Animal studies have flourished within the field of Classics of late and this book is an important contribution to the field and toward stimulating the growth of further studies. The current book is an expansion of Franco’s 2003, *Senza ritegno: il cane e la donna nell’immaginario della Grecia antica*. Bologna: Il mulino, itself an offshoot of her dissertation. The appearance of an expanded, English, version, is most welcome. A new introduction has been written, and the thorough bibliography has been updated and more current references have been added to the notes. I am not qualified to judge the translation, but there is a constant attempt to explain things that might be culturally alien to non-Italians. The largest change in the text of the book seems to be the admirable appendix, more on which below.

The book seeks to understand the undeniable fact that in the Greek world, the dog was both a staunch best friend (think Odysseus and Argos) and a source of abusive language. How can Priam be afraid that the same dogs that lie beneath his dining couch will mutilate his body? Why does Hermes give Pandora the mind of a dog? Why does Helen refer to herself as a *kyon* and why, in general, are insults against women so often associated with canine-based language? In trying to solve such questions, Franco uses an interdisciplinary approach, combining “anthropology, interpretive semiotics, human animal studies, and gender studies” (viii). It is in this approach that the book makes the greatest impact, stretching the boundaries of purely text-based analysis, forcing us to think outside our philological boxes.

Thus, along the way, examples are cited from Japanese (193, n.20) and Amazonian (170, n.22) cultures, to name but two. Franco’s depth and width of knowledge of the classical texts is quite impressive, a testimony to the author’s thoroughness and the abilities computers currently afford scholars.

The Prologue begins with Pandora and her dogish mind and poses the basic questions to be discussed in the book. Chapter 1 treats the Greeks’ huge vocabulary of dog-based insults and offensive epithets, asking what canine traits may have given rise to the language. Chapter 2 is a wide ranging discussion of the general position dogs held in the Greek world and Chapter 3 investigates the charge that dogs would eat corpses. Chapter 4 discusses other “heinous behaviors” attributed to dogs by discussing a series of “masks,” or character traits, that dogs were thought to exhibit. It is in Chapter 5 that the link between language about the social status of women and dogs is studied. This is followed by the “Conclusion” (155-59) and the new “Appendix” (160–84), which both summarizes the book’s argumentation and addresses the latest research. It also addresses

---

1 For example, most recently, Campbell, Gordon Lindsay, ed. 2014. *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
the blend of scholarly approaches the book employs and the approaches and sources which it does not use. Most notably absent is the ample presence of dogs interacting with humans on Greek vases. It is hoped that some scholar will address this evidence in a future work.

The book is wide ranging and, as the author suggests, a blend of fields of study that are too often separate. It would be impossible to cover Franco’s detailed argumentation, but her overall insights are thought provoking. She is very persuasive on the fact that dogs, by their special place in the world of humans, evoke special emotions and language. The survey of the many types of canine behavior that informed the Greeks’ language is intriguing. Her concept of the “cultural encyclopedia,” or store of common beliefs that the Greeks held about dogs is compelling and is one that could and should be applied by scholars to other animals more frequently. Some other arguments are less persuasive. The fact that dogs ate table scraps is not sufficiently linked to corpse eating in this reviewer’s opinion, for example. The use of sources from Homer to Plutarch without an obvious cultural filter may seem overly inclusive to some. But even when a reader is putting question marks in the margin, s/he is being forced to view the human-dog-female nexus through new, and entirely useful, lenses.

It must be admitted that the book is difficult to read in many spots. For this reason I should think it would be unsuitable for general undergraduates. The writing is dense and often contains terms from other disciplines that could use better explanations for outsiders. Often, it seems, certain ideas are put in footnotes that would be better served in the body of the text. Readers, by the way, who ignore the footnotes do so at their peril. Their erudition and scope alone should demand our attention. Arguments can ramble, leading the author so say things like “But to return to the thread of the argument,” (39). Even then, it can be difficult to follow the argumentation. Franco has tried to address this difficulty in her preface:

In the British and American tradition of expository writing, it is normal to set out one’s thesis statements at the head of the work, anticipating the conclusions toward which the subsequent pages will then progress...The present work instead follows a writing tradition more typical in Continental scholarship, one conceived as more of an investigative work, in which the hypothesis — the idea that gave rise to the research — is presented as a riddle to be solved, and the argumentation then guides the reader along the pathway that led the researcher-detective toward the solution of the case.

She adds,

Impatient or disoriented readers, preferring to get an overall picture of the work’s structure and a statement of its results, may want to begin with the last section,

---

‘Conclusion’ which briefly sketches the themes and arguments that the work traces out. (vii-viii)

I would suggest that even the patient among us do just this, and read the “Appendix” as well, for this will make it easier to follow the argumentation in the body of the work.

In this Appendix, Franco stresses that this new approach of studying how animals and humans interacted is destined to raise further questions and spark future research. Therein lies the strength of this book. Levi-Strauss notoriously said that “animals are good to think with.” This book is good to think with about Greek animals and the society they inhabited.
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