." (50)
> And right away Menelaus intended to give him to
> A slave to lead down to the Achaeans' swift ships. (*Il*.6.45-53)

After being bested in combat by Menelaus, Adrastus approaches him, seizes him by the knees and makes his supplication. In his speech, Adrastus' one recourse for protection is an offer of *axia apoina*. Not unlike Zeus' moment of indecision, Menelaus first accepts Adrastus as a captive. However, this response is soon altered by an interjection made by Agamemnon, reminding Menelaus of the crimes done to him in his own house by the Trojans (*Il*.6.56-57). What is most clearly missing in this scene, as Pedrick has pointed out, especially when compared to the supplication of Thetis to Zeus, is any reference to Zeus the protector of suppliants. Along the same line, Adrastus makes no reference to the value of his honor, nor does he use a prayer formula. This pattern is repeated in other battlefield supplications, until the supplication of Hektor to Achilles.

The supplication of Hektor to Achilles is a departure from other earlier supplication scenes because of its combination of an offer of *apoina* and references to the gods—although not to Zeus specifically. It can be found in Book 22.337-60:

> Τὸν δ' ὀλιγοδρανέων προσέφη κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ·
> λίσσομ' ὑπὲρ ψυχῆς καὶ γούνων σῶν τε τοκήων
> μή με ἔα παρὰ νηυσὶ κύνας καταδάψαι Ἀχαιῶν,
> ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν χαλκόν τε ἅλις χρυσόν τε δέδεξο (340)
> δῶρα τά τοι δώσουσι πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ,
> σῶμα δὲ οἶκαδ' ἐμὸν δόμεναι πάλιν, ὄφρα πυρός με
> Τρῶες καὶ Τρώων ἄλοχοι λελάχωσι θανόντα.
> Τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς·
> μή με κύον γούνων γουνάζεο μὴ δὲ τοκήων· (345)
> αἴ γάρ πως αὐτόν με μένος καὶ θυμὸς ἀνήη

ὤμ’ ἀποταμνόμενον κρέα ἔδμεναι, οἷα ἔοργας,
ὡς οὐκ ἔσθ’ ὃς σῆς γε κύνας κεφαλῆς ἀπαλάλκοι,
οὐδ’ εἴ κεν δεκάκις τε καὶ εἰκοσινήριτ’ ἄποινα
στήσωσ’ ἐνθάδ’ ἄγοντες, ὑπόσχωνται δὲ καὶ ἄλλα, (350)
οὐδ’ εἴ κέν σ’ αὐτὸν χρυσῷ ἐρύσασθαι ἀνώγοι
Δαρδανίδης Πρίαμος· οὐδ’ ὥς σέ γε πότνια μήτηρ
ἐνθεμένη λεχέεσσι γοήσεται ὃν τέκεν αὐτή,
ἀλλὰ κύνες τε καὶ οἰωνοὶ κατὰ πάντα δάσονται.
Τὸν δὲ καταθνῄσκων προσέφη κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ· (355)
ἦ σ’ εὖ γιγνώσκων προτιόσσομαι, οὐδ’ ἄρ’ ἔμελλον
πείσειν· ἦ γὰρ σοί γε σιδήρεος ἐν φρεσὶ θυμός.
φράζεο νῦν, μή τοί τι *θεῶν μήνιμα γένωμαι*
ἤματι τῷ ὅτε κέν σε Πάρις καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
ἐσθλὸν ἐόντ’ ὀλέσωσιν ἐνὶ Σκαιῇσι πύλῃσιν. (*Il*.22.337-60)

Weakly, Hektor of the glancing helm addressed him:
“I supplicated you by your soul and your knees and your parents:
Do not let the Achaeans’ dogs devour me beside your ships,
But take the bronze and gold in abundance (340)
As gifts that my father and revered mother with give to you,
And let my body return again homewards, in order that
The Trojans and wives of the Trojans may give my corpse its share of fire.
Glaring at him from under his brows, swift-footed Achilles replied:
“Dog, do not supplicate me by my knees nor by my parents. (345)
Indeed my mind and spirit do so urge me to eat your heart, raw,
cut from your body, so terrible are the things you have done
that there is no man who would defend your head from the dogs
nor if, leading it here, they offered ten or twenty times the ransom

and promised others besides, (350)
not if Dardanian Priam paid your weight in gold;
by no means will your revered mother placing you on a bed
mourn the one whom she bore
but the dogs and birds will eat you up entirely."
And Hektor of the glancing helm responded as he lay dying: (355)
I foresee this, as I know you well, nor was I about to
Persuade you. For truly the spirit in your body is made of iron.
But agree with me now, lest I become a cause for revenge from the gods
On that day when Paris and Phoebos Apollo
Kill you, although you are noble, on the Skaean Gates. (*Il*.22.337-60)

This supplication is also different from others in that Hektor asks for his body's return to his parents, and burial rites, instead of his life.[76] Hektor, in fact, in this supplication appears to be imbued with something of the supernatural. The clearest instance occurs at the end of his speech, beginning in 356. Here, Hektor explicitly states that he is having a presentiment by using the verb *protissomai*. In lines 358-360, Hektor warns Achilles that his behavior will anger the gods, should he choose to deny Hektor's request. Hektor also makes a prophecy of Achilles' own death at the hands of Paris and Apollo.

Crotty and others point to this scene as a kind of turning point in the emotional atmosphere of the poem, and Crotty specifically sees it leading to later appeals to *eleos*. Similarly, I would also propose that it is in the supplication of Hektor to

[76] This is not to say that a Greek's insistance on proper burial is an any way abnormal, but rather simply that it adds to the religious or divine energy of the scene, and that it is a request unparalleled in other supplications.

Achilles that we begin to see what Pedrick calls a "sanctification" of the suppliant found in the Odyssey.[77] The sanctification of Hektor is apparent particularly in his concern for burial rites, his prophecy of Achilles' death, and his reference to the gods, who will be angry with Achilles should he deny Hektor's request.

The events leading to the supplication of Priam to Achilles add to this "sanctification." At the beginning of Book 24, Hermes and Zeus team up to retrieve Hektor's body from the camp of the Achaeans. Priam remains hidden by the power of Hermes up to the moment that he begins his supplication of Achilles. Later in the scene, we can see a more direct reference to Zeus' role in this supplication in a comment made by Achilles, when he warns Priam against angering him:

> τὼ νῦν μή μοι μᾶλλον ἐν ἄλγεσι θυμὸν ὀρίνῃς,
> μή σε γέρον οὐδ' αὐτὸν ἐνὶ κλισίῃσιν ἐάσω
> καὶ ἱκέτην περ ἐόντα, Διὸς δ' ἀλίτωμαι ἐφετμάς. (*Il*.24.568-570)

> Do not now stir my spirit further in discomfort,
> Lest I do not allow you to remain in my shelter, even though you are an old man, my suppliant, and I though I would transgress the injunctions of Zeus. (*Il*.24.568-570)

Achilles threatens violence even though Priam is his suppliant and Achilles would be acting against the commands of Zeus. Again in these lines we find a characteristic of Pedrick's sanctification of the suppliant: Priam is named specifically as a *hiketes*. Zeus' part here, and as it is described earlier in the scene, reveals yet another

[77] This sanctification Pedrick refers to is connected to the adjectives *aidos* and the noun *iketes* which are used to describe the suppliant in the *Odyssey*.

glimpse of his evolving role as gaurdian of suppliants. Also, as in the Odyssey, the divine protection of Priam occurs in a scene where correct behavior towards guests—that is, *xenia*—is a concern.

This scene and in particular Achilles' extreme fluctuation of emotion within it has been a source of debate in Homeric scholarship. An example of an approach to this problem is laid out above in the description of Elizabeth Minchin article in which she explains Achilles' sudden anger towards Priam following the latter's supplication as a reaction consistent with his Iliadic character. Although Minchin does add nuance and insight into the character of Achilles, her paper does not address the entire situation sufficiently (albeit this was most likely not the purpose of her study). Graham Zanker[78] addresses the scene with a view beyond Achilles' anger with Priam to the implicatons of Achilles' acceptance of Priam as a suppliant. Zanker believes that in this case Achilles transcends the "institutionalized reciprocity" of his society, and is motivated instead by altruism. Crotty attributes Achilles' actions in this scene to a subversion of the Heroic culture present in the *Iliad* as well.

One opinion that Crotty argues against in particular is that of Charles Segal,[79] who writes that with the supplication of Priam, Achilles returns to the proper order of the *Iliad*. In oppostion, Crotty maintains that due to the secrecy with which

---

[78] Zanker, Grahm. "Beyond Reciprocity: the Akhilleus-Priam Scene in *Iliad* 24." *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*. Ed. Christopher Gill. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1998.

[79] Segal, Charles. *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the* Iliad. Mnemosyne Suppliment 17. Leinden: Brill, 1971.

Achilles accepts Priam as a suppliant Achilles begins to act outside of the former warrior society, and it is at this point in the poem that a "new order is discovered."[80] According to Crotty, Achilles in this scene is able to break through barriers of his old society to find "novel expressions adequate to his understanding;" these "novel expressions" include having a meal with an enemy king, and "challenging the idea of ceremony as something outside a character's control: Achilles puts the traditional meal of *philotes* to a new use and endows it with a powerful new significance."[81] Considering this input from Crotty's study, changes in attitude—whether it is towards the gods, towards suppliants, towards humankind—are abundantly clear at the end of the *Iliad.* Although valid in regard to Achilles' change of attitude in his interaction with Priam, Crotty's argument still calls for some refinement.

Returning to the Greek, line 570 of the quotation above draws attention to other forces at work in this scene—those that are not connected with altruism (as Zanker would claim)—which are the influence of Zeus and the sanctification of the suppliant. Although in this case Achilles threatens to deny the commands of Zeus, I think it is right to assume that up to this point (and afterwards) Achilles allows Priam into his shelter and accepts the loss of Hektor's body because Zeus demanded that this happen. Furthermore, as has been proved above, Zeus became involved in this situation because of his interest in justice and also in the protection of those in need: in this case, that person is Priam. Finally, Achilles also has held back from

[80] Crotty (1994) 6
[81] *ibid*. (1994) 8

harming Priam because the latter is an *hiketes*, the term used for the sanctified suppliant in the *Odyssey*. Taking these points into consideration, it is clear that Achilles adds to Crotty's "change of attitude," but what Crotty fails to communicate is that the change of attitude begins earlier in the *Iliad* with the sanctification of Hektor.[82] Due to sanctification of the suppliant in this earlier scene, I would argue that Achilles is *not* subverting the heroic code of the surrounding poem, but rather that he upholds the implications the emotional shift that occurs in the supplication of Hektor to Achilles, including the sanctification of the suppliant, and the influence of Zeus as protector of suppliants. This change of attitude will then continue to be found in the action of the *Odyssey*.

3.2 Supplications in the Odyssey

As opposed to the *Iliad*, the act of supplication and the tradition of *xenia* are quite often combined in the *Odyssey*, and Zeus is called upon as both the gaurdian of suppliants and of guests. According to Pitt-Rivers, "in order that the rules of social intercourse may operate with regard to him the hostile stranger must be converted into a guest. This transformation is achieved through some ritual of incorporation which places the host and the guest outside the bounds of the rivalry that governs relationships in a neutral setting."[83] In other words although a suppliant has no rights in a foreign society, through his transformation into a guest by means of the

[82] Crotty does of course recognize the emotional shift with the supplication of Hektor to Achilles
[83] Pitt-Rivers (1970) 95

act of supplication, he is given a place.[84] Although this combination of roles is implied in the *Iliad* during the supplication of Priam to Achilles, it is often referred to explicitly in the *Odyssey*. In the supplication scene between Odysseus and the Cyclops there is virtually no differentiation between the suppliant and *xenos*:

> καὶ τότε πῦρ ἀνέκαιε καὶ εἴσιδεν, εἴρετο δ' ἥμεας·
> 'ὦ ξεῖνοι, τίνες ἐστέ; πόθεν πλεῖθ' ὑγρὰ κέλευθα;
> ἦ τι κατὰ πρῆξιν ἢ μαψιδίως ἀλάλησθε
> οἷά τε ληϊστῆρες ὑπεὶρ ἅλα, τοί τ' ἀλόωνται
> ψυχὰς παρθέμενοι, κακὸν ἀλλοδαποῖσι φέροντες;' (255)
> ὣς ἔφαθ', ἡμῖν δ' αὖτε κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ,
> δεισάντων φθόγγον τε βαρὺν αὐτόν τε πέλωρον.
> ἀλλὰ καὶ ὧς μιν ἔπεσσιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπον·
> 'ἡμεῖς τοι Τροίηθεν ἀποπλαγχθέντες Ἀχαιοὶ
> παντοίοισ' ἀνέμοισιν ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης, (260)
> οἴκαδε ἱέμενοι, ἄλλην ὁδὸν ἄλλα κέλευθα
> ἤλθομεν· οὕτω που Ζεὺς ἤθελε μητίσασθαι.
> λαοὶ δ' Ἀτρεΐδεω Ἀγαμέμνονος εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι,
> τοῦ δὴ νῦν γε μέγιστον ὑπουράνιον κλέος ἐστί·
> τόσσην γὰρ διέπερσε πόλιν καὶ ἀπώλεσε λαοὺς (265)
> πολλούς. ἡμεῖς δ' αὖτε κιχανόμενοι τὰ σὰ γοῦνα
> ἱκόμεθ', εἴ τι πόροις ξεινήϊον ἠὲ καὶ ἄλλως
> δοίης δωτίνην, ἥ τε ξείνων θέμις ἐστίν.
> ἀλλ' αἰδεῖο, φέριστε, θεούς· ἱκέται δέ τοί εἰμεν.
> Ζεὺς δ' ἐπιτιμήτωρ ἱκετάων τε ξείνων τε, (270)
> ξείνιος, ὃς ξείνοισιν ἅμ' αἰδοίοισιν ὀπηδεῖ.'
> ὣς ἐφάμην, ὁ δέ μ' αὐτίκ' ἀμείβετο νηλέϊ θυμῷ·

[84] Gould (1974) 80

‘νήπιός εἰς, ὦ ξεῖν’, ἢ τηλόθεν εἰλήλουθας,
ὅς με θεοὺς κέλεαι ἢ δειδίμεν ἢ ἀλέασθαι.
οὐ γὰρ Κύκλωπες Διὸς αἰγιόχου ἀλέγουσιν (275)
οὐδὲ θεῶν μακάρων, ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτεροί εἰμεν·
οὐδ’ ἂν ἐγὼ Διὸς ἔχθος ἀλευάμενος πεφιδοίμην
οὔτε σεῦ οὔθ’ ἑτάρων, εἰ μὴ θυμός με κελεύοι. (*Od*.9.251-278)

And when he lit a fire and perceived our presence, he spoke:
“O strangers, who are you? Whence have you sailed across the watery ways?
Do you wander either for some task or idly
And commit such acts as pirates do upon the sea, those who wander
Risking their souls, and bringing evil to those of foreign lands?” (255)
Thus he spoke, and our hearts were broken,
Being frightened by his deep voice and great size.
But I replied in this way, answering with this speech:
“We are Achaeans, struck off our path from Troy
by many winds upon the great back of the sea, (260)
although we set off for home, we went along another path and another
journey; I suppose it is the way Zeus wished to bring it about.
We boast to be the people of Agamemnon, son of Atreus,
Of whom there is now the greatest glory under the sky;
For so great was the city he sacked and many the people he destroyed. (261)
But we are now at your knees as suppliants
If you would give a guest present or some other
Gift, which is the custom for guests.
Most of all, friend, beware the gods; we are suppliants.
Zeus is the protector of both suppliants and guests, (270)
And he is called “Protector of Guests”, who accompanies honorable guests.”
Thus I spoke, and he immediately answered with a ruthless spirit:

> "You are either a fool, stranger, or you have come from too far away,
> that tells me to fear or keep clear of the gods.
> For indeed the Cyclopes have no concern for aegis-bearing Zeus (275)
> Nor for the other blessed gods, since we are much stronger than they are.
> Neither would I, fearing the disfavor of Zeus, spare you nor your men, if my spirit did not urge me. (*Od*.9.251-278)

At the beginning of this scene, after the Cyclops has finished his household work, he first addresses Odysseus and his men as *xenoi*. Later in lines 267-268, Odysseus also uses forms of the word *xenios*: *xeineion* (267) and *xeinon* (268). Furthermore, in 271 Odysseus calls Zeus, "*xenios*", protector of guests. All these lines connect this scene to supplications in the *Iliad*, the first of which is the theme of suppliant-exile as it is explained by Robin Schlunk.[85] The suppliant-exile is a widely used theme throughout the *Iliad* and can be seen particularly in the simile that begins the supplication of Priam to Achilles.[86] In this simile, Priam is compared to a man who has been exiled from his homeland on account of having killed someone. The situation described in that simile is in fact a story similar to what happened to Patroklos (among others) as a young man (*Il*.23.85). In her study, Schlunk focuses on characters driven out of their homelands by other citizens, which is not the case for Odysseus. However, in his speech to the Cyclops, Odysseus does state that he and his men were driven from their original course (259). Also, even though there

[85] Schlunk, Robin R. "The Theme of the Suppliant-Exile in the Iliad." *The American Journal of Philology*. 973. (1976): 199-209.
[86] *ibid*. (1976) 204

is no *mortal* forbidding Odysseus from Ithaca, this does not prevent the gods from making Odysseus an exile in the same way as Patroklos and Priam in the *Iliad*.

After giving a brief history of their wanderings, Odysseus's speech continues with the typical markers of a supplication. Here, the physical positioning of supplication is not described, but Odysseus performs what Gould calls a figurative supplication: instead of actually touching the Cyclops, Odysseus tells him, "*kichanomenoi ta sa gouna*". Odysseus goes on to ask for gifts, as is the custom for *xenoi*. Thirdly, Odysseus warns the Cyclops to honor the gods, and says, "we are your suppliants. Zeus is the avenger of both suppliants and *xenoi*, who follows *xenoi* who are to be honored."

As is well known, this supplication is entirely unsuccessful. Notably, the Cyclops does not concern himself with the first part of Odysseus' speech: he does not explain why he has no qualms harming heroes of the Trojan War, and he has no pity for their past wanderings. What the Cyclops does address is the effect that the gods have upon Cyclopes, which is none: the Cyclops is stronger than the gods, and has no fear for Aegis bearing Zeus.

In this scene we see several changes in the rules of supplication that have occurred between the two poems. Although it is difficult to compare this scene to the battlefield supplications of the *Iliad*, it offers a situation similar to that of Priam and Achilles. Odysseus has come to the home of an unknown, and potentially hostile, individual (not knowing, of course, how hostile he would be) seeking assistance. However, Odysseus' method for arguing his case is very different. In

both cases, the stranger/suppliant is entering what is, and what is effectively, the *supplicandus'* home, and arena of *xenia*. However, unlike Priam, Odysseus puts the full weight of his argument into his status as both suppliant and *xenos*, and calls upon Zeus for protection. This subtle difference in the use of *xenos*, one used by the Cyclops, not in the sense of inheritied guest-friend, but as a guest who is deserving of assistance is in turn attached to the evolved sense of suppliant also employed by Odysseus.

The changes made to scenes of supplication between the two poems are all present in the supplication of Odysseus to Arete and Alcinoos:

> αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ διὰ δῶμα πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
> πολλὴν ἠέρ' ἔχων, ἣν οἱ περίχευεν Ἀθήνη, (140)
> ὅφρ' ἵκετ' Ἀρήτην τε καὶ Ἀλκίνοον βασιλῆα.
> ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' Ἀρήτης βάλε γούνασι χεῖρας Ὀδυσσεύς,
> καὶ τότε δή ῥ' αὐτοῖο πάλιν χύτο θέσφατος ἀήρ.
> οἱ δ' ἄνεω ἐγένοντο δόμον κάτα φῶτα ἰδόντες,
> θαύμαζον δ' ὁρόωντες· ὁ δ' ἐλλιτάνευεν Ὀδυσσεύς· (145)
> "Ἀρήτη, θύγατερ Ῥηξήνορος ἀντιθέοιο,
> σόν τε πόσιν σά τε γούναθ' ἱκάνω πολλὰ μογήσας… (*Od.*7.139-154)

> But then godlike Odysseus walked through the house
> having a great mist around him which Athena poured about, (140)
> in order that he could approach Arete and Alcinoos the king.
> And Odysseus threw his arms about the knees of Arete
> And then the mist that was ordained by Athena fell away
> And the men were silent all through the house after seeing the man,

> And beholding him they were amazed; and Odysseus spoke in supplication:
> "Arete, daughter of godlike Rexenor
> I am at your and your husbands knees having suffered many troubles…
> (*Od.*7.139-147)

The strange behavior of Arete and Alcinoos in this scene, and the characterization of the Phaeacians in general have prompted discussion from antiquity.[87] According to some scholars,[88] nothing strange occurs amongst the Phaeacians at the time of Odysseus' arrival; Scheria, as the boundary between the fantastic and realistic lands, at last offers Odysseus some respite from his travels.[89] However, although Odysseus' arrival on Scheria marks the end of his difficult journeys amongst dangerous peoples, the Phaeacians are not consistantly described as being hospitable to strangers, and at times it is clear that Odysseus is in some danger amongst them. At the beginning of his experience on Scheria, Odysseus is warned twice about the Phaeacians: Nausikaa tells him not to follow her to the house because of the "over-bearing" nature of the townspeople.[90] Here is one break with convention in the theme of *xenia*: in most cases a child of the ruler (or more specifically, the one who will accept the *xenos*) leads the stranger to the court.[91] In fact after Odysseus finally reaches Arete and Alcinoos, Alcinoos reprimands

---

[87] For more on the inhospitality of the Phaeacians see Rose, Gilbert P. "The Unfriendly Phaeacians." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 100 (1969): 387-406.
[88] Segal (1962)
[89] Reece (1993) 101
[90] *ibid*. (1993) 104
[91] This is true, for example, in Telemachus' acceptance of Athena as Medon in Book 1 of the *Odyssey*.

Nausikaa for failing at this duty. Later, Athena, after covering Odysseus with a protective mist (Od.7.14-17), tells him not to look any Phaeacian in the eye, nor to speak to any of them or ask anything because of their lack of tolerance for strangers (7.32-33). Furthermore, Odysseus is challenged by the king's son Laodamas to participate in an athletic competition, and he is also abused by another Phaiacian, Euryalus (8.158-64), not to mention prodded for identification by Alcinoos himself before he has finished eating.[92] Steve Reece explains these anamolies through the influence of folktale in the *Odyssey*, and in particular, folktales that center on a story of a suitor entering a strange land and intending to marry the local princess. By making this comparison Reece is able to explain most of the strange occurances in this guest-reception sequence including the hostility of the Phaeacian people, the athletic contests Odysseus participates in, Nausikaa's reluctance to be seen with Odysseus, etc. Although I would not deny that this scene may have been affected by influence from a folk tale, it also seems likely that this scene of the *Odyssey* could also reflect a scene from a much closer source: the *Iliad*.

Continuing with the passage, Odysseus, as is mentioned above and like Priam in his supplication, is guided by an immortal, Athena, and remains hidden until reaching the seat of Arete. Not only do these scenes mirror each other in the above two aspects, but also in the hostility surrounding the suppliant. Just like Odysseus in Scheria, Priam could not have spoken to any of the Myrmidons—if he had, one would expect a most dire consequence. The divergence between these scenes occurs

[92] Reece (1993) 105

in the manner in which the supplicandus comes to his decision. In the case of Achilles and Priam, Achilles raises Priam from his crouched position, thereby accepting him. Arete and Alcinoos, being less sure of themselves, are advised by Exeneos, an elder among the Phaiakians. Exeneos explains what is necessary to be done for a guest, and ends his speech by saying:

> "ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ ξεῖνον μὲν ἐπὶ θρόνου ἀργυροήλου
> ἔσσον ἀναστήσας, σὺ δὲ κηρύκεσσι κέλευσον
> οἶνον ἐπικρῆσαι, ἵνα καὶ Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ
> σπείσομεν, ὅς θ' ἱκέτῃσιν ἅμ' αἰδοίοισιν ὀπηδεῖ"· (*Od.*7.162-165)
>
> "But come and after raising the stranger set him on the
> Silver-studded chair, and send orders to the heralds
> To mix the wine, and we will make a libation to Zeus who delights in thunder
> Who also accompanies revered suppliants." (*Od.*7.162-165)

I would suggest, then, that this scene of the Odyssey has been composed with the scene of Priam and Achilles in the Iliad in mind, and may even show the audience where the tradition of proper treatment of suppliants and guests comes from. The Iliadic scene displays Achilles treating Priam in a certain manner under threat of punishment from Zeus in a more generic and non-specific form. When the scene is replayed in the Odyssey, Exeneos names Zeus as one who explicitly attends to suppliants, and prescribes a course of action identical to that followed by Achilles.

4.1 Conclusion

Reading supplication scenes in the Homeric poems as Homeric themes, in which the addition or absence of elements betray the intent of the poet, allows for the preceding analysis and from that analysis comes a new understanding of Zeus and supplication in the *Iliad*. First, Zeus has a proven interest in justice which is apparent in his relation to the *litae* and in his prevalence as recepient of prayers among the gods. Secondly, although he is not called by such epithetis as Zeus *Soter* in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Zeus maintains an interest in protecting the weak and wronged in these poems. He exhibits this interest by granting Thetis' request to restore Achilles' honor and also when he requires Achilles to return Hektor's body to Priam. Looking closer into supplications in the *Iliad*, there is an obvious shift in attitude between the early supplications on the battlefield and the supplication of Hektor to Achilles. In the latter case, Hektor, a prototype of the sanctified suppliant, does not merely suggest a transaction of goods for his body but instead also warns Achilles to beware of the wrath of the gods if he chooses to disregard Hektor's request. Furthermore, Hektor asks for pity from Achilles, which is a tactic used by Priam in Book 24, wherein Zeus plays an even more direct role in protecting the suppliant.

Supplication scenes in the *Odyssey* also allude to Zeus' influence on Iliadic supplications. In the supplication of the Cyclops by Odysseus all elements of supplication are employed: Odysseus uses words of supplication referring figuratively to grasping the Cyclops' knees, the suppliants are sanctified and given the title of *hiketes*, and Zeus is named as the protector of guests and suppliants.

Although the final two of these elements are in the first case rare and in the second non-existant in the *Iliad*, this scene is connected to the *Iliad* through the theme of the suppliant-exile. Although supplications made by exiles are referenced in the *Iliad*, as is the story of Patroklos' arrival to the house of Peleus, the only suppliant-exile who actually makes his supplication in the time of the *Iliad* is Priam. The supplication of Odysseus to Arete and Alcinoos further alludes to the supplication of Priam to Achilles in three elements: the suppliant is led in by a god, is made invisibile to the potentially hostile crowd surrounding the *supplicandus*, and in the silence following his initial appearance. Moreover, in the Odyssean scene, the king and queen are advised by an aged warrior as to the manner in which they should accept Odysseus: a clear reference to Achilles' treatment of Priam during the Trojan war, and the part played by Zeus in both.

To conclude, I want to return briefly to Whitman's diagram of the ring-composition of the first and last books of the *Iliad*. Although his breakdown of corresponding scenes is certainly accurate and sensible, Whitman does not address the possibility or significance of parallel themes in non-corresponding scenes: for example, the relationship between the supplication of Thetis to Zeus in part (iv) of *Il*.1, and the supplication of Priam to Achilles in part (iv), rather than its corresponding part (ii), of *Il*.24. But if we can still read these scenes as part of the *Iliad*'s ring-composition in spite of their being out of order, then they are two supplication scenes bookending the action of the *Iliad*: the second models the first

replacing gods with men, reiterating the sanctification of the suppliant and the existance of Zeus *Hikesios*.

Works Sited

1. Adkins, Arthur W. H. *Merit and Responsibility; A Study in Greek Values*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
2. Arafat, Karim W. *Classical Zeus: A Study in Art and Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
3. Arieti, James A. "Homer's Litae and Ate." *CJ* 84.1 (1988): 1-2
4. Bohen, Barbara E. "The Dipylon Amphora: Its Role in the Development of Greek Art." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 25.2 (1991): 59-65.
5. Chantrain, Pierre. "Le Divin dans Homere," *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt* I (1952), 75-81.
6. Coldstream, J. N. "The Geometric style: birth of the picture." *Looking at Greek Vases*. Eds. Tom Rasmussen and Nigel Spivey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
7. Crotty, Kevin. *The Poetics of Supplication: Homer's* Iliad *and* Odyssey. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.
8. Desborough, V. R. d'A. *The Last Mycenaeans and their successors; an archaeological survey, c. 1200-c. 1000 B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
9. Dodds, Eric Robertson. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951.
10. Edwards, Mark W. "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type-Scene."
11. Finley, M.I. *The World of Odysseus*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1964.
12. Gould, John. "HIKETEIA." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*. 93 (1973), pg. 74-103.

13. Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. *The Justice of Zeus*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
14. Lang, Mabel, L. "Reason and Purpose in Homeric Prayers." *The Classical World*. 68.5 (1975): 309-314.
15. Lord, Albert Bates. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
16. Minchin, Elizabeth. "The Interpretation of a Theme in Oral Epic: 'Iliad' 24.559-70." *Greece & Rome*, Second Series.
17. Nagy, Gregory. *The Best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.
18. Naiden, F. S. *Ancient Supplication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
19. Page, Denys Lionel, Sir. *The Homeric* Odyssey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
20. Pedrick, Victoria. "Supplication in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)*. 112 (1982): 125-140.
21. Pedley, John Griffiths. *Greek Art and Archaeology*. 5th ed. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall Inc., 2007.
22. Pitt-Rivers, Julian. "Women and Sanctuary in the Mediterranean." *Echanges et Communications: Melanges offerts a Levi-Strauss a l'occasion de son 60eme Anniversaire*. Eds. Jean Pouillon and Pierre Maranda. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.

23. Pucci, Pietro. *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the* Odyssey *and the* Iliad. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.

24. Reece, Steve. *The Stranger's Welcome*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993.

25. Rose, Gilbert P. "The Unfriendly Phaeacians." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 100 (1969): 387-406.

26. Segal, Charles. "The Phaeacians and the Symbolism of Odysseus' Return." *Arion* 1.4 (1962): 17-64.

27. ---. *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the* Iliad. *Mnemosyne Suppliment 17*. Leinden: Brill, 1971.

28. Schlunk, Robin R. "The Theme of the Suppliant-Exile in the Iliad." *The American Journal of Philology*. 973. (1976): 199-209.

29. Strittmatter, Eugene J. "Prayer in the *Iliad* an the *Odyssey*." *The Classical Weekly*. 18.11 (1925): 83-87.

30. Thorton, Agathe. *Homer's Iliad: its Composition and the Motif of Supplication.* Gottingen: Vanderhoeck and Ruprecht. 1984.

31. Whitfield, Guy K. *The Restored Relation. The Supplication Theme in the Iliad*. Diss. Columbia, 1967.

32. Whitman, Cedric Hubbell. *Homer and the Homeric Tradition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

33. Wilson, Donna Faye. *The Politics of Compensation in the Homeric* Iliad. Diss. University of Texas at Austin, 1997.

34. Zanker, Graham. “Beyond Reciprocity: The Akhilleus—Priam Scene in *Iliad* 24.” *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*. Ed. Christopher Gill. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

VITA

Miriam Tworek-Hofstetter was born in Columbus, Nebraska on February 18, 1983, the daughter of Mary Tworek-Hofstetter and Virgil Tworek-Hofstetter. After completing her work at Scotus Central Catholic, Columbus, Nebraska, in 2001, she began class at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities, Minneapolis, Saint Paul, Minnesota. She received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from the University of Minnesota Twin Cities in May, 2006. In the intervening years she was employed as a daycare teacher at the Veteran's Affairs' Medical Center and Neighborhood Childcare in Minneapolis, Minnesota. In August, 2007, she entered the Graduate School at the University of Texas at Austin.

Permanent Address: 801 East 45th Street
Austin, Texas 78751

This report was typed by the author.