

Canine Connections

Perceptions of Dogs and Dog Symbolism
in Homer and Hesiod

by

Alexander Neuschotz

Advised by Dr Bret Mulligan

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts in the Department of Classics at Haverford College.

May 2023

Acknowledgements

This thesis is a culmination of my entire college career, and as such it would not have been possible without the encouragement and support of everyone involved in my education in the field of Classics, and really everyone who took the time to listen to me drone on about dogs and Homer. I would like to thank Dr. Asya Sigelman for teaching me to love Homer, Dr. Deborah Roberts for her invaluable feedback as a second reader, Dr. Mathew Farmer for his enthusiasm and flexibility as I navigated this year-long project, despite my concussion, and, above all, Dr. Bret Mulligan for his incredible insights, receptiveness, patience, and dedication. This thesis is here because of all of you!

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	1
<i>Dogs in Homeric Narrative</i>	4
<i>Dogs in Blame and Praise</i>	26
<i>The Canine Manifold</i>	40
<i>Conclusion</i>	49
<i>Bibliography</i>	51

Abstract

This thesis traces the discussion of dogs in Homer and Hesiod first from a narrative point of view, including their role in what I call canine-based tonal transitioning, wherein they draw the focus away from any preceding dominant emotion or theme in order to establish a tone that is consistent with episodes to follow; their narrative significance; their capacity for foreshadowing; and their reflective properties. These reflective properties naturally lead into a treatment of dogs in the context of moral judgements, including the role of gender on which aspects of dogs are emphasized in human comparisons, and a consideration of the use of canine traits in insults and compliments. In particular, this thesis considers the consequences of Pandora, the first woman, being said to have a “bitchy” mind. Lastly, this thesis combines the preceding discussions, along with other observations, in the formulation of my Canine Manifold Theory, which develops a holistic picture of dogs in antiquity by tracing patterns between differing but locally-consistent portrayals.

Introduction

Depictions of dogs throughout the Greco-Roman world are remarkably varied, and one would be forgiven for being uncertain as to the supposed status of these creatures that seem to be at once savage and nurturing, fickle and loyal, tireless and lazy, stupid and intelligent. Compare the flesh-rending dogs in the *Iliad* to the nurturing *lupa* of Rome's founders; or loyal Argos to "bitch-faced" Helen. Through their associations with war and Hades, dogs often connote death and destruction, even as they play a non-trivial role in ancient medicine through supposed healing properties. At other times, the depictions seem to complement one another: could Helen's self-ascribed epithet be interpreted alongside the Iliadic proem to form an image of dogs as savage, untrustworthy beasts? More broadly, is there a means by which a cohesive depiction of dogs might be attained through some form of synthesis? A full and proper treatment of these questions, to the extent that one is possible, is far beyond the scope of this thesis, but I pose them broadly in the hopes of inspiring further exploration in ancient canine studies, towards which end the work at hand aims to address the role of dogs in the related realms of myth and epic, as presented through the works of Homer and Hesiod. It is my hope that the resulting methodology, namely the consideration of hyperspheres, which are formal objects from Topology, specifically Manifold Theory, might be applied not only towards answering the question of how canines fit into the greater Greco-Roman culture, but also in animal studies more broadly in the ancient world.

When I first set out to write this thesis, I was driven primarily by the question of how the ancient Greeks experienced and thought about dogs. What images would the idea of a dog have evoked to an ancient Greek individual and in what capacity did these evocations influence or otherwise engage with the human experience? These questions may of course be posed about

animals more broadly, but the peculiar placement of dogs as occupying a kind of liminal space between domestication and wildness in the ancient world makes them a particularly intriguing subject of study. While still a ways off from the modern figure of a pet dog, ancient canines were nevertheless depicted as companions not only to mortals such as Odysseus, but also to gods, such as Hades. Yet, despite often occupying a human-adjacent role, dogs routinely fell short of unequivocal human companionship. As Kenneth F. Kitchell Jr. comments “The dog of early Greece might in fact share its master’s table, but it was never forgotten that the wild nature of the dog lay just beneath the surface and could emerge in short order.”¹ As a result, the dog is simultaneously savage and worthy of both mortal and divine companionship.

Our exploration here is therefore concerned with how the semi-domesticated state of dogs allows us to consider the natures of humans and dogs in relation to one another. This question of exploring human nature through animals, and vice versa, is an influential component of modern day animal studies, as exemplified by Boria Sax’ article, “Animals in Folklore”, in which he explores the ways that the representation of animals in folklore provides a framework in which to consider human-animal relations outside of an anthropocentric status quo.² For a related classical perspective, we turn to Chiara Thumiger’s article, “Animals in Tragedy”, in which she discusses the tendency to represent destructive human traits in tragedy through animals, which idea might naturally be expected to extend to the related genre of epic, as we see exemplified by the dogs in the Iliadic proem.³

Indeed, dogs in particular are ideal subjects of study in Homer primarily because of their prevalence in the *Odyssey*, including Argos, Eumaeus’ dogs, Telemachus’ dogs, and Alcinous’

¹ Kitchell Jr. 2004, p. 179. Compare this with the familiarity between dogs and humans today, especially in America, wherein pet dogs can be found essentially anywhere.

² Sax, 2014.

³ Thumiger, 2014.

dogs, all of whom have crucial effects on the narrative and, as we shall explore, significant relationships with their masters. Influenced in part by Laura Hawtree's article "Animals in Epic", the first two sections of this thesis explore the idea of understanding humans and dogs in relation to one another, specifically from the perspective of epic.⁴ Then, in the final section, it considers the ways in which this method of understanding dogs through relationships can extend to considerations of their roles within the Greco-Roman world more broadly.

First, we discuss the particular effect that dogs have on Homeric narrative by analyzing the structure and impact of canine episodes in the *Odyssey*, including the encounter between Odysseus' men and Circe's wolves and lions, the appearance of Alcinous' silver and golden dogs, the attack of Eumaeus' guard-dogs, and, of course, the Argos episode. This order of treatment follows the epic chronologically rather than the order in which these episodes are presented, with the express purpose of highlighting the Circe episode as the strongest instance of a process we will come to know as canine-based tonal transitioning. Altogether, these moments exemplify a particular reflective property of dogs, whereby they take on attributes of people, deities, and monsters around them, which reflective property further motivates us to analyze dogs through their relationships with their masters and environments. This, as I argue, in turn gives rise in canine interpretation to dual notions of the Internal and the External Dog, which shape, mold, and reflect the personalities and actions of individuals, and ultimately make it possible for us to explore the extensive range of connotations of dogs to the ancient Greek mind with a little inspiration from basic Manifold Theory.

⁴ Hawtree, 2014.

Dogs in Homeric Narrative

Dogs appear in many roles in Homer: they are fierce protectors, aggressive attackers, filthy beasts, divine symbols, and loyal companions. They simultaneously shape and reflect the world around them, and in particular, they have a profound effect on Homeric narrative. As this section aims to argue, scenes of dogs and dog symbolism in the *Odyssey* make use of traditional narrative devices, such as Homeric expansion and similes, to lean into a nostalgic or tragic past, skillfully guiding the focus of the audience away from the narrative progression and thereby locking them in an emotional prison from which the sudden emergence of dogs rescues them and paves the way for further progression. Through this narrative pattern, dog scenes establish a tonal shift from any preceding dominant emotion or theme to a forward-looking tone that is consistent with episodes to follow. The narrative pattern we now identify is fundamentally concerned with juxtaposing what was, here identified as a tonal past, with what is to come, an emerging tonal present. Per Alfred Heubeck in the second volume of the Oxford commentary on the *Odyssey*, such temporal comparisons are integral to moments of narrative transitions. As he observes, There are innumerable connective devices of various kinds between the individual scenes [of the *Odyssey*]: we have references forward in the form of warnings, premonitions, and advance announcements, and references to earlier events by way of reminiscence and reflection; there are correspondences and parallels, and likely contrasts; there are links between pairs of episodes and unifying themes which serve as guidelines; and so on.⁵

As I aim to demonstrate, dogs play a particularly prominent role in the implementation of these transitioning devices in dog-based episodes of the *Odyssey*. Perhaps the best example of this phenomenon occurs in the lines leading up to the Circe episode in *Odyssey* Book 10:

καὶ τότε ἔγων ἀγορὴν θέμενος μετὰ πᾶσιν ἔειπον:
 ‘κέκλυτέ μεν μύθων, κακὰ περ πάσχοντες ἑταῖροι:
 ὦ φίλοι, οὐ γάρ τ’ ἴδμεν, ὅπη ζόφος οὐδ’ ὅπη ἠώς,
 οὐδ’ ὅπη ἠέλιος φαεσίμβροτος εἶς’ ὑπὸ γαῖαν,

⁵ Heubeck, 1989, p. 10.

οὐδ' ὄπη ἀννεῖται: ἀλλὰ φραζώμεθα θᾶσσον
 εἴ τις ἔτ' ἔσται μῆτις. ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ οἴομαι εἶναι.
 εἶδον γὰρ σκοπιῆν ἐς παιπαλόεσσαν ἀνελθῶν
 νῆσον, τὴν πέρι πόντος ἀπείριτος ἐστεφάνωται:
 αὐτὴ δὲ χθαμαλὴ κεῖται: καπνὸν δ' ἐνὶ μέσση
 ἔδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι διὰ δρυμὰ πυκνὰ καὶ ὕλην.
 ὡς ἐφάμην, τοῖσιν δὲ κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ
 μνησαμένοις ἔργων Λαιστρυγόνος Ἀντιφάταο
 Κύκλωπός τε βίης μεγαλήτορος, ἀνδροφάγοιο.
 κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντες:
 ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ τις πρῆξις ἐγίγνετο μυρομένοισιν.
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ δίχα πάντας ἐυκνήμιδας ἑταίρους
 ἠρίθμεον, ἀρχὸν δὲ μετ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ὄπασσα:
 τῶν μὲν ἐγὼν ἦρχον, τῶν δ' Εὐρύλοχος θεοειδής.
 κλήρους δ' ἐν κυνέῃ χαλκήρεϊ πάλλομεν ὄκα:
 ἐκ δ' ἔθορε κλήρος μεγαλήτορος Εὐρύλόχοιο.
 βῆ δ' ἰέναι, ἅμα τῷ γε δὺω καὶ εἴκοσ' ἑταῖροι
 κλαίοντες: κατὰ δ' ἅμμε λίπον γοόοντας ὀπισθεν.
 εὖρον δ' ἐν βήσσησι τετυγμένα δώματα Κίρκης
 ξεστοῖσιν λάεσσι, περισκέπτῳ ἐνὶ χώρῳ:
**ἀμφὶ δέ μιν λύκοι ἦσαν ὀρέστεροι ἢ δὲ λέοντες,
 τοὺς αὐτὴ κατέθελξεν, ἐπεὶ κακὰ φάρμακ' ἔδωκεν.
 οὐδ' οἳ γ' ὠρμήθησαν ἐπ' ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλ' ἄρα τοί γε
 οὐρῆσιν μακρῆσι περισσαίνοντες ἀνέστην.
 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἀμφὶ ἀνακτα κύνες δαίτηθεν ἰόντα
 σαίνωσ', αἰεὶ γάρ τε φέρει μειλίγματα θυμοῦ,
 ὧς τοὺς ἀμφὶ λύκοι κρατερόνυχες ἢ δὲ λέοντες
 σαῖνον: τοὶ δ' ἔδεισαν, ἐπεὶ ἶδον αἰνὰ πέλωρα.**

And gathering the crowd all together, I said:

“Hear my words, evil-suffering companions:

190 Friends, we know not where darkness is, nor dawn,
 nor where the light-bringing sun sets below the earth,
 nor where it rises: but, quick, let us consider
 if we can figure something out. I don't think we can.

195 For ascending a mountainous lookout, I saw
 an island, encircled by the boundless sea:
 and it itself is flat, and in the middle with my eyes
 I saw smoke through dense thickets and woods.”

Thus was I saying, and the dear heart of my companions
 broke, remembering the deeds of Antiphates
 200 and the great-hearted mighty man-eating Cyclops.
 And they were weeping loudly, shedding tears,
 but the blubbing did nothing for us.

And I split up my well-greaved companions
 into two groups, assigning a leader to each,

205 I the leader of one, godlike Eurylochus of the other.
 And straightaway we mixed lots in a bronze helmet,
 and when the lot of great-hearted Eurylochus sprung,
 he went to go, together with two and twenty
 weeping companions, and he left us behind in grief.
 210 And he saw in the glen Circe's home, furnished
 with shaved stones, visible from every direction.
**And there were both mountainous wolves and lions,
 whom she tamed with spells by means of drugs.
 Nor did they rush at the men, but indeed, behold:
 they jumped up, wagging their tails.**
 215 **And thus, just as dogs on their master after a feast
 might fawn, for he always bears them food,
 so too did the wolves and strong-clawed lions fawn.
 And they feared when they saw the terrible beasts.**⁶

There is little room for tonal subtlety here; Odysseus and his men have lost nearly all of their companions and are down to only one ship. A strong emphasis on this narrative nadir is felt in the successive repetition of plaintive vocabulary,⁷ and the audience itself is pulled into the display of mourning both by the recollection of the dual ordeals of Polyphemus and the Laestrygonians, and by the general theme of uncertainty in the face of seemingly insurmountable loss. In refocusing past traumas through flashbacks, Homer slows down time nearly to a halt and establishes the series of unfortunate events as central to the festering sense of doom and defeat, while simultaneously creating a space for the audience to recall the preceding episodes and thereby form an empathetic connection with the narrative figures.⁸ In particular, Odysseus' admission of lost confidence stands in stark contrast to his typical wily nature; even πολύτροπος ("resourceful") Odysseus has little faith in the possibility of escape and resigns himself to the

⁶ Homer, *Odyssey* 10.188–219. The text is taken from Perseus; the translation is my own.

⁷ κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ ("their dear heart sank"), κλαῖον ("they were weeping"), δάκρυ χέοντες ("shedding tears"), μυρομένοισιν ("blubbing"), κλαίοντες ("weeping"), γοόωντας ("bemoaning").

⁸ This effect would be further strengthened by the oral nature of epic, wherein emotion and recollection would be stimulated through aural expression.

only remaining option: sending scouts to investigate the smoke.⁹ Forlorn emotions are expanded in the description of the grieving companions that Eurylochus and his men leave behind, themselves perpetuating a general sense of melancholy with heavy weeping all the way up until the introduction of fawning “dogs”, whereafter dolefulness is exchanged for magic and the narrative is at last allowed to progress beyond the stagnancy of loss and despair.¹⁰

Key to the efficacy of this transition is the shock of the supernatural: the presentation of wild beasts fawning like dogs, emphasized by the mention of spells and drugs immediately before, is inherently unsettling and eerie, and the evocation of fear conjured by a sense of impending danger provides a necessary distraction from preceding disasters, both for Eurylochus and his men, and for the Homeric audience, thereby opening up the narrative for a shift in focus from the dangers of the past to the new, magical danger that awaits them.¹¹ Emphasis lies in the spectacle of the event, and the effect is not dissimilar to that produced by anecdotes in Herodotus or the elder Pliny concerning extraordinary animal behavior that surpasses or even opposes their natures.¹²

⁹ Heubeck and Hoekstra argue (p. 54) that Odysseus’ claim of being perplexed is pretense. Even if this is the case, the fact remains that Odysseus has only one option moving forward and is nevertheless forced to send his men, or else go himself, to the mysterious island before them.

¹⁰ It should be noted that this transition in tone is not permanently adopted, instead being interrupted throughout *Odyssey* 10.244–10.275 as Eurylochus crawls back to Odysseus, blubbing and barely able to speak, in order to relate the misfortunes of his companions, and Odysseus takes it upon himself to confront Circe directly. This interruption should not, however, be taken to devalue the impact of the transition facilitated by the wolves and lions since it is fundamentally necessary to the plot in order for Odysseus to come face-to-face with Circe in the first place, and because the tone of magic and suspense here established will be central to the epic only 32 lines later. In this way, the “dogs” succeed in breaking the barrier between tones in preparation for Odysseus’ imminent sojourn with Circe, and the effect of tonal transitioning is still achieved.

¹¹ The depiction of fawning dogs may conjure up a modern-day image of a pet demanding a treat or greeting their human upon arrival, and we see evidence to support similar ancient occurrences, not only through extrapolation from this particular Homeric simile, but also through Attic artwork. See Figure 1.10 on page 16 of Oakley (2020) for the image of an Athenian vase depicting a noblewoman bending down to give a treat to an upright dog, snout up and front legs excitedly out.

¹² Perhaps the best example of this in Herodotus is his description of the Indian gold-bearing ants in *The Histories* 3.102–105, which are said to be in size between dogs and foxes and swift enough to outrun male camels. More shocking, in his *Natural History* 8.40, Pliny the Elder describes hippos bleeding themselves with reeds upon eating too much, citing this as evidence that they somehow hold medical knowledge.

William Beck, in his article “Dogs, Dwellings, and Masters: Ensemble and Symbol in the *Odyssey*”, was the first to suggest that the role of dogs in the *Odyssey* can be best understood by recognizing that they are intimately tied to the characters and fates of their masters. For Beck, therefore, these wolves and lions are associated with Circe, even as Argos is to Odysseus and the swineherding dogs are to Eumaeus. There is a great deal of value in these associations, and the ideas that arise from their consideration can be extended, as I aim to show, towards a partial explication of the complex role of dogs in Homer. If we accept Beck’s reasoning that dogs are able to take on attributes of their master’s home and personality, then, in recognition of the role that descriptions of environments, including homes, play in the establishment of the narrative tone of a given episode, it seems reasonable to expect dogs to have an impact in some manner or another on the narrative structure of the epic itself through their masters.¹³ In this way, we view Beck’s work as a launching pad for an examination of the role that dogs play in Homeric narrative, beginning with perhaps the most pronounced instance, involving the “dogs” in the Circe episode.

Beck’s method of analyzing Circe’s wolves and lions through their connection to their master is well-founded: we see in Circe the same dichotomy of affection and ferocity that we do in the wolves and lions: her nature is to attack first, as she demonstrates by instantly transfiguring Eurylochus’ men, while maintaining an aura of deception with a friendly invitation.¹⁴ We later see her fawn over Odysseus much the same as the dogs in the simile, but always from a position of power, with the potential of attack contributing a continuous sense of suspense to the narrative.¹⁵

¹³ For instance, as we shall discuss later, the description of Alcinous’ home establishes a regal tone to which Alcinous’ golden “dogs” contribute.

¹⁴ Homer *Odyssey* 10.229–243.

¹⁵ Circe’s obsession begins in *Odyssey* 10.325–335 when she discovers that Odysseus is immune to her potion. Odysseus’ immunity, however, should not be taken as a sign that Circe is unable to harm Odysseus altogether, since transformation is not the only means by which magic may be used to harm someone. Furthermore, she may still harm him indirectly through his companions, and Odysseus himself remains cautious against the possibility of a direct attack, making her swear to do him no harm in *Odyssey* 10.336–344.

Moreover, given that the tameness of the animals is entirely in Circe's control, the danger that she presents is not merely analogous to that posed by the beasts, but is in fact one and the same, so that she herself can be seen in the wolves and lions as a predator manipulating her prey with a false sense of security that can be ripped away at any moment.¹⁶

The four-part narratological structure of the Circe episode illustrates what we will call canine-based tonal transitioning. First, in *Odyssey* 10.188–200, the protagonists come to a crux in the plot and a dominant theme—in this case despondency over recent losses and ensuing hopelessness—is brought to the forefront of the audience's mind by narrative devices, primarily Homeric expansion, to the point where all else is momentarily cast away and forgotten.¹⁷ Next, in *Odyssey* 10.201–209, Odysseus initiates the second component, an attempt to shake off the preceding tone by trudging forward into unknown horizons, upon which, per the third component, the protagonists encounter a canine surprise, in this case the supernaturalness of Circe's domain that comes to a head in *Odyssey* 10.210–219 with the startling image of domesticated beasts. Finally, in the fourth component, the protagonists continue on their adventure, leaving behind the tone of the past, in this case misery and mourning, and entering new narratological terrain, which is here the magical domain of Circe, replete with the continued suspense of raw magical power. Essentially, the sudden appearance of the dogs, combined with their innate aptitude for absorbing and reflecting the state of both their masters and the tone around them, provides a medium for ending and replacing the previously dominant tone,

¹⁶ As Beck observes, “Enchanted, pleasant yet dangerous, these ‘dogs’ reflect their magical mistress and give witness of her powers while foreshadowing the transformation into swine which Circe will work on the companions in her house.” (p. 16).

¹⁷ In chapter 7 of *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*, “Type Scenes and Expansion”, Mark W. Edwards presents expansion as the Homeric practice of “dwell[ing] on a scene...for the purpose of emphasis”. It is, in practice, a means of highlighting significant features of a text and thereby of drawing the audience's attention to desired foci. Here, the duration and intensity of lamentation has the effect of sucking the audience in to the all-consuming sense of mourning and melancholy, which only augments the sense of relief when the miserable tone comes to an end.

especially with the aid of the Homeric simile, which focuses the audience's attention on the dogs in much the same way that Homeric expansion drew our attention into past tragedies. In this sense, the beasts redirect the narrative, so to speak, and in the final component establish a distinct narrative tone for the episodes to follow, a sense of magical dread, transformation, and suspense, based in their connection to Circe. We might summarize these steps as such: (I) a pull into a tonal past; (II) a journey into an unknown future; (III) a startling canine-based event that severs inertial ties to this tonal past; and (IV) the establishment of a tonal future through reflective canine properties. This method of narrative refocusing explicitly places dogs at the center of tonal and narrative transition, and consequently urges us to explore what makes dogs in particular optimal for this structure. In order to answer this question, we need to better understand the placement of this pattern in the broader context of Homeric narratology.

Much of the impact of canine-based tonal transitioning both here and elsewhere, I argue, comes from the simultaneous evocation and augmentation of two Homeric type-scenes: the arrival type-scene and the guard-dog type-scene. Summarizing Walter Arend's breakdown of the arrival type-scene from his paper "Die typischen Szenen bei Homer", Edwards partitions it into five steps:

"A person sets off (I); he arrives at his destination (II); he find the person he seeks, sitting, standing or occupied in some way (III); often the bystanders are also mentioned (IIIa); the visitor stands beside the person sought...(IV) and speaks (V)."¹⁸

Recall that arrival type-scenes can at times be extended into visit type-scenes, wherein the arriver, here called the visitor, situates himself near the doorway and is, in order, seen, greeted, welcomed, led in, seated, offered hospitality, and invited to conversation. Comparing this blueprint to the structure of the Circe scene, we see remarkable consistency. Eurylochus arrives

¹⁸ Edwards, 1975, p. 62.

at the threshold of Circe's home (*Odyssey* 10.210–211), he and his companions are seen and greeted by Circe through her “dogs” (*Odyssey* 10.211–219), and his companions are welcomed and led in by Circe herself (*Odyssey* 10.230–232), whereupon she offers a twisted form of hospitality by drugging and transforming them (*Odyssey* 10.233–245). The skeleton of the visit type-scene is undoubtedly present, and all major checkpoints are achieved, but each with their own twist that plays into a building tension between what should be and what is. While Circe's “dogs” can, and should, be viewed as extensions of herself, it is perverse that her “dogs”, and not herself, are present for the initial introduction and greeting. Furthermore, the subsequent hospitality that Circe demonstrates bears a remarkable similarity to the standard practices of hosts offering an abundance of food without pressure of conversation, and if it weren't for the interwoven narrative of her deception and the consequent transformation of Eurylochus' men, we would almost be tricked into ranking this among the visit scenes. In actuality, this episode is best considered an imposter of the visit type-scene, which creates an intentional confusion of audience expectations: the events are close enough to the visit type-scene for the audience to recognize the general narrative structure, but just different enough that they are disconcerted. We even see this confusion of expectations present in the reactions of Eurylochus and his men, who, certainly expecting a reception of some sort, are startled and thrown off by the sudden presence of excited beasts, but who nevertheless, with the exception of Eurylochus, put aside their fear and confusion in accepting Circe's invitation.

We also see in the Circe episode an inversion of the guard-dog type-scene, wherein typically, the protagonist arrives at a location, is met by hostile, barking dogs, confronts these dogs, often by trickery, and continues on his journey.¹⁹ In this case, the sudden onrush of dogs

¹⁹ For the clearest example of the guard-dog type-scene, also called the watch-dog type-scene by Edwards, consider the attack of Eumaeus' dogs upon Odysseus' return to Ithaca in *Odyssey* 14.5–34. Per Edwards (1987), we may also

upon arrival is not a sign of hostility, but of affection, and what was a central element of the guard-dog type-scene, the attack of protective dogs, has instead become an integral aspect of the visit type-scene, the welcoming by friendly dogs, further contributing to a sense of confusion both for the audience and for the protagonists. All at once, this episode seems and fails to be an example of both a visit type-scene and a guard-dog type-scene, somehow resulting in a combination of the two that is ultimately neither. It is through these rising tensions, namely that between what the audience expects from the type-scenes being approximated and what actually occurs, and that between the visit type-scene and the guard-dog type-scene, that the audience's focus is captured and rendered susceptible to tonal transitioning. Naturally, we find Circe's "dogs" at the center of everything, exactly because of the essential role that they play in evoking both type-scenes.

Looking ahead in the chronological order of events, we find a fundamental example of canine-based tonal transitioning in *Odyssey* 7.73–95, leading up to and including the appearance of Alcinous' golden dogs, which helps us contextualize why the guard-dog and visit type-scenes in particular are essential. Like Circe's "dogs", these golden canines, with a divine connection to their maker Hephaestus and a regal connection to their master Alcinous, are not as they appear. Despite playing the role of guard-dogs, these statues are in fact not even sentient, wherein we see a fundamental alteration to the guard-dog type-scene, just as with the wolves and lions in the Circe episode. Indeed, the elements of a guard-dog scene are present, namely the arrival, the extravagant scene-setting, and the appearance of dogs, but no defenders immediately lunge forth at Odysseus with an intent to kill; instead, we are met with the more silent, intimidating threat of divine and regal power concentrated in effigies of our expectations. At the same time, it is

consider the appearance of Alcinous' dog statues in *Odyssey* 7.91–94 as an instance of the watch-dog type-scene. We will momentarily explore both of these episodes in the context of canine-based tonal transitioning.

impossible to ignore the symbolism of these dogs lying directly at the threshold between ruin and salvation for Odysseus just as he has lost everything and is about to plea for help from the Phaeacians.

One noticeable difference between this and the Circe episode in terms of the execution of canine-based tonal transitioning lies in the fact that emphasis here is placed on the tone being established, namely a return to nobility for Odysseus, rather than the tone of desolation and misfortune being torn down, whereas in the Circe episode, emphasis shifted more gradually from a tone of misery to one of magical suspense. Nevertheless, the effect of exchanging one tone for another through the appearance of dogs remains fixed and justifies the consideration of these events as both being instances of canine-based tonal transitioning.

Throughout *Odyssey* 7.46–77, Athena’s description to Odysseus of the divine descension of Alcinous and his home is indicative of a return to order and the kinds of noble introductions that were part of Odysseus’ old life back on Ithaca. In this way, such a simple literary device as establishing Alcinous’ bloodline is itself a call to a noble past and a hint at what Odysseus might get back if he obeys Athena’s instructions to go inside and seek aid for his predicament:

οὐ μὲν γάρ τι νόου γε καὶ αὐτὴ δέυεται ἐσθλοῦ:
 ἦσι τ’ ἐὺ φρονέησι καὶ ἀνδράσι νείκεα λύει.
 75εἰ κέν τοι κείνη γε φίλα φρονέησ’ ἐνὶ θυμῷ,
 ἐλπώρῃ τοι ἔπειτα φίλους τ’ ἰδέειν καὶ ἰκέσθαι
 οἶκον ἐς ὑψόροφον καὶ σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.

For indeed, [Arete] herself has no lack of a good understanding, and she relieves strife for women she likes, and also their husbands. If she is a friend, considering you well in her heart, then there is hope for you to see your loved ones and return to your high-roofed home and your fatherland.²⁰

²⁰ Homer, *Odyssey* 7.73–77; the translation is my own.

In this prodding, we see a merging of the first and second parts of canine-based tonal transitioning, wherein we are reminded of Odysseus' state of loss even as he steps forth into an unknown location and the narrative progresses towards a tone of regality and salvation. The sense of approaching nobility suggested by the recollection of Alcinous' genealogy and immediate family emphasizes a stark contrast between the status Odysseus used to have and his present misfortune, having lost his ship and all of his companions, which contrast is only further stressed by his beggar guise. In this way, the transition from a tone of loss to one of salvation is not suddenly evoked by the presence of dogs as it was previously, but is carried out through a gradual progression, beginning with a reinitiation to court life for both Odysseus and the audience and expanded upon throughout Odysseus' reception and subsequent narration of his adventures, so that in processing all of the misery that has befallen him, he is able to cast it aside in favor of a more hopeful future. As this initiation marks a metaphorical crossing over the narrative threshold between abject ruin and a return home, it is fitting that the moment is marked by a physical crossing over the threshold of Alcinous' home, where Odysseus is met by the immobile guard-dogs. Therein lies the role of these dogs: to guard the narrative threshold even as they mark and defend a physical threshold, and in the process, to transmute the narrative tone by reflecting the nature of their master and what is to come on the other side.

Throughout this process, the divinity and regality of Alcinous' dogs ensures the establishment of a divine and regal tone, just as the nature of the "dogs" in the Circe episode matched the magical tone being established. As Edwards writes:

When Odysseus stands admiring Alcinous's palace in Phaeacia, it would be unfitting for him to be accosted by watchdogs in such a luxurious and peaceful setting, but in front of the golden doors and silver pillars and lintel he observes the gold and silver immortal watchdogs made by Hephaestus, affirming the opulence of the king and his friendship with the gods (*Odyssey* 7.91–

94; presumably these are not thought of as statues, but as thinking and moving “cynoids,” similar to Hephaestus’s robot attendants at *Iliad* 18.418–20).²¹

It is exactly this animated quality of the statues that encourages a treatment of them as real dogs and, by extension, marks this as an unconventional instance of the guard-dog type-scene. In particular, once we allow this vision of “cynoids” to fully take place, we see opportunities for interpretation through the same reflective properties pursued by Beck, and in the process, we see a concentration of the influence of Hephaestus and Alcinous present in their forms. More essentially, we see the dogs’ capacity for marking a literal and metaphorical threshold, wherein we find an explanation for the guard-dog motif in canine-based tonal transitioning, namely in that guard-dogs are the physical landmarks of tonal and narratological transitions. This ability to weave together the thematic with physical reality, in turn, can be understood exactly through the above-mentioned reflective nature of dogs. As Beck puts it: “It is clear that here, too, dogs, house, and master belong together: magic dogs, fairy-tale house, and elfin inhabitants.”²²

A few books later, we see the same components of canine-based tonal transitioning leading up to and following the introduction of Eumaeus and his dogs. As expected, we are again met with a fusion of the visit and guard-dog type-scenes. Just as with the Circe episode, the narrative preceding the introduction of Eumaeus and his dogs is fraught with confusion and worry for Odysseus, whose evident discombobulation upon his arrival back home and subsequent indignation at the invasion of the suitors, heavily and continuously emphasized from *Odyssey* 13.185 well into Book 14, bind him to a nomadic past by prohibiting, or rather delaying, a complete and proper homecoming. In particular, the elaborateness of Odysseus’ speech in *Odyssey* 13.200–215, lamenting his arrival at yet another strange destination and rebuking the

²¹ Edwards, 1987, p 76.

²² Beck, 1991, p 161.

failed promises of the Phaeacians, followed by Athena's deception, serve to establish the lingering effects of Odysseus' wanderings as manifest in his status as a stranger in his own land. Odysseus' subsequent transformation into his beggar disguise marks a journey forward, into an unknown future characterized by conflict with the suitors and the hostility they have brought to his home. Just as we saw in the Circe episode when Eurylochus set forth, the narrative here shifts towards a precise description of the landscape, quickly interrupted by dogs:

- 5 τὸν δ' ἄρ' ἐνὶ προδόμῳ εὖρ' ἤμενον, ἔνθα οἱ αὐλή
 ὑψηλὴ δέδμητο, περισκέπτῳ ἐνὶ χώρῳ,
 καλὴ τε μεγάλη τε, περιδρομος: ἦν ῥα συβώτης
 αὐτὸς δεῖμαθ' ὕεσσι ἀποιομένοιο ἄνακτος,
 νόσφιν δεσποίνης καὶ Λαέρταο γέροντος,
 10 ῥυτοῖσιν λάεσσι καὶ ἐθρίγκωσεν ἀχέρδῳ:
 σταυροὺς δ' ἐκτὸς ἔλασσε διαμπερὲς ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα,
 πυκνοὺς καὶ θαμέας, τὸ μέλαν δρυὸς ἀμφικεάσσας:
 ἔντοσθεν δ' αὐλῆς συφεοὺς δυοκαίδεκα ποίει
 πλησίον ἀλλήλων, εὐνάς συσίν: ἐν δὲ ἐκάστῳ
 15 πεντήκοντα σύες χαμαιευνάδες ἐρχατόωντο,
 θήλειαι τοκάδες: τοὶ δ' ἄρσενες ἐκτὸς ἴαυον,
 πολλὸν παυρότεροι: τοὺς γὰρ μινύθεσκον ἔδοντες
 ἀντίθει μνηστῆρες, ἐπεὶ προΐαλλε συβώτης
 αἰεὶ ζατρεφῶν σιάλων τὸν ἄριστον ἀπάντων:
 20 οἱ δὲ τριηκόσιοί τε καὶ ἐξήκοντα πέλοντο.
**πὰρ δὲ κύνες, θήρεσσιν ἐοικότες αἰὲν ἴαυον
 τέσσαρες, οὓς ἔθρεψε συβώτης, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν.
 αὐτὸς δ' ἀμφὶ πόδεσσιν εἰς ἀράρισκε πέδιλα,
 τάμνων δέρμα βόειον ἐϋχροές: οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι**
 25 **ᾤχοντ' ἄλλυδις ἄλλος ἅμ' ἀγρομένοισι σύεσσιν,
 οἱ τρεῖς: τὸν δὲ τέταρτον ἀποπροέηκε πόλινδε
 σὺν ἀγέμεν μνηστῆρσιν ὑπερφιάλοισιν ἀνάγκη,
 ὄφρ' ἱερεύσαντες κρειῶν κορσαίατο θυμόν.
 ἐξαπίνης δ' Ὀδυσῆα ἴδον κύνες ὑλακόμωροι.**
 30 **οἱ μὲν κεκλήγοντες ἐπέδραμον: αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
 ἔξετο κερδοσύνη, σκῆπτρον δὲ οἱ ἔκπεσε χειρός.
 ἔνθα κεν ᾗ πὰρ σταθμῷ ἀεικέλιον πάθεν ἄλγος:
 ἀλλὰ συβώτης ᾗκα ποσὶ κραιπνοῖσι μετασπῶν
 ἔσσυτ' ἀνὰ πρόθυρον, σκυῖτος δὲ οἱ ἔκπεσε χειρός.**

- 5 [Odysseus] found [the swineherd] sitting in the fore-hall, where the court was built high in a place of wide outlook, a great and goodly court with an open space around it,

which the swineherd had himself built for the swine of his master,
 gone, without the knowledge of his mistress and the old man Laertes.
 10 With huge stones had he built it, and set on it a coping of thorn.
 Without he had driven stakes the whole length, this way and that,
 huge stakes, set close together, made by splitting an oak to the black core;
 and within the court he had made twelve sties
 close by one another, as beds for the swine, and in each one
 15 were penned fifty wallowing swine,
 females for breeding; but the boars slept without.
 These were far fewer in number, for on them
 the godlike wooers feasted, and lessened them,
 for the swineherd ever sent in the best of all the fatted hogs,
 20 which numbered three hundred and sixty.
**By these ever slept four dogs, savage like wild beasts,
 which the swineherd had reared, a leader of men.
 But he himself was fitting boots about his feet,
 cutting an ox-hide of good color, while the others**
 25 **had gone, three of them, one here one there, with the droves of swine;
 and the fourth he had sent to the city to drive
 perforce a boar to the insolent wooers,
 that they might slay it and satisfy their souls with meat.**
**Then the baying hounds caught sight of Odysseus,
 30 and rushed upon him with loud barking, but Odysseus
 sat down in his cunning, and the staff fell from his hand.**
 Then even in his own farmstead would he have suffered cruel hurt,
 but the swineherd with swift steps followed after them,
 and hastened through the gateway, and the hide fell from his hand.²³

An immediate comparison with the previous instances of canine-based tonal transitioning
 arises in the presentation of environment. The previously discussed role of dogs as markers of
 both literal and metaphorical thresholds is reflected here by the stakes driven in by Eumaeus to
 separate his courtyard from the outside world,²⁴ just as in the Circe episode there was an
 emphasis on the shaved stones, which distinguished the wilderness from Circe's domain.²⁵ In
 both cases, dogs appear alongside physical demarcations of thresholds and serve to usher the
 protagonist(s), either in a friendly or a hostile manner, into the next stage of their journey.

²³ Homer, *Odyssey* 14.5–34. Translation slightly revised from Murray, 1919.

²⁴ Homer, *Odyssey* 14.11–12.

²⁵ Homer, *Odyssey* 10.210–211.

Furthermore, whereas Circe's domain was a carefully constructed oasis of pseudo-civilization and order amidst a decidedly wild isle, we see in Eumaeus' domain an element of disorder and lost foundation.²⁶ This is perhaps best illustrated by the nature of dog figures in their respective scenes; Circe's beasts are friendly towards Odysseus' men despite an expectation of aggression, whereas the swineherding dogs are vicious towards Odysseus despite an expectation of friendliness towards the rightful ruler of their land.²⁷ This contrast between what should be and what is becomes somewhat of a staple in scenes of dogs and dog symbolism in the *Odyssey*, as in the aforementioned recurrence of imposter guard-dog scenes. In the courts, too, we see disorder where there should be order, and the dogs prove themselves to be enmeshed in the chaos by herding pigs to the invading suitors, thereby feeding the enemy even as they attack Odysseus. By this association, even unknowingly, the dogs are contributing to a sense of flipped allegiances, whereby Odysseus has become an alien presence opposite the welcome suitors, and by extension, the dogs serve as Odysseus' first tangible indication of the disease that has overcome his home and kingdom.

Whereas Circe's beasts established through canine-based tonal transitioning a tone of magic and suspense, Eumaeus' dogs here establish a tone of internal threats towards Odysseus and his home. The description of Eumaeus' court in *Odyssey* 14.5–7 bears with it echoes of regality, and its lofty position overlooking much of Odysseus' kingdom is evocative of the status that Odysseus' own court once held, so that there seems to be a transposition between the description provided of Eumaeus' court and an expected description of Odysseus' court had the suitors not interrupted the proper order of things. This brings us to a diversion in *Odyssey* 14.9,

²⁶ Such a sense of lost foundation will later be further exemplified, even in Odysseus' own courtyard, by the depiction of a haggard and dying Argos.

²⁷ The fact that the dogs are unaware of Odysseus' true identity does not preclude the irony of the situation.

wherein we are reminded of Odysseus' long absence, which draws us to Eumaeus' reality: as far as the swineherd is concerned, Odysseus is still far off and will likely never return. We continue to follow Eumaeus throughout *Odyssey* 14.10–16, flowing through time from the construction of his domain to the established system of pig-keeping, which lulls us into a world in which things are as they should be, before reintroducing the suitors in *Odyssey* 14.17–28 as disruptors to this system, eating away at the herd with blatant disregard for resources. Immediately after the suitors have been invoked as the problematic element in Odysseus' journey, the dogs attack, and a disconcerted Odysseus is met with his first trial in reclaiming his home and identifying himself with his homeland once more. In this way, the description of the environment which is typical of arrival type-scenes is used to deliberately capture the audience's attention, trapping it in the past in order to maximize the effectiveness of the canine surprise and a contrasted future.²⁸

As with Circe's beasts, suddenness is central to the impact of this scene, pulling Odysseus into the present moment and concentrating the focus of the narrative on one point wherein a tonal transition is achieved through the planting of thematic seeds that echo throughout episodes to come. As Gilbert Rose observes in his article, "Odysseus' Barking Heart", Odysseus' method of sitting in response to the dogs' attack is evocative of his later manipulation of the suitors, and his general tactic of enduring their slings and arrows until the right moment.²⁹ Such a realization lends retrospective credence to viewing this act of sitting as the first instance of Odysseus' patient defiance, and thereby identifying the instant of attack as a tonal and narrative shift to Odysseus' psychological games to come. It also seemingly associates the dogs with the suitors, just as the wolves and lions were associated with Circe. Later on, however, we see those

²⁸ The fact that these dogs are unaware of who Odysseus really is does not alter their role as an obstacle in Odysseus' reclamation of his home, and in this way, well-intentioned or not, the guard dogs play a role akin to that of the suitors.

²⁹ Rose, 1979, p. 219.

same dogs happily greet Telemachus, whom the suitors want to murder, and their connection to Eumaeus is highly antithetical to an absolute association with the suitors. Resolution comes when we accept the fact that dogs, like any narrative tool, are not limited to just one function, but in fact have the capacity for fluid representation. That is, there is nothing forbidding a dog from being associated with different individuals at different times, and so we have no reason to expect the mortal-canine associations that Beck discusses to be fixed.

Beck's ideas can further be extended in the recognition of a canine capacity for connection not just with mortals and gods, but with the narrative itself. Scholars recognize two key ways in which dogs, and animals more broadly, engage with and effect narratives in epic: the Homeric simile and prophetic foreshadowing. Edwards discusses the ways that similes can become so interwoven with the narrative that they cannot be extracted.³⁰ Even when similes are not interwoven to such an extent, similes still holds the capacity to fundamentally influence the audience's perception of a scene, as in the simile of fawning dogs in the Circe episode, which evokes in the audience familiar associations with domesticated dogs in contrast with the expected savageness of wolves and lions. Animal imagery is also able to affect the audience's perception of scenes yet to come, with animals scenes often having prophetic qualities.³¹ In particular, I argue that the swineherd dogs' attack is indicative of the suitor's aggression.

Odysseus at this point simultaneously is and is not home; for one thing, the necessity of disguising himself bars a proper reunion with his family and kingdom in a very practical sense, but it also serves as a literary tool to emphasize the ways in which he is seen as an outsider in his own kingdom and home, invaded by suitors and unfaithful servants. He is externally unrecognizable to the dogs in a literal sense by virtue of Athena's disguise, but two decades

³⁰ Edwards, 1987, 107-108.

³¹ Thumiger (2014) explores this prophetic feature of animal behavior, both in epic and tragedy.

away has also distanced his connection to the land in a deeper sense. As Rose puts it, "...[H]e cannot even recognize Ithaca; he is a stranger in his own homeland".³² It is with this in mind that we should interpret the recognition, or lack thereof, of Odysseus as a stranger that sets Eumaeus' dogs on him in defense of swine and home. Just as we can interpret the tone established by this episode as one of Odysseus reclaiming his homeland from the suitors, we can also view it as one of him reclaiming his *connection* to his home.

Unlike what we find in the Circe episode, there can be no doubt that this is an example of a true guard-dog type-scene; rather than greeting Odysseus like Circe's "dogs" or merely standing still like Alcinous' statues, Eumaeus' dogs charge and guard their home. Intriguingly, however, this is not *only* a guard-dog scene, as it contains essential elements from the visit type-scene, beginning with Odysseus' arrival, complete with an extensive description of the courtyard and its history, and continuing when Eumaeus calls off his dogs and transitions to the role of host. In this way, Eumaeus and his dogs serve as a bridge between type-scenes. Through this mixing of arrival/visitation and hostilities, we see reflected the reality of Odysseus' situation, wherein he is in the process of determining who is an ally and who is a foe. This suspense, established and made palpable by the contrast between the dogs' attack and Eumaeus' greeting remains crucial to the established tone for the rest of the epic.

By comparing the Circe episode and the Eumaeus episode, we start to see other variations in the implementation of canine-based tonal transitioning as well. While the four essential components remain the same, the number of lines allotted to each part, as well as when and how certain narrative devices are applied, are dependent on individual episodes. In both presentations, the first part is the longest, covering Odysseus' speech and the resulting lot leading up to the

³² Rose, 1979, p. 217.

Circe episode, and the entire interaction between Odysseus and Athena in *Odyssey* 13 leading up to the Eumaeus episode. After the second part, namely the journey into the unknown, we get a description of the landscape, which can be relatively succinct, as in *Odyssey* 10.210–211, or lengthy and detailed as in *Odyssey* 14.5–28. In the third part, the greeting of Circe’s beasts is described in the form of a simile in order to emphasize the peculiarity of the situation, whereas the attack of Eumaeus’ dogs is not inherently peculiar and therefore requires no such simile. Lastly, the way that type-scenes factor into the narrative effect of canine-based tonal transitioning is evidently dependent on a particular episode, as the implementation of the guard-dog type-scene is proper in the case of Eumaeus’ dogs, and twisted in the case of Circe’s “dogs”, whereas both episodes clearly represent the visit type-scene. Despite their differences, however, the order of presentation remains fixed: a pull to a tonal past (I); a journey into an unknown future (II); a survey of the landscape (II.a), which may include, in order, a description of people present (II.a.i), a description of buildings and structures (including, potentially, historic details) (II.a.ii), and a description of animals present (II.a.iii); the sudden approach or appearance of dogs, or dog-like figures (III), which may take the form of a simile (III.a), wherein the dogs may appear friendly (III.a.i), threatening (III.a.ii), or downright hostile (III.a.iii), but which might be expected to have contrasting natures (III.b); and a continuation of the narrative with a changed tone (IV), which may include a proper conclusion to a visit type-scene (IV.a) or an approximation of a visit type-scene (IV.b).

Together, the dog statues, Circe’s beasts, and Eumaeus’ dogs form a tonal triad. These episodes all take place in large, open areas, such as courtyards and gardens, follow the same pattern of tonal transitioning, and gradually heighten a feeling of danger across episodes.³³ When

³³ That is, if one accepts Circe’s island as a garden of sorts. These open areas intentionally coincide with physical thresholds, marked in part by the present of guard-dogs.

Odysseus encounters the statues, they are more a symbol of impending salvation than they are a threat. On the other hand, Circe's wolves and lions, tame as they may act, are fundamentally untrustworthy and their presentation as hosts is ultimately no more genuine than that of Circe, with Eurylochus' men manifesting the sense of unease in their own hesitations. By the time Odysseus arrives home, the threat is no longer veiled or subtle, and the swineherding dogs conclude the sequence of canine hostility with a direct attack. This type of progression of animal similes was first noted by William C. Scott in his book *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile*, wherein he tracks the lion similes in the *Odyssey* as mirroring Odysseus' transition from a "weather-worn lion who yearns for food" in *Odyssey* 6.130–135, to a "blood-covered lion" in *Odyssey* 22.401–408 after he takes his revenge on the suitors.³⁴

Outside of this triad lies Argos, a lone and loyal testament to the affability of at least some dogs in Homer, and to the fact that both Odysseus and Telemachus have strong connections to dogs.³⁵ While the strongest canine connection lies in that between Odysseus and Argos, a link to dogs, can also be found in Telemachus,³⁶ as we see beginning in *Odyssey* 2:

βῆ ῥ' ἴμεν εἰς ἀγορήν, παλάμη δ' ἔχε χάλκεον ἔγχος,
οὐκ οἶος, ἅμα τῷ γε δύο κύνες ἀργοῖ³⁷ ἔποντο.

[Telemachus] went to go to the assembly, and he held in his palm a bronze spear, nor was he alone; together with him followed two swift dogs.³⁸

In terms of narrative connections, we see here a canine-based instance of Homeric doubling, wherein the dogs, technically redundant, nevertheless lend emphasis to Telemachus' initial act towards taking control of his present circumstance by confronting the suitors. We also see the

³⁴ Scott, 1974, p.121-122.

³⁵ This will become significant when we consider notions of internal and external canine relations.

³⁶ Whether this is because of Telemachus' role as a secondary protagonist in the epic or through bloodline association is difficult to say for certain, but the second seems more plausible.

³⁷ While a not uncommon epithet for dogs, the word choice is potentially suggestive of Odysseus' connection to Argos as well.

³⁸ Homer, *Odyssey* 2.10–11; the translation is my own.

swineherd dogs fawn on Telemachus upon his arrival back to Ithaca in *Odyssey* 17.1–6, which is noted within the narrative by Odysseus himself, drawing the audience’s attention and emphasizing the contrast with their less than welcoming reception of Odysseus a few books prior.

Argos is introduced in *Odyssey* 17 right as the narrative is developing the theme of loyalty and disloyalty in Odysseus’ household, initiated tonally by the attack of Eumaeus’ swineherding dogs. Prior to Argos’ appearance, this theme is continued by the contrast between the goatherd, Melanthius, who shamelessly rebukes and kicks Odysseus in *Odyssey* 17.215–234, and the swineherd, Eumaeus, who defends Odysseus and remains loyal to Telemachus.³⁹ With Odysseus’ believed absence, Melanthius demonstrates a shameful and disloyal character that contrasts with the loyalty displayed by Eumaeus and serves to emphasize the courage and fortitude of Odysseus, who, even after spending over a decade at sea and returning home to hostile individuals like Melanthius and the suitors, remains stout and admirable when in response to Eumaeus’ urging him not to loiter, he proclaims:

γινώσκω, φρονέω: τά γε δὴ νοέοντι κελεύεις.
 ἀλλ’ ἔρχευ προπάροιθεν, ἐγὼ δ’ ὑπολείψομαι αὐτοῦ.
 οὐ γάρ τι πληγέων ἀδαήμων οὐδὲ βολάων:
 τολμήεις μοι θυμός, ἐπεὶ κακὰ πολλὰ πέπονθα
 κύμασι καὶ πολέμῳ: μετὰ καὶ τόδε τοῖσι γενέσθω.

I see and am aware. you order these things with understanding.
 But go forth first, and I will remain behind.
 For I am not at all unacquainted with blows or strikes.
 My heart is enduring, since I have suffered many evils
 both in waves and war; let this too number among them.⁴⁰

³⁹ Given that Odysseus is still in disguise, the sense of loyalty is felt less in the actual treatment of Odysseus, than in the consistencies between attitudes towards Odysseus’ beggar character and the household of Telemachus and Odysseus. Compare Eumaeus’ explicit reverence to Telemachus in *Odyssey* 17.185–191 to Melanthius’ desire for Apollo to smite Telemachus in *Odyssey* 17.247–253.

⁴⁰ Homer, *Odyssey* 17.281–285; the translation is my own.

Just as we are confronted with the realities of fickle allegiances within Odysseus' household, we are reminded once again of all that Odysseus has endured and of his unyielding and enduring heart, and beginning in *Odyssey* 17.290, just after Odysseus' speech, we see that same enduring heart manifest in Argos. Rather than ending the theme of underlying allegiances, the narrative here concentrates our attention on a particular kind of loyalty, that towards a sense of duty. We see this in Eumaeus, who reverently obeys Telemachus and defends Odysseus; we see it in Odysseus, who, despite the obstacles he has faced and those that lie before him, is fundamentally focused on restoring his household to its former glory; and at the pinnacle, we see it in Argos, who is without a doubt one of the best examples of loyalty shown to Odysseus. In this refocusing of the narrative towards a canine point, so to speak, we have the first stage of canine-based tonal transitioning, and in Odysseus' resolve to plow forward, we find elements of the second stage, which culminates in the third, most essential, stage: the canine encounter.

Thematically, Argos stands in contrast to the dogs we saw earlier.⁴¹ Relative to Eumaeus' dogs, we see an almost antipodal narrative connection in Argos, who represents in part Odysseus' ties to the land, however dwindling. As Beck writes:

“Argus reared and then, when he had reached hunting maturity, left by Odysseus for others to enjoy the benefit of Argus' high qualities, can be compared with the house on which [sic] Odysseus built and then left in good order for others to dwell in. But Odysseus himself was forced in his prime to leave his home and to serve the benefit of others: the Atreids. Now Argus, twenty years older, weak and neglected by the maidservants, lies on a dung-pile, his body covered by vermin. Compare the household where the maidservants now run wanton and which is infested by the parasitical suitors. Because of his domestic troubles Odysseus, when he returns after twenty years, must come as an old tattered beggar to his house where his ‘substance’ is being squandered by parasites and his maidservants are conniving with them.”⁴²

⁴¹ For further evidence that the nature of dogs at the time of Ancient Greece is at least somewhat comparable to the nature of modern-day dogs, compare the story of Argos to that of Hachi, who waited at a train station for his master to return from work a whole nine years after he died.

⁴² Beck, 1991, p. 162.

Indeed, we see in the description of Argos' great skill and speed a reflection of Odysseus' own skills, so that in leaving Argos behind to serve the household, Odysseus left a piece of himself to serve as his extension, a metaphorical anchor linking him to his homeland. The weakening of Argos and his haggard state reflects the dwindling influence that Odysseus has over his household, manifesting the extent and impact of his absence and tribulations, and Odysseus' arrival so nearly concurrent to the dog's death is indicative of a last-minute return and somewhat evocative of the modern trope of a clock striking midnight. When Argos dies, therefore, he necessarily passes the duty of guarding his home back to his master, marking the endgame for Odysseus' reclamation of home and country in *Odyssey* 18–23.

In presenting Argos as loyal and loving immediately following Odysseus' speech about his own enduring heart, the narrator further associates master and dog, not only through a common household, but even more, through a common heart. This association also helps to elucidate the Homeric simile of Odysseus' barking heart in *Odyssey* 20.13–16, which leads us to view Odysseus' protective nature as fundamentally intertwined with that of Argos. More subtly, this association is present in *Odyssey* 19.220–248 when Odysseus describes to Penelope his garb upon leaving, most notable among the articles being a brooch depicting a hunting dog catching a fawn. It is difficult to ignore the symbolism, especially given that brooches are worn so close to the heart, which has already been shown to be canine in nature through Argos, and will in the next book be described as if it were itself a dog.

Dogs in Blame and Praise

Once we accept that dogs can be understood as extensions of their masters, we open the door for dogs' actions to reflect on their masters through these extensions, and we thereby recognize a capacity for blame and praise through dogs. In this way, we find that, aside from

internal associations with dogs, such as Odysseus' barking heart as evocative of a canine spirit linked to Argos, canine connections can also manifest externally with tangible consequences. After Eumaeus rescues Odysseus from his dogs, the swineherd proclaims “ὦ γέρον, ἦ ὀλίγου σε κύνες διεδηλήσαντο / ἐξαπίνης, καί κέν μοι ἐλεγχείην κατέχευας.”⁴³ Absent the theory of canine connections, the meaning of this line appears superficial: the dogs, as Eumaeus' property, are also his responsibility and thus any harm that they might cause necessarily traces back to him. Even excluding a particular connection with dogs, this highlights a crucial, albeit obvious, distinction between animate and inanimate property, namely that animals are able to act of their own accord, and they thereby impart upon their masters an added responsibility for discipline at the risk of personal rebuke. If the dogs had killed or maimed Odysseus, then their viciousness would have been scorned, and by association Eumaeus would have been shamed for having failed to control them or otherwise halt their assault. Such a simple notion becomes infinitely more intriguing once we throw in the added complication of dogs as reflections and extensions of their masters. In the first place, a successful assault under this theory would have meant not only that Eumaeus had failed to restrain his property, but even worse, that he had failed to retrain an external part of himself. Furthermore, it would have meant that the dogs' urge to attack was in part a reflection of Eumaeus' own feelings.⁴⁴ Consequently, the blame for the attack in this case would have fallen two-fold upon Eumaeus: once because he himself would have committed the atrocity through association with his dogs, and again because he would have subconsciously

⁴³ “Old man, my dogs nearly tore you to pieces / all at once, and on me you would have poured forth blame.” (Homer, *Odyssey*, 14.37–38; the translation is my own.)

⁴⁴ It is objectively well-documented that dogs tend to take on attributes and characteristics of their humans, and perhaps more relevantly, that they have a remarkable propensity for picking up on emotions and subtle non-verbal cues from their humans that manifest as action. Of course, this is not to say that the Greeks would necessarily have been aware of this particular phenomenon in and of itself, but it is reasonable to expect that they were familiar with instances of canine sensitivity to mental states and environment.

desired to do so, as evidenced both by a supposed inaction on his part and by an innate desire to protect his home against whom he perceives to be another invading stranger.

Alluding to an alternative path that might have been realized, Eumaeus's words serve to emphasize by contrast what actually happened. By the contrapositive of our reasoning above, we see that because the dogs did not succeed in their attack, Eumaeus did not feel threatened by Odysseus' sudden arrival, even given his guise as a complete stranger, and we thereby confirm that, despite the invasion of his homeland by suitors, Eumaeus' mindset is not that of a paranoid protector at the expense of all others. Fundamentally, he has not let the suitors corrupt his cultural understanding of how guests ought to be received, and in this we see that he has maintained his core sense of morality, which attribute is augmented in contrast to what might have occurred. We are therefore left to suppose by this restraint and by his ensuing customary reception of Odysseus that the attack itself was not the product of the dogs as extensions of Eumaeus, but rather resulted from their previously established place as extensions of the suitors in exemplifying a tangible threat to Odysseus within his own home.

Eumaeus' intervention prevents the tragedy of Odysseus' downfall at the hands⁴⁵ of his own swineherding dogs, and by extension himself, as a result of his unrecognizable state as a stranger in his own land. Naturally, this evokes comparisons to another Homeric instance of dogs turning on their households, foretold by Priam in Book 22 of the *Iliad* in a fruitless attempt to keep Hector from confronting Achilles:

60 πρὸς δ' ἐμὲ τὸν δύστηνον ἔτι φρονέοντ' ἐλέησον
 60δύσμορον, ὃν ῥα πατὴρ Κρονίδης ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδ᾽ ᾗ
 αἴση ἐν ἀργαλέῃ φθίσει κακὰ πόλλ' ἐπιδόντα
 υἱᾶς τ' ὄλλυμένους ἐλκηθείσας τε θύγατρας,
 καὶ θαλάμους κεραϊζομένους, καὶ νήπια τέκνα
 βαλλόμενα προτὶ γαίῃ ἐν αἰνῇ δηϊοτῆτι,
 65 ἐλκομένας τε νουὺς ὀλοῆς ὑπὸ χερσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.

⁴⁵ Or paws?

αὐτὸν δ' ἄν πύματόν με κύνες πρότησι θύρησιν
 ὠμησταὶ ἐρύουσιν, ἐπεὶ κέ τις ὄξει χαλκῷ
 τύψας ἢ ἐ βαλὼν ῥεθέων ἐκ θυμὸν ἔληται,
 οὓς τρέφον ἐν μεγάροισι τραπεζῆας θυραωρούς,
 70 οἳ κ' ἐμὸν αἶμα πiónτες ἀλύσσοντες περὶ θυμῷ
 κείσονται ἐν προθύροισι.

But have mercy on wretched me while I yet feel,
 60 I ill-fated, whom Zeus at the threshold of old age
 will ruin with a terrible fate, looking upon many evils,
 my sons dying and my daughters being dragged off,
 my chambers being ravished and infant children
 being thrown to the earth in dread conflict,
 65 and my daughters-in-law dragged off by the destructive
 hand of the Achaeans. **But me last of all, outside my door,
 my dogs will tear apart, consuming my flesh, when someone,
 striking me with sharp bronze, takes the life from my limbs,
 those same dogs whom I nourished in my halls at my tables as guards,
 70 which dogs, having drunk my blood, restless in their hearts,
 will lie in my doorway.**⁴⁶

Interestingly, Odysseus' state when he runs into Eumaeus' dogs is not dissimilar to that envisioned in Priam's prophecy; he too has seen κακὰ πόλλ', and the images of dear ones being dragged off has parallels to Odysseus' companions being snatched by Scylla and Polyphemus. Both men are at narrative low points when their fates are potentially sealed by their own dogs, one in an evaded possibility left in the past, and the other in an unverified future.⁴⁷ Regardless of reality, these imagined ambushes exemplify a variant on the Greek trope of causing one's own downfall, in particular the destruction of oneself and one's household through one's own dogs.⁴⁸ Because dogs are highly instinctive and impulsive creatures, they connect to the underlying instinctive and impulsive aspects of their masters and environments. In the case of the swineherding dogs, the impulse is to attack, an urge fed by their upbringing as protectors and

⁴⁶ Homer, *Iliad* 22.59–71; the translation is my own.

⁴⁷ That Odysseus' family and home are not yet lost at the time of his encounter should be of little consequence to this point, since had he been slain by the dogs, his household would have crumbled along with him.

⁴⁸ Compare this to the story of Actaeon (Oxford Classical Dictionary), who actually was torn apart by his own dogs and whose fate makes the potential downfall of Odysseus and the envisioned death of Priam even more tangible.

herders of livestock, and influenced narratively by their thematic relation to the suitors. In the case of Priam's dogs, the impulse is to rip and tear as soon as the last vestige of their domestic household, namely Priam himself, is slain; from this, they transition to wildness, their past lives forgotten, and all the while blame falls upon Hector for failing to heed his father's warning.

The impact of a dog's actions can have tangible consequences for their masters in that a dog's actions directly reflect their household. This quality evokes similarities with children, and just as children can ruin a household, so too can they bring praise upon it, as we see in the case of Odysseus' dog Argos, whose once youthful strength, speed, and prowess augment Odysseus' own reputation for such qualities.⁴⁹ Framing the identification between canines and their masters as loosely analogous to a parent-child relationship lines up well with empirical observation, namely in that that a similar sensitivity to emotions and subconscious action and a similar propensity for mirroring can be found in infants and toddlers as in dogs, which being a fundamentally human phenomenon, would be no different among the Greeks than it would today.

Characterizing the effects of dogs and dog figures in Homer, we introduce the terminology of the External Dog and the Internal Dog. The External Dog shall refer to physical canines that interact directly with the world, whose autonomy results in tangible consequences on the state or reputation of its master. As we have already explored, examples include Argos, the swineherding dogs, and Circe's beasts. Opposite this, the Internal Dog shall refer to allusions to one's personality or subconscious urges, which for better or worse are presented

⁴⁹ This comparison between dogs and children is meant broadly in the sense that, just as children are the responsibility of their parents/guardians to raise well, and therefore a child's negative behavior reflects poorly on their parents, dogs are the responsibility of their masters to train well, and therefore a dog's negative behavior reflects poorly on their master.

metaphorically as dog-like.⁵⁰ In *Odyssey* 20.13–16, Odysseus’ barking heart demonstrates that the internal dog can be bold, protective, and vengeful, whereas Achilles’ charge against Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1.149–171, and in particular the insult κυνῶπα,⁵¹ depicts the military leader’s internal dog as fundamentally greedy, thus suggesting an expected connection between character and the Internal Dog. This also elucidates a new means by which we might analyze personality through the lens of dog-based Homeric insults and otherwise derogatory applications of canine-centered language. It is perhaps here that we should note that, while we see in Odysseus a positive characterization of the Internal Dog, all instances of the Internal Dog in the context of women are negative. This misogynistic feature extends beyond Homer to the works of Hesiod, and we can further contextualize it by considering the portrayal in *Work and Days* of the first mortal woman, Pandora, as having a “κύνεόν...νόον”. As I intend to argue, this has deep connections to misogynistic themes throughout the extended mythos of Homer and Hesiod, including Helen’s self-ascribed epithet as κυνῶπις, best translated with the full implication of gender-based ridicule prevalent in the misogynistic use of *bitch*.

No great revelation lies in stating that the myth of Pandora is fundamentally misogynistic in its presentation of the first woman as the cause of man’s destruction, not unlike Eve in the Bible. This effect is further exacerbated by the shoe-horning of Pandora into the narrative at all: given that destruction arises not through her creation, but through the act of opening her jar and thereby unleashing the evils of the world, Zeus might have omitted her existence altogether by simply releasing the contents of the jar on his own. By contrast with what might have been, we conclude that the evils in the jar were meant to be a secondary punishment; it was Pandora

⁵⁰ By the capitalized Internal Dog, we shall mean the abstract concept, and when talking about particular instances, we shall omit capitalization.

⁵¹ “Dog-faced”.

herself, which is to say woman, with which Zeus sought to punish man. Ironically, however, Pandora is quite literally presented as a gift, not a punishment, to Epimetheus, despite Zeus' proclamation preceding her creation:

τοῖς δ' ἐγὼ ἀντὶ πυρὸς δώσω κακόν, ᾧ κεν ἅπαντες
τέρπωνται κατὰ θυμὸν ἐὼν κακὸν ἀμφαγαπῶντες.

But in exchange for fire, I will give men an evil, in which they will all rejoice, even as they are embracing their own evil.⁵²

Yet hidden within this gift is a promise for further suffering, and the tension between Pandora's status as a κακόν ("an evil") and a δῶρον ("a gift")⁵³ finds footing in the contrast between man's desire to keep her and his wish to be rid of the inevitable havoc that she wreaks. We see this same form of objectification in the treatment of Helen as simultaneously the root cause of the destruction around her and a prize to be earned on the battlefield. These presentations of Helen actually complement one another: it is exactly because she is so beautiful that she is desirous, and it is exactly because she is desirous that she is sought after so vehemently and so violently, which in turn situates her as a kind of femme fatale whose looks allure but whose actions ruin. This, and really the entire trope of the femme fatale, suggests a proportional relationship between beauty and destructive potential, and it is through this lens that it behooves us to consider the creation and subsequent treatment of Pandora.

- 60 Ἥφαιστον δ' ἐκέλευσε περικλυτὸν ὅττι τάχιστα
γαῖαν ὕδει φῦρειν, ἐν δ' ἀνθρώπου θέμεν αὐδὴν
καὶ σθένος, ἀθανάτης δὲ θεῆς εἰς ὧπα εἴσκειν
παρθενικῆς καλὸν εἶδος ἐπήρατον: αὐτὰρ Ἀθήνην
ἔργα διδασκῆσαι, πολυδαίδαλον ἰστὸν ὑφαίνειν:
65 καὶ χάριν ἀμφιχέαι κεφαλῇ χρυσέην Ἀφροδίτην
καὶ πόθον ἀργαλέον καὶ γυιοβόρους μελεδώνας:
ἐν δὲ θέμεν κύνεόν τε νόον καὶ ἐπὶ κλοπὸν ἦθος
Ἑρμείην ἦνωγε, διάκτορον Ἀργεῖφόντην.
ὥς ἔφαθ': οἱ δ' ἐπίθοντο Διὶ Κρονίῳ ἀνακτι.

⁵² Hesiod, *Work and Days*, 57–58; the translation is my own.

⁵³ Hesiod, *Work and Days*, 85.

70 αὐτίκα δ' ἐκ γαίης πλάσσειν κλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυήεις
 παρθένω αἰδοίῃ ἴκελον Κρονίδεω διὰ βουλᾶς:
 ζῶσε δὲ καὶ κόσμησε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη:
 ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ Χάριτές τε θεαὶ καὶ πότνια Πειθὼ
 ὄρμους χρυσεῖους ἔθεσαν χροῖ: ἀμφὶ δὲ τήν γε
 75 ὦραι καλλίκομοι στέφον ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖσιν:
 πάντα δέ οἱ χροῖ κόσμον ἐφήρμοσε Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.
**ἐν δ' ἄρα οἱ στήθεσσι διάκτορος Ἀργεῖφόντης
 ψεύδεά θ' αἰμυλίους τε λόγους καὶ ἐπίκλοπον ἦθος**
 τεῦξε Διὸς βουλῆσι βαρυκτύπου: ἐν δ' ἄρα φωνήν
 80 θῆκε θεῶν κῆρυξ, ὀνόμηνε δὲ τήνδε γυναῖκα
 Πανδώρην, ὅτι πάντες Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
 δῶρον ἐδώρησαν, πῆμ' ἀνδράσιν ἀλφηστῆσιν.

60 And [Zeus] bade renowned Hephaestus to be swift
 and to mix earth with water, and to endow it with the voice
 and strength of a human, and to make it beautiful and lovely
 in face, like the immortal maiden goddesses; and he bade
 Athena to teach her the labor of weaving an intricate web,
 65 and golden Aphrodite to bathe her head in grace
 and painful longing and cares that exhaust the limbs.
**And he bade the messenger Hermes, slayer of Argos,
 to give her the mind of a bitch and a thievish nature.**
 So he spoke, and they obeyed the lord Zeus, son of Kronos.
 70 And forthwith out of the earth the lame renowned god
 molded the likeness of a respectable maiden, as Zeus desired.
 And the grey-eyed goddess Athena girded and made her up,
 and around her form the divine Graces and royal Persuasion
 placed golden necklaces, and the beautiful-haired seasons
 75 crowned her all around with blossoms fresh from Spring.
 And Pallas Athena placed on her form every kind of adornment.
**And in her chest the messenger slayer of Argos placed
 lies and wheedling words and a thievish nature,**
 just as loud-thundering Zeus desired. And the herald
 80 of the gods put speech in her and called this woman
 Pandora, since everyone living at Olympus
 gave a gift, a misery for breadwinning men.⁵⁴

These are the things that make up Pandora, and by extension, the prototypical woman, to the Ancient Greek mind: she is beautiful and graceful; she is wily, as is evidenced by her ability to weave metaphorical intricate webs;⁵⁵ she is full of care and longing; and, lastly, she has the

⁵⁴ Hesiod, *Work and Days*, 60–82.

⁵⁵ Compare this to Penelope's deception of the suitors, an example of literal and metaphorical weaving.

mind of a bitch and the nature of a thief. On the question of differences between command and action, Benjamin Wolkow argues in his article, “The Mind of a Bitch: Pandora’s Motive and Intent in the *Erga*”, that any divergences can be chalked up to poetic variation.⁵⁶ In particular, he is focused on the distinction between Zeus’ order to endow Pandora with the “mind of a bitch” and the subsequent description of Hermes’ contribution as “lies and wheedling words”. The bulk of his ensuing argument then seeks to situate this dog imagery in the context of the linked language of wheedling words, ultimately settling on the canine metaphor as evocative of an underlying character of thievery and deception that can be found echoed in the behavior of the “bad wife” later in the poem. Wolkow’s points are well articulated and his conclusion regarding a theme of deceptive women is persuasive; however, I think there is further value in exploring alternative readings alongside these themes that Wolkow stresses. For example, as we shall later discuss, in his quest to connect Pandora’s actions to deception and thievery, Wolkow all but dismisses the role of curiosity, creating a dynamic of either/or that seems unsatisfying in and of itself. The rest of this section, therefore, is dedicated to exploring the implication of dog imagery in the Pandora episode, keeping in mind Wolkow’s perspective, while simultaneously leaving room for multivalent interpretations.

In the first place, while poetic variation cannot be fully dismissed as a means of accounting for the distinction between command and action in the creation of Pandora, it presents as a throwaway response to a potentially rich dynamic. In particular, by attributing the change in wording from “the mind of a bitch” to “lies and wheedling words” to poetic word choice, we lose the independent implications of each of these phrases, and thereby rob the text of some of its interpretative value. Wolkow does an excellent job of arguing a connection between

⁵⁶ Wolkow, 2007, 248.

dogs and deception, but certainly that is not *all* that “the mind of a bitch” entails, and so by conflating the accounts of Zeus’ command and of Pandora’s creation, he loses other associations, such as that between dogs and curiosity. For further evidence against a reading based on poetic variation, consider the role of Athena, who is ordered to teach Pandora to weave but ultimately clothes and does up the divine creation instead. Unlike Hephaestus, whose deed follows more or less the spirit of Zeus’ desire, namely molding Pandora into the form of a beautiful and divine maiden, the discrepancy in the case of Athena pushes the bounds even of *varatio*. Furthermore, there are divine figures that, unmentioned by Zeus, nevertheless play a part in the creation of Pandora, such as the Seasons, the Graces, and Persuasion, while Aphrodite makes no appearance outside of Zeus’ command.

Instead, I suggest that we consider everything said and everything described as occurring either literally together or else in some nonbinary realm between action and potential. That is, even if one takes the stance that no undescribed actions were performed, Zeus, by calling to mind a specific order of events, gives life to an alternative, potential narrative that, agreeing in some ways with and differing in others ways from the purported reality of the situation, nevertheless provides sufficient and valid substance for understanding the nature of Pandora. One should, however, still take into account who gives which gifts, and in this way we see patterns emerge through the representation of Pandora’s creation as the union of sets of gifts, each corresponding to a specific divine figure, or divine figures, and bearing with it a flavor of the gift-giver(s). Hephaestus, with his aptitude for molding and building, forms the foundational body, while Athena, as the goddess of maidens, sees to Pandora’s physical appearance, and simultaneously infuses in the creation her own wily and strategic nature through the art of weaving. Aphrodite makes Pandora prone to longing and cares, typical aspects of a “love-struck woman”, and the

Graces, along with Persuasion and the Seasons, bring their own characteristic gifts. This leaves the work of Hermes, last commanded and last performed, and by the association between order and deed we gain insight into what might be meant by κύβεόν...νόον.

Like those of the other deities, Hermes' "gift" relates to his realm as a deity: being the god of dogs,⁵⁷ he plants in Pandora a canine nature.⁵⁸ After our manner of analysis, it is allowable for us to take these qualities all together, namely (1) a bitchy mind, (2) a thievish nature, (3) lies, and (4) wheedling words, the second of which is repeated twice for emphasis. While the particular effect to the ancient mind of evoking dogs in this passage is not clear *a priori*, things start to come into focus once we take up our practice of treating these qualities not only as individual additions, but also as vital components of a more holistic bequeathal. Doing so, we see a direct connection between the canine-based epithet and the knavish characteristics being emphasized by Hermes, who though god of dogs is also god of thieves. Extending our view, we also see a connection between the bitchy mind and the web-weaving alluded to earlier, namely that they both represent elements of trickery, although it is perhaps necessary to draw a distinction between the wily aspects of cleverness, represented here by Athena, who herself is also connected to the wiliness of Odysseus, Telemachus, and Penelope, and the deceitful nature of thieves represented by Hermes. Here we see our first connection to Pandora's supposed "bitchiness", and conclude that one interpretation lies in her dishonesty and untrustworthiness, as demonstrated by her act of opening the jar.

Such nefarious qualities ultimately punish man in two ways. More immediately, we see through the opening of Pandora's jar a release of evils and the initiation of mankind's doom,

⁵⁷ Homer, *Hymns* 4.568–573.

⁵⁸ An interesting connection also lies in the epithet Ἀργεϊφόντης, which Rhys Carpenter argues in his article, "Argeiphontes: A Suggestion", should be taken as literally meaning "dog-killer", citing the original meaning of *argos* as simply "dog".

caused by the shamelessness of the first woman. But, as noted earlier, this cannot be the extent of Zeus' intended punishment; again, he himself might have skipped a step and acted directly, and he posits Pandora as a punishment in and of herself. We therefore conclude that the long-term, primary punishment intended was the very creation of women with "bitchy minds" and consequent destructive potential. The opening of Pandora's jar then becomes a mere consequence of this, as does Helen's initiation of the Trojan war in running off with Paris. The story of Pandora, then, was orchestrated and performed exactly as Zeus planned it, with no free will in sight; she was always meant to be a mere pawn for the god in an effort to exact revenge for Prometheus' transgression. In this sense, we have in Pandora's creation a counterpart to Prometheus' fire, one which will burn both passionately with longing and desire ignited by the beauty and grace of Pandora as a woman, and painfully with the consequences of wherever her bitchy mind may lead her, and along with her, humankind. We see a more deliberate association between Pandora and fire made manifest by Hesiod later on in the poem:

οὐ μὲν γάρ τι γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ ληίζετ' ἄμεινον
 τῆς ἀγαθῆς, τῆς δ' αὖτε κακῆς οὐ ρίγιον ἄλλο,
 δειπνολόχης: ἦτ' ἄνδρα καὶ ἴφθιμόν περ ἐόντα
 εὔει ἄτερ δαλοῖο καὶ ὠμῶ γήραϊ δῶκεν.

For man acquires nothing better than a wife
 who is good, and in turn nothing colder than
 a bad wife, prowling the dinner table. Even a strong man
 does she, torchless, burn and bring to a cruel old age.⁵⁹

The bad wife is herself a fire, and her destructive acts a jar; she simultaneously enthralls and ruins in line with the precedent set by Pandora. Further connections arise to Pandora's "bitchy mind" through the analysis of Wolkow, who suggests an element of associated thievery in the

⁵⁹ Hesiod, *Work and Days*, 702–705; the translation is my own.

rendering of δειπνολόγης (literally “dinner” + “ambush”), and, less convincingly, argues that the fire here mentioned is indicative of the heat of the Dog-star Seirios.⁶⁰

While an initial glance only draws connections between κύνεόν...νόον and lacking scruples, if we widen our perspective and consider that Pandora was created to cause destruction, primarily through opening her jar, then her “bitchy mind” simultaneously refers to each and every quality that guided her actions. This of course includes dishonesty and thievery, but her motivations were doubtless more involved than such an oversimplified relation equating Pandora to “thief” that would ultimately render this account 2-dimensional in analysis and effect. For example, as alluded to before, Wolkow is reluctant to see curiosity as a cause for opening the jar on the grounds that any evidence pointing in that direction, such as the curiosity of Semonides’ dog-woman⁶¹ and the descriptor *curiosius*⁶² attributed to Psyche in Apuleius’ Hesiod-inspired tale, are flimsy due to their distance from Hesiod, who nowhere explicitly refers to curiosity.⁶³ Falling just shy of outright dismissing curiosity as a factor, Wolkow posits thievery and greed as essentially sole motivators.⁶⁴ Yet there is no reason why we cannot accept curiosity alongside thievery as a contributing factor, especially since the evidence, tenuous as Wolkow may avow it to be, nevertheless establishes, through Semonides, a link in the ancient mind between the nature of women as dogs and negative curiosity, and through Apuleius, an interpretation of Pandora

⁶⁰ Wolkow, 2007, 252. While I find this notion somewhat intriguing in its ability to bring together differing qualities attributed to Pandora under a common heading, there is little evidence in the text to either verify or disprove this, and as such it is best taken as an allusive morsel than a true piece of evidence.

⁶¹ Semonides of Amorgos 7.12–20.

⁶² Apuleius, *Asinus Aureus*, 6.19.

⁶³ Wolkow, 2007, 250. Wolkow also here argues that other animals in Semonides’ poem might have connections to Pandora, but I am not convinced that this observation is relevant to the discussion at hand, especially since the entirety of Semonides’ poem is evocative of the same misogynistic atmosphere that birthed the dog imagery in the first place, and thereby is necessarily going to connect to the misogynistic themes presented here in several ways.

⁶⁴ Wolkow, 2007, 251–252.

through Psyche and thus of Pandora's motivation through that of Psyche, namely biting curiosity.

Greed, as proposed by Wolkow, is necessarily an impetus related to thievery, although it connotes an underlying cause for thievery, whereas before we were focused on untrustworthiness as an effect, or attribute, of thievery. Before, we took the view of Pandora's inner dog as a force driving her towards immorality in the abstract, to which notion we may adjoin, without contradiction, a desire for obtaining what is not rightfully one's own, which is itself a kind of natural greed. A dog has no understanding of notions of property, and yet it adamantly protects its own; a dog follows its nose and takes whatever happens to be in the intersection of desire and obtainability, the determination of which qualities are subject to quick and instinctive judgements. Such a depiction of dogs is hardly novel, and indeed we see in Agamemnon's inner dog a manifestation of canine greed. As Wolkow points out, we also see gluttonous characterizations of dogs presented in the figures of Scylla, who ravenously snatches as many men as she can,⁶⁵ and who is often depicted as being part-dog, with dog-heads along her waist in connection to her mother Hecate.⁶⁶ This physical manifestation of greed, which is essentially gluttony, is complemented by a more economic sense, as addressed in Morris Silver's 1992 book, *Taking Ancient Mythology Economically*, wherein he discusses the role of dogs and dog imagery in commerce and trade, specifically relating dogs to usurers.⁶⁷ Compare this to Pandora's canine-based untrustworthiness and her actions, which effectively cheated mankind out of a life free from the evils locked in the jar.

⁶⁵ Homer, *Odyssey* 12.244–259, discussed by Wolkow (2007) on p. 251-252.

⁶⁶ Alan Griffiths on Scylla, in the Oxford Classical Dictionary.

⁶⁷ Wolkow (2007) discusses Silver's work on p. 251. In the context of these economic associations, it seems dogs symbolized gluttony for the Greeks in a connotation similar to that of "pig" in English. While dogs may at times evoke similar ideas in English, their evocation generally leans sexual, an association that is also familiar to the Ancient Greeks through the idea of dogs as inherently "shameless".

Natural instincts do well to ties together all of these impetus together: Pandora is not thinking about the consequences of opening the jar; she is acting out of a mix of curiosity, an urge to uncover what may lie inside for personal gain, an innate Zeus-mandated impulse, and, alongside all of this, a fundamental inability to comprehend the consequences of her actions outside of the bounds of these immediate impulses and desires. This impulsivity is perhaps the cornerstone of the canine connection within Pandora, Helen, and all of the connected women who are framed as desirous and destructive, and this is doubtless in large part due to the inability of dogs to understand the consequences of their actions beyond the ability of a toddler. More often, these destructive qualities are framed as indicative of a lack of care regarding one's actions or appearance, whence the common associations between dogs and "shamelessness". In Pandora, then, we see that "bitchiness" and "shamelessness" are one, conspiring together towards the opening of Pandora's jar and, subsequently, the establishment of destructiveness and beauty as defining characteristics of women, such as Helen, to follow, and the resulting reality holds dire consequences for all mortals, regardless of gender.

The Canine Manifold

All this brings us back to perhaps the most intriguing point of inquiry in the study of dogs in Homer and Hesiod, namely the disparity present in their depiction across and within episodes. The Iliadic proem introduces dogs as savage beasts and the table-dogs of Patroclus represent a more domesticated breed of canine companions, linked to man and worthy of funereal sacrifice, while Cerberus stands out as simultaneously divine and monstrous. Similarly diverse attributes of dogs are present in modern-day culture: we have police-dogs, guard dogs, wild dogs, farm dogs, and pet dogs, just to name a few, all of which bring with them a distinct pieces of a more complex

cultural context, while still maintaining an agreed upon sense of “dogginess”.⁶⁸ From this perspective, the question we now explore is concerned with the analogous cultural context for individuals in Ancient Greece: what associations may κύων have evoked in the ancient Greek world?

One avenue of exploration for this question lies in the established reflective nature of dogs and their related capacity for forming relationships. We have already seen that dogs are able to form reflective bonds with their masters, including humans, gods, and monsters, and also with more abstract concepts, such as narrative structure and themes. Our method, then, will be focused on analyzing the overarching concept of Dog by observing depictions of relationships between dogs and the world around them, both in literature, as we did above with the works of Homer and Hesiod, and more broadly in the ancient world as we begin to move away from epic. This includes both the relationships that dogs themselves form and the associations that people develop with dogs. For instance, the Circe episode hints at a perceived association between dogs and magic that, as we shall later discuss, has ties to other magical portrayals of dogs in the Greco-Roman world, whereas the ruthlessness of dogs on the Iliadic battlefield may be closely linked with depictions of dogs as savage and feral beasts found elsewhere in literature. Central to this idea is that, while deviations may occur across broader depictions of dogs, there are self-consistent elements of canines across specific instances. In other words, we have common characteristics locally despite

⁶⁸ One might argue that humans are just as, if not more, varied in their behavior and the roles that they play, which helps to illustrate the point being made here. In order to even talk about the “human experience” we need to first accept that, for all the differences present among individuals, there is an underlying sense of “humanity” that binds mankind as distinct in classification from other animals, which is somehow consistent across the many different types of humans. Thus, in the language we shall soon present, it would not be entirely out of line to consider the existence of a Human Manifold, but as the thesis at hand relates to dogs and not humans, we drop this thread.

greater departures more globally.⁶⁹ Compare this to the notion of a manifold from Mathematics, which we now present.

A topological manifold is a second countable Hausdorff space that is locally homeomorphic to Euclidean space. This definition is highly terminological, and a comprehension of its specifics are not crucial to the paper at hand, so for those who are unfamiliar with the concept, I present a basic example that will suffice for the sake of providing intuition for our purposes. Consider a hollow sphere, like a beachball. When you look at the whole shape, you see that it is curved, but if you were, say, an ant crawling along the surface of the ball, it would almost certainly look flat to you. In this way, if we zoom in really close to any fixed point on the sphere, the area around that point will start to look like a 2-dimensional “flat” plane, but when we put these planes together, we recover the curved shape of the ball as a whole. Because this holds for any point, we would say that the ball is a 2-manifold. In essence, my argument is that this phenomenon of local behavior giving insight into a global property is analogous to the situation we find ourselves in our analysis of dogs, and thus maybe we can obtain information on the larger notion of Dog by zooming in on specific related instances and building up from there.⁷⁰

To construct a “manifold” in line with this idea, we shall isolate and analyze self-similar depictions of dogs to build up a collection of thematic resolutions that together provide broader and more holistic insights into the reception of dogs and dog imagery in Ancient Greece. Reminding ourselves of the mathematical intuition, let us refer to the self-similar objects in these

⁶⁹ These terms “local” and “global” are taken from Mathematics. “Locally” can be thought of as restricting to the immediate context surrounding a particular instance of dogs or dog imagery, such as a particular passage, whereas “globally” encompasses a more wide-scoped consideration of dogs that spans differing episodes, texts, and even authors.

⁷⁰ I do not claim that this is the only way to understand dogs in the ancient world, nor do I doubt that many of the results obtained from this method might have been obtained in another manner, but I strongly maintain that the visual nature of this manifold analogy holds unique value in capturing the reality of how canine relationships tie together, and in particular, it has provided me with an invaluable perspective on these relationships.

collections as hyperspheres.⁷¹ In particular, we shall track within individual hyperspheres the extent to which and ways in which dogs are identified with mortals, divinities, and monsters, by which we will come to better understand the broader picture being built up. Before we continue with examples of this methodology, it behooves us to directly confront a supposed objection in our adoption of this over, say, a theory regarding dogs simply being multi-valanced. Simply put, in multi-valanced theories, there is always a potential for differing qualities to pop up alongside one another, whereas this manifold theory expressly works under the assumption that disparate depictions of dogs are disjoint, which is to say, for instance, that if a passage is considering dogs in light of magical associations, it is necessarily not calling upon ideas of dogs as greedy and gluttonous. On the other hand, such a passage may call upon the violence of dogs, since violence and magic are more easily identified than greed and magic. Thus, we have a sense of when characteristics of dogs are related, which in turn arms us with an intuition for distance between these depictions, and this distance recalls further geometric ties to our endeavors, bringing us back to manifolds. With this in mind, we introduce an example of a hypersphere, linking dogs to magic and ritual practices.

Starting with the magical affiliation we see manifest in the Circe episode, we orient our discussion towards an exploration of the broader relationship between dogs and magic. That there was an association between dogs and magic in the Greco-Roman world is well established, and this connection was especially prominent in the realm of healing and protection against offensive magic. Oftentimes, dogs were considered protectors against evil, with Greco-Roman thought holding that their barks were a warning against death or danger.⁷² Such an inherent ability for

⁷¹ The term hypersphere is used to refer to higher dimensional spheres. Its use here is meant to evoke an analogy to the beachball 2-manifold discussed above. In that case, we were building up a 2-sphere (the beachball), and here we are building up something less absolute in geometry, whence the dimensionally ambivalent term.

⁷² Burriss, 1935, p. 41.

warding off evil magic was thought to extend even to the physical, resulting in body parts of dogs being utilized as central ingredients in the formulation of potions and hexes. Per Eli Burriss in his article, “The Place of the Dog in Superstition as Revealed in Latin Literature”, we see that, according to Roman thought, the gall-bladder of black male dogs was a protective talisman,⁷³ that the blood of a dog could ward off evil charms,⁷⁴ and that the tooth of a puppy could drive away fears, among other fantastical applications.⁷⁵

Perhaps these magical associations arose as extensions of the fundamentally protective nature present in guard-dogs, although such a perspective is speculative on my part. Regardless of the root inspirations, however, it is clear that dogs, by this perceived aptitude for magical rituals held a nontrivial role in medical practices, not only through the indirect utilization of their body parts in magical rituals, but also at times directly through acts of sacrifice. The ability of sacrificial rites to heal could be physical, as we see in Plutarch’s description of a process by which newborn puppies were used to “absorb” the sickness from a body. In response to the question of why the Luperci sacrifice dogs, Plutarch writes:

τῶ δὲ κυνὶ πάντες ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν Ἕλληνας ἐχρῶντο καὶ χρῶνται γε μέχρι νῦν ἔτιοι σφαγίῳ πρὸς τοὺς καθαρμούς: καὶ τῇ Ἑκάτῃ σκυλάκια μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καθαρσίων ἐκφέρουσι καὶ περιμάττουσι σκυλακίοις τοὺς ἀγνισμοῦ δεομένους, περισκυλακισμὸν τὸ τοιοῦτον γένος τοῦ καθαρμοῦ καλοῦντες.

And all the Greeks, so to speak, (also) used to use a dog as a sacrifice for the sake of purification, and some still do even today; and they sacrifice puppies to Hecate along with other victims, and they rub them on those in need of purification, calling such a kind of purification “puppification.”⁷⁶

Through this act of violence towards dogs comes a believed path towards healing that is itself dependent on a supposed ability of dogs to draw into themselves external evils. In the context of

⁷³ Burriss, 1935, p. 32.

⁷⁴ Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, 30.82.

⁷⁵ Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, 32.137. Burriss (and Pliny) provide many further examples, but the point is made.

⁷⁶ Plutarch, *Quaestiones Romanae*, 68.

the broader theory of dogs' reflective natures, this is easily explained as a manifestation of what we might call canine absorption. Just as dogs embody narrative tones in the *Odyssey*, they are likewise able to act as vessels for harmful energy, whether it originates from magic or sickness. Consequently, the placement of dogs in the realm of magic is rooted in the same underlying features that allowed for canine-based tonal transitioning and canine-based identification through ideas of the External Dog.

It is probably worth stating that Pliny describes a similar Roman practice wherein sickness was thought to be transferred to puppies for the purpose of eradication. In their article, "Dog Sacrifice in the Ancient World: A Ritual Passage?", Jacopo De Grossi Mazzorin and Claudia Minniti are adamant on the presence of a preconceived assumption of canine impurity in these practices, in line with dogs' depiction elsewhere as filthy beasts.⁷⁷ Alternatively, these healing rituals might be viewed as an explicit alteration of the state of puppies from pure to tainted, which we see mirrored in Homer through the sickness of noble Argos, polluted like the home of Odysseus. As evidence for a less cynical⁷⁸ view of these canine sacrifices, we call upon the broader theory of canine reflective properties present in this paper in order to better understand a particular instance of canine sacrifice of a different flavor, namely that of Achilles' dogs at the funeral of Patroclus. Here, we see a purification not of the physical but of the spiritual, wherein Achilles, through an external connection to his dogs is able to symbolize the extent of his loss and to grieve by sacrificing in essence a part of himself. In this act, Achilles matches the state of his external dogs to the inner dismay of his internal dog, crying out for redemption not unlike Odysseus' own barking heart.⁷⁹ Compare this with the traditional

⁷⁷ Mazzorin and Minniti, 2006.

⁷⁸ Pun very much intended.

⁷⁹ Of course, sacrifices are not in and of themselves necessarily personal on this level. For instance, in the same ritual, Achilles sacrifices twelve Trojans (Homer, *Iliad* 23.175–176). However, sacrificing someone or something

manifestation of grief to the ancient Greeks, which often consisted of hair-pulling, clothes-tearing, and guttural cries, all of which, just as with Achilles and his dogs, give the intangible, internal state of grieving external expression through physical action. We therefore see that the canine ability to heal extends to the mental and spiritual.⁸⁰

This canine capacity to protect and heal, often through magic, is contrasted by instances in which dogs play a nontrivial role in the perpetration of aggressive witchcraft. We find in Burriss a compilation of references in which witches use canine-linked ingredients, such as the *ossa ab ore rapta ieiunae canis* (“bone snatched from the mouth of a hungry dog”) in Horace’s fifth epode⁸¹ and rabies froth.⁸² Furthermore, as Burriss points out, Apuleius lists dogs as among the animals that witches can transform into, through which process we see the internal dog become external.⁸³ Aside from these more passive instances, we also see dogs take on an active role in the accompaniment of witches at crossroads, often in association with Hecate, as in Horace’s satires:

...Hecaten vocat altera, saevam
altera Trisiphonen: serpentes atque videres
infernus errare canes lunamque rubentem,
ne foret his testis, post magna latere sepulcra.

One cried out to Hecate, the other, savage,
to Trisiphonen: you could see snakes
and hellhounds wander and the moon blushing,
hiding behind great sepulchers, lest she be a witness.⁸⁴

with whom one has a personal connection is undoubtedly an emotional undertaking, and so it stands to reason that the killing of his own dogs, which he fed beneath his own table (Homer, *Iliad* 23.173) would conjure up emotions that relate to his grief. Indeed, sacrificing enemies is one thing, but why would he kill his own dear dogs if it did not serve some purpose in honoring his lost lover.

⁸⁰ As I am sure that any dog-lover would testify.

⁸¹ Horace, *Epodes*, 5.23.

⁸² Lucan, *Bellum Civile*, 6.671.

⁸³ Apuleius, *Asinus Aureus*, 2.22. Other animals listed are birds, mice, and flies.

⁸⁴ Horace, *Satires* 8.33–36. Text from the Latin library; the translation is my own.

Compiling these data points, it is undeniable that dogs were at times viewed in the Greco-Roman world as fundamentally magical beings with propensities for witchcraft and purification that can be aligned towards either the evasion or the perpetration of evil, and in this sense dogs ultimately serve as tools for magical masters. Circe's feat, therefore, extends further than merely taming wild beasts; she has endowed the wolves and lions with the magical charge of canines, which implies a particular talent in that these beasts, while canine-adjacent, fall short of the supposed magical proclivities of their more domestic counterparts. Her magical nature emanates and transforms not only wild nature, as evidenced by her perfect house of shaved stones amongst disheveled brush, but also the natures of living beings. Thus, our argument brings us full circle back to the Circe episode, now equipped with essential context.

Branching off of this magical hypersphere, which draws a relatively seamless thread between the role of dogs in magical settings and canine-based sacrifices, we see a prominent adjacent hypersphere, suggested in the above quote from Horace's eighth satire, namely a connection between dogs, particularly hellhounds, and chaos. Such an association pairs quite nicely with dogs' presentation in the realm of medicine when considered from the perspective not of healing, but of taking on sicknesses as vessels, as in the ritual of pupprification. This might be extended to encompass a broader connection between dogs, sickness, death, and destruction, which itself holds promise in the analysis of Homer and Hesiod, wherein dogs are often referenced in the context of death. Sometimes, dogs are framed as victims of violence, as in *Odyssey* 9.287–290, in which we see two of Odysseus' men being compared to puppies as Polyphemus bashes them to death. At other times, dogs are perpetrators of violence: aside from the depictions of savagery afforded by the backdrop of war in the *Iliad*, Scylla, as well as the wolves and lions in the Circe episode, introduce a level of canine threat consistent with the

negative traits inherent in the disastrous consequences of Pandora’s “bitchy mind”. Central to the connection between dogs and death is Cerberus, the literal hound of hell, who eats up souls that try to escape. In fact, Cerberus’ gluttonous soul eating meshes well with the canine-monster connection presented by Polyphemus and Scylla, and, through his connection to Hades, also suggests a potential for divine association as well.

We find further evidence for this last association in Xenophon’s *Cynegeticus*, wherein he makes explicit reference to canine divinity through Apollo and Artemis:

τὸ μὲν εὖρημα θεῶν, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ἀρτέμιδος, ἄγραι καὶ κύνες: ἔδοσαν δὲ καὶ ἐτίμησαν τούτῳ Χείρωνα διὰ δικαιοσύνην. ὁ δὲ λαβὼν ἐχάρη τῷ δώρῳ καὶ ἐχρῆτο: καὶ ἐγένοντο αὐτῷ μαθηταὶ κυνηγεσίων τε καὶ ἐτέρων καλῶν Κέφαλος, Ἀσκληπιός, Μειλανίων, Μέστωρ,⁸⁵ Ἀμφιάραος, Πηλεὺς, Τελαμών, Μελέαγρος, Θησεύς, Ἴππόλυτος, Παλαμήδης, Μενεσθεύς, Ὀδυσσεύς, Διομήδης, Κάστωρ, Πολυδεύκης, Μαχάων, Ποδαλείριος, Ἀντίλοχος, Αἰνείας, Ἀχιλλεύς, ὧν κατὰ χρόνον ἕκαστος ὑπὸ θεῶν ἐτιμήθη.

Hunting and dogs are the invention of the gods, of Apollo and Artemis; they gave it to most just Cheiron and thereby honored him. And having received the gift, he rejoiced and made good use of it, and he later had his own students of dog hunting and other noble pursuits, including Cephalus, Asclepius, Meilanion, Mestor, Amphiarus, Peleus, Telamon, Meleager, Theseus, Hippolytus, Palemedes, Menestheus, Odysseus, Diomedes, Castor, Polydeuces, Machaon, Podaleirius, Antilochus, Aeneas, and Achilles, each of whom was in his own time honored by the gods.⁸⁶

By weaving in references to a catalog of godlike mortals in the wake of divine creation, Xenophon elevates the origin of dogs through simultaneous association with divinity and humanity, lending credence to canine nobility through mortal and divine figures in Homer and Hesiod, including Odysseus, Achilles, Patroclus, Priam, Hades, and Hephaestus, and establishing a foundation for the role of dogs in mortal-divine interactions such as canine sacrifices. This becomes central to the placement of dogs among the already convoluted mortal-divine stage, and would be a wonderful topic for further exploration in a subsequent paper. As things stand, we are

⁸⁵ It is unclear whether or not this is a mistake, but the Greek text on Perseus has Μέστωρ, whereas McBrayer (2018) translates Nestor.

⁸⁶ Xenophon, *On Hunting* 1.1-2. The text is taken from Perseus; the translation is adapted from McBrayer, 2018.

here merely only able to hint at this dynamic. Unfortunately, given the constraints of the thesis at hand, rather than rushing partially constructed arguments on these points, we must content ourselves with the idea that the theory of the Canine Manifold contains too much to be addressed in one thesis, and with the hope of returning to it sometime in the future.

Conclusion

The idea of the Canine Manifold fundamentally relies on the understanding of dogs as reflective, or perhaps more politely, empathetic beings in the sense that they take on attributes of their surroundings. The joke that cats are liquid because of the ways they contort their bodies may be better applied to dogs, at least with respect to their personalities. We have already discussed the effect on narrative that this property has in the *Odyssey*, but our evidence extends beyond that. For instance, reflectiveness provides a satisfactory explanation for the distinction in canine depiction between Homeric epics, with scholars noting a tangible familiarity in the *Odyssey* in contrast with the less-than-admirable depiction of corpse-eating dogs in the *Iliad*. That is, the environment of war is reflected in the nature of dogs in the Iliadic proem; just as the strength and heart of warriors within the epic are symbolized by Homeric similes of the Inner Dog, the plot has manifested its own Outer Dogs. Moreover, in proportion to the relative lack of environmental diversity, dogs in the *Iliad* are themselves lacking in diversity of personality. On the other hand, dogs in the *Odyssey* reflect by their situational personalities, the ever-changing environment and theme, which naturally gives rise to canine-based tonal transitioning.

Because Hesiod's works are less narrative-based, dogs in Hesiod reflect less what is happening and more who is acting. Pandora's inner dog becomes central to the representation of women in *Work and Days*, and one might speculate that this stems from a common root of misogynistic associations between women and dogs that also spawned the epithet "bitch-faced"

Helen. Regardless of whether these canine connections are built with individuals, such as Odysseus or Circe, or abstract concepts, such as the narrative or tone, they necessarily help us partially trace the structures of literary works, as I hope to have demonstrated in this thesis, and in the process, they provide us with avenues of understanding what *κύων* actually meant to the ancient Greek mind. It is from this insight that Canine Manifold Theory arose: by understanding dogs' relationship with *x* in the ancient world, we can better understand the abstract Dog, and this can be done by honing in on a particular type of canine connection, like their affinity for magic, and following that thread to nearby "neighboring" associations, such as those with healing, medicine, and sacrifice, which lead us to an association with chaos, destruction, and Hades, and so on. Throughout this process, we find ourselves deviating further and further from the point of origin, but we nevertheless stay relatively close to the preceding depiction, which is to say that deviations in local approximations compound into the desired diverse framing of dogs in the ancient world. This also begins to explain how dogs can at once be the god-granted gift of Apollo and Artemis, and the namesake for Diogenes the Cynic, or how a dog as loyal as Argos can belong to the same species that rends Priam's body limb from limb. There is continuity in these portrayals of the canine figure, but it comes from an exploration of a much more complicated web of inter-related characterizations that ultimately makes up the Canine Manifold.

Bibliography

Apuleius, *Asinus Aureus*, II.22.

Arend, Walter. 1933. "Die typischen Szenen bei Homer."

Beck, William. 1991. "Dogs, Dwellings, and Masters: Ensemble and Symbol in the Odyssey". *Hermes*. 119: 158-167.

Bloomfield, Maurice. 1904. "Cerberus, The Dog of Hades". *The Monist*. 14. 4: Oxford University Press, 523-540.

Burriss, Eli Edward. 1935. "The Place of Dogs in Superstition as Revealed in Latin Literature." *Classical Philology*. 30. 1: 32-42.

Carpenter, Rhys. 1950. "Argeiphontes: A Suggestion". *American Journal of Archaeology*. 54. 3:177-183.

Edwards, Mark W. 1975. "Type-Scenes and Homeric Hospitality." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. 105. 51-72.

Edwards, Mark W. 1987. "Type Scenes and Expansion" in *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 71-78.

Edwards, Mark W. 1987. "Similes" in *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 102-110.

Forster, E. S. 1941. "Dogs in Ancient Warfare". *Greece & Rome*. 10. 30: 114-117.

Franco, Cristiana. 2014. *Shameless: The Canine and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*. Oakland: University of California Press.

Griffiths, Alan H. "Sycella (1)." Oxford Classical Dictionary, edited by Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow (eds.), vol. 4, Oxford University Press, 1334.

Hainsworth, J. B. 1961. "Odysseus and the Dogs". *Greece & Rome*. 8. 2: 122-125.

Hawtree, Laura. 2014. "Animals in Epic" in *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, Campbell, Gordon Lindsay (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 73-83.

Herodotus, *The Histories*, 3.102-105.

Hesiod, *Work and Days* 57–58, 69–82, 85, 702–705.

Heubeck, Alfred and Hoekstra, Arie. 1989. “Book X: Commentary” in *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey: Volume II Books IX–XVI*, translated by Jennifer Brooker and Stephanie West. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 43-74.

Heubeck, Alfred and Hoekstra, Arie. 1989. “Introduction” in *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey: Volume II Books IX–XVI*, translated by Jennifer Brooker and Stephanie West. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 3-11.

Homer, *Hymns* 4.568–573.

Homer, *Iliad* 1.149–171, 22.59–71, 23.161–177.

Homer, *Odyssey* 2.10–11, 6.130–135, 7.46–95, 9.287–290, 10.188–219, 10.229–10.275, 10.325–344, 13.185–14.34, 14.37–38, 17.1–6, 17.185–191, 17.215–234, 17.247–253, 17.281–285, 17.290–327, 20.13–16, 22.401–408.

Homer. 1919. *The Odyssey*, translated by A.T. Murray. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Horace, *Epodes*. 5.23.

Horace, *Satires*, 8.33–36.

Johnson, Helen M. 1919. “The Portrayal of the Dog on Greek Vases”. *The Classical Weekly*. 12. 27: 209-213.

Kitchell Jr., Kenneth F. 2004. “Man’s Best Friend? The Changing Role of the Dog in Greek Society” in *PECUS Man and Animal in Antiquity: Proceedings of the Conference at the Swedish Institute in Rome, September 9-12, 2002*, Frizell, Barbro Santillo (ed.). Rome: The Swedish Institute in Rome, 177-182.

Kitchell Jr., Kenneth F. 2014. *Animals in the Ancient World from A to Z*. London: Routledge.

Lucan, *Bellum Civile*, 6.671.

Mazzorin, Jacopo De Grossi and Minniti, Claudia. 2006. “Dog Sacrifice in the Ancient World: A Ritual Passage?” in *Dogs and People in Social, Working, Economic or Symbolic Interactions*, Snyder, Lynn M. and Moore, Elizabeth A. (eds). Oxbow Books, 62-66.

- McBrayer, Gregory A. ed. 2018. "The One Skilled at Hunting with Dogs" in *Xenophon: The Shorter Writings*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 295-325.
- Oakely, John H. 2020. *A Guide to Scenes of Daily Life on Athenian Vases*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 16.
- Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, 8.40, 30.82, 32.137.
- Plutarch, *Quaestiones Romanae*, 68.
- Rose, Gilbert P. 1979. "Odysseus' Barking Heart". *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. 109: 215-230.
- Rose, Herbert Jennings, and March, Jenny. 2012. "Actaeon." Oxford Classical Dictionary, edited by Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow (eds.), vol. 4, Oxford University Press, 10.
- Sax, Boria. 2012. "Animals in Folklore" in *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Studies*, Kalog, Linda (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 456–472.
- Scodel, Ruth. 2005. "Odysseus' Dog and the Productive Household". *Hermes*. 133. 4: 401-408.
- Scott, John A. 1948. "Dogs in Homer". *The Classical Weekly*. 41. 15: 226-228.
- Scott, William C. 1974. *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile*. Leiden: Brill Publishers.
- Semonides of Amorgos. 7.
- Silver, Morris. *Taking Ancient Mythology Economically*. Leiden: Brill Publishers.
- Thumiger, Chiara. 2014. "Animals in Tragedy" in *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, Campbell, Gordon Lindsay (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 84–98.
- Wolkow, Benjamin. M. 2007. "The Mind of a Bitch: Pandora's Motive and Intent in the *Erga*". *Hermes*. 3: 247-262.
- Xenophon, *Cynegeticus* 1.1–1.2.