NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI®

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

"*Dolos* in Homer: an Analysis of the Meaning and Context"

by

Filip Johannes De Decker

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF GREEK AND ROMAN STUDIES

CALGARY, ALBERTA

AUGUST, 2009

Abstract

This thesis discusses the use of δόλος in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. I approached the topic thematically and discussed the word in 5 different chapters based on the combination of δόλος and a specific action. As such, I discussed the combination of δόλος and the verbs of a mental activity, δόλος as an indication of versatility, δόλος and its connection to concrete activities, δόλος as a tool of secrecy, and finally death and dying as a result of δόλος.

This allowed me to draw some important conclusions. The first one was that the use of δόλος is gendered. Women are more often than men portrayed as preparing δόλος in a thorough manner. Men on the other hand use δόλος as well, but are also portrayed as suspecting female δόλος. The second one was that there is an important contrast between the use of δόλος and the use of μῆτις. That contrast is based on the perspective of the people involved in the action: if someone benefits from an action, the word μῆτις is usually employed. Lastly, the thesis pointed out that Odysseus was the king of tricks in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* but at the same time it became clear that in the *Odyssey* Penelope was as well versed in the use of δόλος as Odysseus, and was actually more effective in its use.

Appendix A discussed the eytymology of δόλος and *Appendix B* compared the trickster of general mythology with the Indo-European and Greek tricksters.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my parents, Theo De Decker and Lieve Peeters, and to my grandparents, Jean Peeters and Gabrielle Mercken. Without their love, support and care this MA thesis would never have been possible.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Deceit, tricks and trickery.

This thesis will deal with the word δόλος in Homer. My initial intention was to discuss the concept of deceit in the Homeric poems, but this topic was too large to be treated in a Master thesis, as can be clearly seen by the fact that there are between 20 and 25 words that can possibly mean "deceive". I therefore decided to focus on the most important and most common word of the group, δόλος. The importance of δόλος can be seen by the fact that a part of the *Iliad*, and one of its main characters are named after it, the *Doloneia* and *Dolon* respectively. Δόλος is the only noun with the notion "deceit" that appears more than 10 times in the epics.[1] I will give a literary analysis of the passages where δόλος appears, with focus on the meaning and the use of the word δόλος in that specific episode.

1.1. Meaning of the word δόλος.

The following meanings have been suggested for δόλος: "trick",[2] "trick, guile, cunning",[3] "deceit",[4] "deceit, ambush".[5] LSJ give as original meaning "a bait to catch fish".[6] The link between the concrete object "fishing bait" and the more abstract "trick, guile" would be conceptually similar to Old Norse, because in Old-Norse mythology Loki, the typical god of trickery, was credited with creating the net to fish.[7] From a "bait" the word would then

---

1 It is the only noun quoted in Owen-Goodspeed's frequency lists for Homeric words.
2 Coulon 1643:156-157 (but in Latin)
3 LSJ s.v.
4 Owen-Goodspeed 1969:32
5 Ebeling 1885 I: 316 (but in Latin)
6 Chantraine 1968:293; LSJ s.v.; Detienne-Vernant 1978; Nordheider 1984:329: *Netz heißt auch δόλος.*
7 Dumézil1948; Mallory-Adams 1997:601. The story of the creation of the net is told in Edda 50.

have received a wider meaning.[8] Detienne-Vernant assumed that δόλος had only one

meaning "a trap with deceit under a reassuring appearance". This would explain all the

meanings and uses, such as the Trojan Horse, the Hephaistean bed and the fish bait.[9]

Levine, on the other hand, thinks that the meaning "fish bait" is a logical consequence of

the meaning "deceit".[10] Against that assessment, it has to be said that the evolution from a

concrete into an abstract meaning is more likely.[11]

The meaning of δόλος, however, is more ambiguous. For some, it lies between

"cleverness" and "tricks", giving the one with δόλος an advantage over the one without

it.[12] According to others, δόλος is "a trick" but because it can be used to defend oneself

against enemies, the meaning of the word is not necessarily bad.[13] In several passages

involving a fight with or killing of an opponent, δόλος is contrasted with βίη "violence",

κράτος "force" or ἀμφαδόν "openly". This distinction has been interpreted in two

different ways. Finkelberg assumed that therefore the word δόλος was interpreted

negatively in the heroic worldview.[14] De Jong interpreted the contrasts with βίη and

κράτος as an illustration of the "cunning versus force" motif, and consequently assigned a

positive value to those instances of δόλος, although it has to be said that she did not

distinguish between δόλος and μῆτις.[15]

---

8   LSJ s.v. ; Barnouw 2004:53
9   Detienne-Vernant 1978:22. These are the first two subsections of chapter 4.
10 Holmberg 1990:74; Levine 2002/3:146 δόλος *means deceit, and also-logically- fish bait (Od. 12.252).*
Underlining is mine.
11 The use of words such as "ambush" and "Trojan Horse" can illustrate that, because the word "ambush" is
not always used in its military meaning anymore. When using the expression "Trojan Horse", the reference is
more often than not, to something other than the actual Horse that sealed the fate of Troy.
12 Doederlein 1850 II:329; 1850 III:314.
13 Nordheider 1984:329; Pucci 1987:61
14 Finkelberg 1995(2007):24
15 De Jong 2003:103 and 207

Because of this ambiguity, there is not one general meaning. In some instances, it is clear that a trick is referred to, but that is not always the case. Some of the meanings seem to overlap with μῆτις and ἀπάτη. The translators of *Loeb Classical Library* translate the word by "wiles" or "cunning". Holmberg assumed that μῆτις was a form of deceit and that it was always a bad trait when used for women.[16] In a similar way, Dunkle assumed that πολύμητις "with many wiles, resourceful" and κερδαλεόφρων "out for personal gain", and that also μῆτις, δόλος and κέρδος were synonyms.[17]

The translations "wiles" and "cunning" obfuscate the distinction between δόλος, μῆτις and ἀπάτη. These words are not synonyms, however, because there are instances where μῆτις is perceived as δόλος, depending on the point of view.[18] The conflict between Antilokhos and Menelaos, the description of Penelope's weaving trick, the attempt by the suitors on Telemakhos' life, and the Kyklops episode indicate that the Greeks made some distinction between these different words.[19] Another clear example of the positive value of μῆτις can be seen in *Odyssey* 3,18. Athena advised Telemakhos to ask for Nestor's advice and added that he would not lie. She used the following words εἴδομεν ἥν τινα μῆτιν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κέκευθε "let us find out which advice he has kept hidden in his chest". The same applies for the derivative μητιόεις, as can be seen in φάρμακα μητιόεντα "healing, effective medicine".[20] Such a positive meanings for δόλος or the compound δολόεις cannot be found, and therefore the distinction between the two words should

---

16 Holmberg 1998:136
17 Dunkle 1987:1
18 Detienne-Vernant 1978:13. I thank Reyes Bertolín-Cebrián for pointing out that difference to me.
19 Detienne-Vernant treat this episode in the first chapter of their 1978 book.
20 For the meaning see LSJ sv and Ameis-Hentze on *Odyssey* 4,227 (also quoted in Bertolín-Cebrián 1996b:30). For a possible origin of the word group see Bertolín-Cebrián 1996b.

remain. I therefore excluded the translation "wiles, cunning"[21] and opted for the translations "snare, trap" if a reference was made to a concrete ambush. I used the translation "trick" if the passage referred to a concrete device and finally translated "guile" if the meaning was more abstract. It is, however, not always clear if the meaning is concrete or rather abstract, because δόλος sometimes refers to a concrete object and an abstract idea at the same time. The contrast between δόλος and μῆτις will become evident throughout the thesis, and I therefore argue that a distinction between the two words is necessary.

1.2. The frequency of the word δόλος.

An important remark is that there are more passages in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*.[22] It has been argued that this had to do with the different nature of both poems: the *Odyssey* is the poem of "wily Odysseus" and is as such opposed to the *Iliad* where the heroic fighting and helping friends are more important. This is only partly true, because also in the *Iliad* misleading dreams, tricks and unfair fighting are common (such as Agamemnon's dream, the *Doloneia*, Apollo's intervention against Patroklos, Athena's deception of Hektor, and Menelaos' defeat by unfair tricks in the chariot race during the funeral games for Patroklos). Personally, I am inclined to say that the difference in world view and mentality between *Iliad* and *Odyssey* cannot entirely be denied, but the many stories about cowardice, deceit and cunning in the *Epic Cycle*, indicate that this distinction might not have been that strict.

1.3. Why a study on δόλος?

21According to the OED online version (edition 1989) "cunning" has also received a negative meaning in contemporary English. Nevertheless, for the sake of clarity, I will not use that translation.
22 Nordheider 1984:329 "meist Odyssee"

There is no agreement among scholars about the use of δόλος. Many scholars have studied

the use of deceit and its gendered aspects, but the use of δόλος has been significantly less

analysed or has been left out in these discussions. Already in 1935 (when women's studies

were less prominent in Classics than they are now),[23] Luther stated that the heroes in the

Iliad were not willing to use lies or deceit, but that women and gods were different,[24] but

the concept of δόλος was not included in his work. Another example is the study of Pratt

who states that taking advantage of the enemies and using deceit to beat an opponent is

hardly ever questioned,[25] but she did not analyse the use of δόλος. Among scholars who

have studied δόλος, we can quote, for instance, Van Nortwick who stated that female

seduction was a special form of trickery and that the tricks used by Hermes and Odysseus

were mostly characteristic of women.[26] In a similar fashion, Holmberg argued that tricks

and deceit were related, that they were used by women and inferior male characters,[27] and

that they were bad.[28] She concluded that there was a gender division with the use of tricks

and deceit, but she focused, however, more on μῆτις than on δόλος and considered μῆτις

to be a bad trait.[29] Bergren and Jenkins stated that women possessed cunning, and were able

to use that trait for both good and bad purposes, but that the possibility of evil was

nevertheless not excluded even when they used cunning and tricks for the best.[30] By

contrast, it is generally assumed that trickery in battle is dishonourable and should be

---

23 For a good overview of women studies in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, see Katz 1992(2003).
24 Luther 1935:84-85
25 Pratt 1993:57
26 Van Nortwick 1980:2 and 5
27 Holmberg 1990
28 Holmberg 1990:224
29 Holmberg 1990 (especially her introduction), 1995, 1997 and 1998:136 for the recapitulation of her ideas.
30 Bergren 1983:70; Jenkins 1985:114; Holmberg 1997:3

avoided by the male warriors.[31] As such, it seems that the use of deceit, cunning and tricks was gendered, but that a detailed analysis of δόλος is missing. We will try to see if our analysis confirms this assumption.

A second assumption was that there was a link between deceit and tricks on the one hand, and survival on the other. Sometimes these two elements were combined, as the assumption was made by Luther, and especially Holmberg and Segal that weaker creatures and women necessarily had to use tricks to survive.[32] Holmberg 1990 expanded that assumption and argued that also Hephaistos, Prometheus and Odysseus had to resort to deceit and guile because of their inferior (and female) position. H.Parry followed that assumption for Odysseus.[33] Some of Odysseus' usage of δόλος could indeed be explained by the fact that he was in an inferior position. The same could be argued about Hephaistos. De Jong called this the "cunning versus force" motif.[34]

The survival and gender element did not apply to every instance, however. The Homeric poems included different instances of δόλος, and its use is not limited to one specific group: both men and women, heroes and lesser mortals, humans and gods used δόλος. As can be concluded from the overview, many modern scholars have left out the use of δόλος in their assessment and, consequently, there is not yet a detailed study available on the use of δόλος in Homer available (contrary to the one of μῆτις by Detienne-Vernant, which served as basis for Holmberg 1990).

---

31 Dobson 2003:146
32 Luther 1935:84-85; Segal ; Holmberg 1990 and her later works in 1995, 1997 and 1998.
33 H.Parry 1994:12-13
34 De Jong 2003:103 and 207

1.4. Methodology.

My approach is to analyse the passages by connecting or contrasting δόλος with other words. Δόλος is often used as the object of a verb or as a means to achieve something, either as sole means or in contrast with other methods. It is also connected with words indicating concrete activities or words of versatilty. As such, I have decided to analyse δόλος as object of verbs expressing mental actions, δόλος as an expression of versatility, the combination of words of concrete actions and δόλος, δόλος as a tool of secrecy, and finally death and dying as a result of δόλος. This distinction should make clear which actions are associated and which are contrasted with δόλος.

I decided to put the passages of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in the same chapter because this allows me to contrast the use in both poems, and determine if there is a difference in use between the poems, and how significant any difference might be. In the *Odyssey* the word δόλος appears 32 times, and in the *Iliad* only 11 times. Therefore I have started every chapter with the instances of the *Odyssey* followed by those of the *Iliad*. I arranged the passages thematically in order to analyse the repetitions and contrasts better. I will discuss who used δόλος, when s/he used it, what the motives were and how it was commented upon. I will also take a closer look at the role females play in the stories, because I would like to discuss the assumption (made by Luther, and especially Holmberg and Segal) that weaker creatures and women necessarily had to use tricks to survive.

It is my opinion that a thorough analysis can only be made if the context also is described and discussed. Therefore intertextual references, variants of the mythical stories and interpretations of the myths are included as well, but only to the extent that they shed

light on the meaning of δόλος and the motives of the character for using it. I only discuss

philological issues, textual problems, and the metrical position of the words when they have

an influence on the meaning.

This research could be expanded in a later stage to include the compounds of

δόλος. This thesis only refers to the compounds if their use provides an additional insight

into the use and meaning of δόλος. In a second phase, it could be widened to the entire

concept of deceit in the Homeric poems, other authors such as Hesiod and Parmenides, and

eventually even to stories of other Indo-European peoples to see who uses deceit and tricks

and if those who use it make use of the same tricks.[35]

---

35 I owe this reference to Professor Toohey, who pointed at the possibility to expand this research to many
Greek Archaic poets and philosophers.

Chapter 2. Verbs of a mental activity and δόλος.

This chapter will discuss the link of δόλος with verbs indicating a mental action. Two different types can be distinguished. The first discussion involves the verbs of "having in mind", because in that case the subject of the verb is also the "performer" and will therefore be the one who benefits from the action. The second discusses verbs meaning "suspect". For that category the opposite is true, as the subject of the verb is afraid that he might be confronted with δόλος, and is therefore the object of the action. This will allow us to form an opinion on who uses δόλος and which characters think that δόλος will be used against them. Females think about δόλος and as a result use δόλος against men, whereas male characters suspect that women will use δόλος against them. The female thinking of δόλος leads to actions which eventually achieve their objectives.

2.1. Verbs meaning "have in mind, think about" with δόλος.

In the first section of this chapter we will analyse the concept of "thinking about a trick". It will become clear that in the *Odyssey* this is a female action in response to a stronger opponent but eventually the female character prevails. The example of the *Iliad* is of a different nature, because the protagonist was Odysseus and he tried to obtain victory in the wrestling contest during the funeral games for Patroklos. It is noteworthy that he did not completely achieve his goal.

2.1.1. Examples.

We now proceed to the analysis of our examples. The first two examples discuss the tricks that were used by Penelope to keep the suitors away and avoid a remarriage. The first line comes from Antinoos and the second one from Amphimedon. Although the lines are almost identical, the context is completely different, and therefore the analysis is also different.

> ἡ δὲ δόλον τόνδ' ἄλλον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερμήριξεν (*Odyssey* 2,93)[36] "
> she on the other hand contrived in her mind another guileful act."

This verse comes from the speech of Antinoos, the leading suitor, who reacted to Telemakhos' complaint in front of the Ithakan assembly. Telemakhos called for an assembly meeting to accuse the suitors in public of misbehaving. Antinoos countered Telemakhos' arguments by saying that it was Penelope who actually cheated the suitors by giving them false hope. The phrase δόλον τόνδ' ἄλλον refers to the fact that she had been cheating the suitors already before she even thought of the shroud-trick.[37] As such, the weaving trick was the main argument in Antinoos' argument against Telemakhos' appeals for compassion of the Ithakan people. I will analyse the weaving and unravelling of the shroud when I analyse the passage where Penelope related the story herself (19,137). I would like to state for now that even at this stage the suitors were aware that Penelope was capable of defending herself and using different means if she needed to.

The story is not entirely positive, however. Until the discovery of the trick, the suitors had been behaving "rationally well", but upon finding out that they were fooled, they decided to organise large banquets in Odysseus' palace at his expense until Penelope

---

36 I quote from the Oxford Classical Texts by Monro-Allen, although its quality is not accepted by all (Janko 1990:332 *the worst text of the Iliad in print*; 1992:20-21; De Jong 2001:ix), and from the Concordance lists by Dunbar and Prendergast. Occasionally when readings differ, I refer to other editions as well. The *Bibliotheca Teubneriana* has a 1997 edition by West of the *Iliad*, and its *Odyssey* edition is made by Von der Mühll (1923 with a reprint in 1947). The West edition is at least as controversial as the one by Monro-Allen.
37 Merry 1876a:243; S. West 1988:138

took a decision on whom she wanted to marry.[38] As a result their threat became more

pressing afterwards because from then on they challenged not only Penelope, but also

Odysseus' estates and Telemakhos.

The use of the verb μερμήριξεν is remarkable, because usually this verb means to

"rush to something, (intransitive meaning) be worried" but here the meaning is almost the

opposite, because Penelope's trick was well thought out, it was not the first one that she had

invented and lasted for a long time (three years). Russo assumed an evolution in Homer's

use of verbs of "thinking" and thought that Homer might have experimented here, whereas

Bertolín-Cebrián assumed that the verb form μερμήριξεν was a metrical substitution for

an aorist form of the verb μήδομαι,[39] which could not be put in the fifth and sixth foot. Her

main argument against the innovation is the fact that this verb is almost non existent in later

Greek.[40] The only issue that there might be with the latter statement is that the verb appears

in very emotional moments. The phrase is repeated in the last book when the suitor

Amphimedon assumed that Penelope had devised a deliberate set-up. The verb was also

used by the suitors to mock Telemakhos' intention to travel to Pylos and Sparta. They

ridiculed him by saying ἦ μάλα Τηλέμαχος φόνον ἡμῖν μερμηρίζει ("Telemakhos

is definitely preparing our murder") with the same verb.[41] West remarked in her

commentary on this passage that in the *Odyssey* mocking statements by the suitors often

turn out to be true.[42] The fact that this verb is used in these almost predicting moments in

the poem, leads me to believe that Homer must have had more in mind than just a metrical

38 *Odyssey* 2,203-207; Marquardt 1985:33
39 Bertolín-Cebrián 1996a:163 *einen Fall von metrischem Ersatz.*
40 Bertolín-Cebrián 1996a:160-163, with reference to J. Russo, Homer aginst his tradition, *Arion* VII, 1968, pp. 275-295, and especially page 290 (non vidi).
41 *Odyssey* 2, 325
42 West 1988:151

substitution. The aorist refers to the fact that Penelope came up with the idea and as such, the action represents a single occurrence, in spite of the fact that this is one of the very few verses with a spondee in the fifth foot, which stresses Penelope's thoughtfulness on how to mislead the suitors.[43] The effects of the action, namely that the suitors will be fooled for nearly three years, indicate a continuous action and are therefore expressed in the imperfect, as can be seen in the analysis of 2,106.

<p style="text-align:center">ἀλλὰ δόλον τόνδ'ἄλλον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερμήριξεν (Odyssey 24,128)
"but instead she devised in her mind another cunning plan."</p>

The foregoing verse was pronounced by the ghost of the suitor Amphimedon. The last book of the *Odyssey* opened with Hermes leading the ghosts of the suitors into the Underworld, followed by a conversation between Akhilleus and Agamemnon, on how they both met their fate. Then they both expressed surprise when they saw the group of young men being transported into Hades. Agamemnon recognised Amphimedon, asked who the others were and what they had done. Amphimedon, who gave Agamemnon a place to stay when he came to enlist Odysseus into the Trojan expedition, related what had happened. After his explanation, Agamemnon praised Penelope's virtue because she did not prepare a baneful homecoming for Odysseus, contrary to what Klytaimnestra had done to him.

We will see that this verse is indeed almost the same as the first one, and as we will see later on, this is not the only verse from the complaint to Telemakhos that will be repeated. I believe that the repetitions are deliberate. The context, however, is completely different. In this verse the suitors had been killed by Odysseus during the bow contest, and consequently, Penelope had finally prevailed. The biggest surprise was the fact that

---

43 Goodwin 1876:11-12 and 16-17; Smyth 1956:429 *the action is regarded as an event or single fact without reference to the length of time it occupied.*

Odysseus had in fact returned and that he was able to kill them all during the bow contest. In the first line (2,93) the suitors were angry because of Penelope's constant false promises, but they expressed the most outrage over the trick with the shroud. At that time that was the biggest scheme that Penelope had come up with. In this instance, however, Penelope's biggest trick was the bow contest, and the shroud trick had become less important. The suitors assumed that Penelope had already recognised Odysseus and deliberately organised the contest on his demand because she wanted to plan their death.[44] As such, the use of the aorist in this instance points to the weaving trick as only one of the many schemes that Penelope used to keep the suitors away, besides the fact that it is one action as contrasted to its effects which lasted much longer.

On the issue of the (alleged) early recognition there is no agreement among scholars, although the majority assumes that Penelope only truly recognised Odysseus after the "bed trick".[45] There are indeed some instances where one might think that Penelope recognised him already, such as the dream interpretation, her telling of the trick with the shroud (cf. infra) and especially her insisting that the beggar be given a shot with the bow,[46] but I think that the poet intentionally created suspense and misdirection.[47] The issue will probably never be settled. It is very well possible that the suitors interpreted the situation differently after the fact and made connections that were not there, but it is remarkable how they failed to understand their own responsibility for the slaughter, and ascribed their

---

44 *Odyssey* 24, 165-167; Nieto-Hernández 2008:40 assumed that this was indeed a scheme of Penelope.
45 Foley 1995(2007):87,103; Schein 1996b:28-29; Felson-Rubin 1996:166; Barnouw 2004:338
46 Harsh 1950 with some convincing arguments; Combellack 1973b:37 with reference to Harsh 1950 and Amory-Parry; Ahl-Roisman 1996(2007):120 and recently Levaniouk 2008:25.
47 The issue of misdirection in the *Iliad* has been treated by Morrison 1992, who pointed out that in many instances the poet's intention was to question even the tradition in order to create more suspense. I do not know if such a research has been done for the *Odyssey*, but I think that Homer will probably have had the same intentions in the *Odyssey*.

demise to Penelope's evil mind and the hatred of the gods.[48] In that perspective they were of the same nature as Agamemnon who failed to see that his own behaviour might have caused Klytaimnestra's anger.[49] In any case, the reaction of the suitors to their murder (and actually also that of Agamemnon to his murder) shows that sometimes tricks were perceived in situations where personal responsibility was at least as important a factor as the trick that led to the demise.

These passages therefore show that female characters use δόλος as a reaction against a stronger opponent and that the female character who thinks about using δόλος will eventually prevail. The next fragment about Eidothea's advice to Menelaos on how to overpower her father Proteus, confirms both aspects.

πάντα δ'ἔσαν νεόδαρτα· δόλον δ'ἐπεμήδετο πατρί (*Odyssey* 4,437)
"they (the seals) were all recently flayed; she on the other hand was thinking about a trick against her father."

In this verse Menelaos was explaining to Telemakhos how he, Helen and their companions finally were able to arrive home after a long journey. Stranded in Egypt,[50] Menelaos was approached by Eidothea, Proteus' daughter, who wanted to know why he was staying in Egypt. He told her that he was kept there by the gods. As a consequence, she informed him and his men what they needed to do to continue their journey.[51] She told them that Proteus came out of the sea every day at noon to count his seals and then went to sleep. Eidothea advised Menelaos and three companions to disguise themselves as seals; she gave the seal

---

48 Heubeck 1992:376-377 (without mentioning the divine aspect); De Jong 2001:571
49 Felson-Rubin 1994:105
50 This can be an indication as to when the poems were composed and/or written down. S.West (1988:192) says that Greece and Egypt had close relations until the end of the Mycenaean period, and only started their contacts again in VII[a]. Scodel (2002:28) thinks these contacts started already to resurface in VIII[a].
51 The most thorough analysis of this passage is Buchan 2007(2004).

skins and ambrosia to be able to withstand the smell because she knew that otherwise they would not succeed. She told Menelaos that he needed to contain Proteus and keep him firmly held, regardless of the appearance he took. If they could do so, he would tell them what they needed to do to go home. The exact nature of the trick and how it was tricky, will be discussed in 4,453.

This verse is interesting because it shows that thinking about a trick was a female action, and that such an action usually prevailed, and also because the person who was relating the story, benefitted from the action. As such, this line is different from the other Odyssean examples. Another interesting feature is Eidothea's motivation. Homer described how she felt pity for Menelaos and therefore decided to help him and his men.[52] Menelaos was aware that challenging Proteus was difficult because he was a god, and therefore he asked her to take the initiative. She answered by outlining how he had to proceed. Menelaos' description indicates that she had been thinking about this for a while, as is shown by the imperfect ἐπεμήδετο, and an imperfect usually indicates a continuous action.[53] Not only the tense of the verb is interesting, also the semantics of it is remarkable, because the verbal root -μηδ- is almost always combined with words with a negative connotation.[54]

I would like to make two final remarks about the role of Menelaos in this story. Menelaos was usually considered to be inferior to other women, and especially to Helen, who would be responsible for his immortality.[55] That Eidothea helped him (and the

---

52 *Odyssey* 4,363-366
53 Smyth 1956:423-424, but see 427 for the difference that is not always observed.
54 Bertolín-Cebrián 1996a:211-218, and especially 213 *das erste, was einem in der Semantik vom μήδομαι auffällt, ist die fast ausschließliche Verwendung mit semantisch negativen Objekten.* (underlining is mine)
55 At this time in the story Menelaos himself was not aware of this, because he had not yet heard Proteus' predictions for the future.

expedition) to obtain the necessary information, seems to confirm this.[56] We have to point out, however, that, in spite of the fact that Eidothea approached him, it was still Menelaos who obtained the necessary information by asking her to think of a trap for her father.[57] Helen, on the other hand, was able to acquire the memory- and painkilling drug νηπενθές "no pain", but was unable to assist the expedition in any way. The way Menelaos wanted to achieve his goal, is even more remarkable. He asked Eidothea to use trickery. He used the words λόχον "ambush" and φράζευ "think about", which is a verb of "thinking".[58] This seems to indicate that the combination of "thinking of, having in mind" and "tricks" is a typical female occupation, and it also seems to indicate that men know that this is a female occupation. It is therefore striking that the only speaker who requested female tricks and benefitted from them, used such a strong negative term to describe the action.

The next example comes from the *Iliad* and is of a different nature. It relates how Odysseus tried to overpower Aias by using a trick during a wrestling contest. The first difference from the previous verses is that Odysseus was the character who thought of the trick and the second one is that he only succeeded partially.

> ὣς εἰπὼν ἀνάειρε· δόλου δ'οὐ λήθετ' 'Οδυσσεύς (*Iliad* 23,725)
> "and so he spoke and tried to lift him up, but Odysseus did not forget (to use) a trick"

After Patroklos died and Akhilleus killed Hektor, he organised funeral games. Homer described how there were chariot races, boxing, wrestling and running contests. When Akhilleus called for a wrestling contest, both Odysseus and Aias Telamonios came forward to compete. They were not able to make the other fall to the ground, and finally Aias

---

56 Doherty 1995(2007):60
57 *Odyssey* 4,395.
58 Bertolín-Cebrián 1996a:109-140

suggested that they would try to lift one another, and Aias made the first attempt, but did not succeed.[59] Odysseus, however, thought of a trick to win. He brought down Aias by knocking on his knee, tried to lift him up, succeeded in lifting him a little but not much, and then crooked his knee behind Aias', so that Aias could not lift Odysseus either. Akhilleus oversaw the fight, and decided that both of them had won.[60] Richardson argued that Akhilleus' intervention was intended to prevent Odysseus from winning by less than straightforward means. Aias and Akhilleus were very similar, and both detested Odysseus' constant use of tricks for personal gain.[61]

I considered adopting the translation "cunning" for δόλου[62] or the translation "(habitual) cunning",[63] because one could argue that the important point here was the fact that the strong Aias was not able to overcome the clever Odysseus. I decided not do that because the story talked about a very specific trick that Odysseus was about to use to try and overpower his opponent. Therefore, "trick" seemed a justifiable translation.

I included this example because "Odysseus did not forget" is a *litotes* for "Odysseus thought about/ had in mind". The verse might be a bit out of place and, compared to the other instances, it is indeed of a different nature. The other examples dealt with females who were thinking about how to change a very pressing situation. Penelope was confronted with more than a hundred suitors whom she had to keep away, and Eidothea needed to find a way for Menelaos to overpower Proteus. Both of them succeeded in the end. This story is

---

59 *Iliad* 23,719-720
60 *Iliad* 23,736
61 Richardson 1993:245-246.
62 Murray-Wyatt 1999 II:547
63 Chantraine-Goube 1972 on line 725; Richardson 1993:248

similar because Aias is physically superior to Odysseus.[64] It is, on the other hand, different

from the Odyssean examples because Odysseus' intention was to obtain personal gain. A

second remark is that the trick only worked to a certain extent. I think it is not a

coincidence that Aias Telamonios was the opponent whom Odysseus could not completely

overpower because they would have another fight over the weapons of Akhilleus. Odysseus

obtained them and Aias felt so wronged that he still refused to talk to Odysseus during his

descent into the Underworld. As such, the story seems to foretell that Odysseus' behaviour

sometimes had negative consequences even for Odysseus.

2.1.2. Conclusion: verbs meaning "have in mind, think about" and δόλος.

It is remarkable that the Odyssean instances refer to female characters, who are faced with

stronger opponents (Penelope with the suitors, and Eidothea with her father). The motives

of the use of the trick is, however, different. Eidothea came up with the trick out of

compassion with Menelaos and because he specifically asked her to do so. Penelope's

actions, on the other hand, were meant to defend her against the suitors. She devised her

own tricks against the suitors, because she was not willing to remarry and tried almost

everything to avoid it.[65]

There is also a difference in the usage of the verbal tenses. Penelope's trick with the

shroud is described with an aorist, whereas for Eidothea's trick an imperfect was used, and

as such these actions were described as the result of long and deliberate thought processes.

---

64 The audience reacted with surprise when Odysseus succeeded in bringing Aias down. Aias' physical
superiority will become obvious during the fight over Akhilleus' weapons. Odysseus cheated Aias and he
became so enraged that Athena had to blind his senses so that he killed sheep and flogged a ram instead of
killing the Greek leaders and whipping Odysseus. This is not related in the *Iliad*, but the story is alluded to in
the *Odyssey*.
65 When she was talking to the stranger, the disguised Odysseus, she said that after the shroud trick she had
run out of tricks and defences and that she probably had to remarry. See *Odyssey* 19,157-158.

This is also remarkable because Penelope is described as having fooled the suitors for a very long time, whereas Eidothea only used one trick against her father. It has to be pointed out that there was not always a clear cut difference between aorist and imperfect in Greek poetry and prose. The aorist used by the suitors to attack Penelope's untrustworthiness could be explained to stress the action itself, namely that she contrived (yet) another trick whereas the imperfect of Eidothea's trick could be interpreted as an indication of her long thoughts about it. Penelope herself described the trick as a sudden (divine) intervention.[66]

The Iliadic instance is of a different nature, because Odysseus is the main protagonist. On the other hand, he was also confronted with a stronger opponent. He succeeded in neutralising Aias but he could not beat him, and as a consequence, he could not obtain a full victory. As such, this story is remarkable because it involves a trick by Odysseus that failed to accomplish all its objectives.

2.2. δόλος as object of verbs meaning "suspect".

In the following section of this chapter I analyse the examples where verbs of "suspecting" are combined with δόλος. As will become clear, the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* agree on the fact that suspicion of a trick is a male characteristic. This does not mean that every man who will be tricked is aware of it, but even in that situation the man is described as "not suspecting the trick", as will become clear in the case of Proteus in the *Odyssey* and the shepherds in the *Iliad*. The examples of the *Odyssey* all are expressed by the same verb, οἴομαι, which means "think", but with an undertone of suspicion.[67]

---

66 *Odyssey* 19,138: the verbal form is ἐνέπνευσε, "blew into me (the idea)". This is an aorist and indicates the sudden change.
67 Ameis-Hentze 1908:116; Bornemann 1958:18

2.2.1. Examples.

We now proceed to the individual examples. We have one example where it is said that Proteus did not suspect the trick. Then we have three examples that deal wih Kirke and her trap. The last example comes from the *Iliad* and describes how two shepherds ran into an ambush without suspecting anything. The first verse relates how Menelaos succeeded in overpowering Proteus after he had received vital information from Eidothea. Eidothea's motives have already been discussed, but the exact nature of the trick and Proteus' reaction have not.

ὠίσθη δόλον εἶναι ἔπειτα δὲ λέκτο καὶ αὐτός (*Odyssey* 4,453)
"(in his mind) he did (not) think that there was a trick, and then he laid/counted himself down as well."

Menelaos and three companions were lying in wait for Proteus to come out of the sea and count his seals. The trick in this story lies in the way Proteus counted his seals.[68] Eidothea told Menelaos that he did not count them in a single numeric way but in multiples of five.[69] Menelaos and his three companions made up only four, so one seal seemed to be missing when Proteus counted them. Despite being confronted with the fact that one seal was apparently missing, Proteus did not suspect any treachery and counted himself. The Greek λέκτο can mean "he laid himself down"[70] but also "he counted himself", since the form λέκτο can come from the root λεγ "to tell, to count", but also from λεχ "to lie down".[71] The noun λόχος from that last root can also mean "ambush". This may well be a clever

---

68 Buchan 2007(2004):198-199
69 *Odyssey* 4,412
70 The English form is actually related to the Greek one. The root is PIE *leg^h, which is still visible in Old-English *liggan*. One can refer to the etymological dictionaries of Boisacq, Chantraine, Frisk and the *OED* under the heading *lie*.
71 Merry 1876a:270; S.West 1988:221; Buchan 2007 (2004):203

pun, but unfortunately it cannot be conveyed in English, although not all scholars agree that there was a pun intended here.[72]

More controversial is the question of what the actual meaning of the trick was and how it could be that the trick eventually worked, but most commentaries pass over that question.[73] The situation must have been that Proteus usually did <u>not</u> count himself; if he did, the trick would not have worked. The basis of the trick then lies in the counting in multiples of five and the "self-counting" by Proteus. The meaning seem to be that Proteus was unaware that there was a world outside his own with different methods of viewing the world. Proteus' counting system seems to indicate that, but also his assumption that there could not be anything missing. When he noticed that there was a seal missing, he looked for a way to make up for the missing one instead of suspecting that something was out of order.[74]

This verse uses the words "suspecting a trick" for a male character and illustrates that if a male character is not "suspecting a trick", he is not able to avoid the trick. As such, it contrasts with the following examples. The next two verses describe how Eurylokhos and Odysseus were aware that there was a hidden threat on the island Aiaie. They suspected that the cave where the nymph Kirke lived was somehow trapped. As a result, they proceeded with caution. This is different from Proteus who was completely unaware of the fact that he could be challenged. I will deal with these two instances (10,232 and 10,258) at once, because they came from the same situation.

---

72 Stanford 1959:281
73 Merry, Stanford, and S. West do not address the issue as to why the trick works with <u>four</u> men disguised as seals.
74 Buchan 2004 (2007)

Εὐρύλοχος δ'ὑπέμεινεν, ὀισάμενος δόλον εἶναι (*Odyssey* 10,232)
"Eurylokhos remained behind because he suspected there was a snare."

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ὑπέμεινα, ὀισάμενος δόλον εἶναι (*Odyssey* 10,258)
"but I stayed behind, because I suspected that there was a snare."

After Odysseus and his men arrived on the island of Aiaie, they decided to divide themselves in two groups. One group needed to check out the island while the others would remain behind. It was decided by lot that the group led by Eurylokhos would go on the mission. They arrived at a cave and were curious who or what was inside it. The verse states that Eurylokhos remained behind, and did not enter the cave, and explains why he did so. Kirke lured the men in and turned them into pigs. Eurylokhos saw what had happened and went back to the shore. There he told everything to Odysseus and the remaining men, and suggested they sail away and leave the men behind.[75] After finding out about the spell, Odysseus decided to find out what happened. Similar in both instances is that the male protagonist suspected the trick, and was able to avoid its destructive effects. In addition, both passages have the same female character who was preparing the snare. The meaning of δόλος is clearly concrete, and as such, the translation "guile" is excluded, but I feel that "trick" is not suited either, so I decided to adopt the translation "snare", as was done by Ameis-Hentze and the Loeb edition.[76]

The differences between the passages are that both men avoided destruction in a different manner and that they had different opinions on their fellow men, who were tricked. Eurylokhos survived by not entering the cave, whereas Odysseus was given an antidote by Hermes to stop the effects of Kirke's magic. The phrase is almost a verbal echo

---

75 Myres 1952:5; Page 1973:51-52; Olson 1995(2007):4; De Jong 2001:255
76 Ameis-Hentze 1908:116

of the previous instance, and I think that the poet intended this, because of two reasons. First of all, the risk was still present because Eurylokhos informed Odysseus about what happened, and Odysseus did not yet know how to counter the tricks and witchcraft of Kirke. Secondly, I believe that the echo points to a comparison between Eurylokhos' and Odysseus' character. Homer wanted to contrast both men here, by repeating the line almost entirely, because Eurylokhos survived the sorceress, and was challenging Odysseus' authority but would prove to be the cause of his men's death. The trick is not something concrete in the sense of the Trojan Horse or the weaving of the shroud, but it is a threat of magic. As such, it is something against which humans could not defend themselves. It is therefore interesting that the action is performed by a female character, because this leads to intrinsic distrust of female characters. This is confirmed by the epithet δολόεσσα "full of tricks, guileful" that Kirke (and also Kalypso) received,[77] and also by the word πολυφαρμάκου "full of poisons" that Homer used for her.[78] Hermes warned Odysseus that Kirke would poison his food. This indicates that Kirke wanted to harm Odysseus when he was her guest because inviting someone to eat was usually a sign of hospitality, and guests were not supposed to be harmed. He gave him an antidote to her poison, and advised him to attack her with his sword once she begged him to sleep with him. Then he had to make her swear an oath that she would not harm him. As such, this line indicates that a certain female δόλος can only be overcome by divine intervention and force. I therefore do not think it is a coincidence that Hermes also is the one who admonished Kalypso to let Odysseus go, because she was also called δολόεσσα, and therefore Odysseus needed help from a god to

---

77 For Kirke see *Odyssey* 7,245; for Kalypso see *Odyssey* 9,245.
78 *Odyssey* 10,276

overcome that danger. We therefore see here that certain forms of female δόλος are so strong that the cannot be fought by humans alone. Therefore it confirms the fact that the use of δόλος is sometimes gendered, and that female δόλος is considered to be dangerous.

The following verse continues to describe how Odysseus distrusted Kirke. When he entered the cave, he acted in accordance with Hermes' advice. As a result she swore the oath not to harm him, and offered him food, but he remained silent. Kirke did not know why he was so reluctant to eat, and asked him if he was suspicious of something.

ἦ τινά που δόλον ἄλλον ὀίεαι; οὐδέ τί σε χρή (*Odyssey* 10,380)
"Do you think there is some other trick involved? You do not need to (fear)."

He answered that he was mourning for his friends who had become pigs.[79] He told the goddess that he would only eat if she freed his men from their enchantment. This is another indication that Odysseus did in fact care about the well being of his companions, and that he was not always solely looking for his own profit.

It is also a very revealing passage about the use of δόλος by female characters. It is quite remarkable that these words were pronounced by Kirke who apparently perceived that Odysseus distrusted her. She was the perpetrator of the initial snare, but at this moment she was already bound by the oath that she had sworn, and yet Odysseus was still cautious. This is another indication that female δόλος cannot be trusted. There was a similar reaction when Odysseus was told by Kalypso that he could leave: he asked her to swear that she was not fooling him.[80]

---

79 De Jong 2001:263
80 *Odyssey* 5,171-179

The verse is built with a strong enjambement towards the next verse. The most important word in this sentence is δείδιμεν "to fear", which appears in the next verse. The metre shows the distinction between the two sentences, because the new sentence starts after the bucolic diaeresis, which is the strongest pause. One other pause could be put after δόλον because this stresses the fact that Kirke thought that Odysseus might have suspected yet another trick on her part.

The next verse comes from the *Iliad* and is of a different nature, as it does not describe any real or mythical event. The verse described Akhilleus' shield. After Patroklos was slain, Hektor took Akhilleus' armour, and therefore Akhilleus needed a new one. He asked his mother and she begged Hephaistos to assemble a new shield and armour.

τερπόμενοι σύριγξι· δόλον δ'οὔ τι προνόησαν (*Iliad* 18,526)
"(two shepherds followed) while enjoying the pipes, but they did not observe the snare in any way."

This scene described some scouts going on a mission to check out a city they were besieging, and referred to two different elements: the cattle hunt and the sending out of scouts to explore enemy territory. On their way, they came across two shepherds, whom they attacked. The noise of the attack alarmed other soldiers and a fight ensued. The exploration reminds us of the *Doloneia*, in which Diomedes and Odysseus embarked on a secret expedition against Troy, and killed Dolon during their tour.[81] The verse in addition to the *Doloneia* could therefore be used as an illustration that even in the *Iliad* warfare had to encompass a certain amount of tricks and spying. This verse uses δόλος in the meaning

---

81 *Iliad* 10,447-464

"snare".[82] I think this meaning is more suited than just "trick" because the word is used in a military context.

This verse fits in the schema because the characters who suspect the tricks (or in this case, do not suspect nor expect the trick) are male. As such, the verse seems to confirm the division that contriving a trick is a female trait, but suspecting one is a male characteristic. A second characteristic is that if a male character does not suspect a trick, he is powerless against it. The trick against Proteus proved this, and so did the stories of Agamemnon, the Kyklops and the suitors.

2.2.2. Conclusion: δόλος as object of verbs meaning "suspect".

The first thing that can be observed is that all the verses refer to men. The second observation is that all these men faced danger from a woman. Proteus was not aware of the danger because he did not know that his daughter was helping Menelaos. Odysseus and Eurylokhos on the other hand felt that Kirke's cave was a dangerous place. Odysseus even gave the impression of being suspicious after Kirke had already sworn the oath not to harm him. Another thing we notice is that the only one who is able to neutralise female δόλος completely is Odysseus but only when he received divine help. As such, it seems that male characters were justified in their fear of female δόλος. The Iliadic example is of a somewhat different nature, because it came from the description of the Hephaistean Shield for Akhilleus. As such, it did not refer to a real event in the Trojan War but rather talked about a siege of a unspecified city where shepherds were tending ther cattle and were ambushed by scouts of the enemy. This seems to allude to the fact that any war needed

---

82 Ameis-Hentze 1908:141 state that in this verse δόλος is a synonym of λόχος.

some amount of spying and ambush.[83] Nevertheless, it confirmed the division because the activity of "suspecting the trick", albeit in its negative form, is still assigned to male persons.

2.3. Conclusion: verbs indicating a mental activity and δόλος.

The Odyssean examples of thinking about (using) δόλος, refer to two different situations, the shroud trick of Penelope and the plot of Eidothea against her father. The first two examples describe how Penelope thought of the trick with the shroud. She was able to fool the suitors for three years. The first instance comes from Antilokhos' reaction to Telemakhos' complaint. He used it to point at Penelope's own responsibility for the suitors' behaviour, because after the shroud trick, the suitors decided to start wasting Odysseus' estate until Penelope married a suitor. It seemed therefore that Penelope's trick had the opposite effect. The second example comes from the explanation by the dead suitor Amphimedon about what happened to the suitors. He enumerated all Penelope's tricks, but at that moment the shroud trick was no longer her most guileful act. The suitors thought that Penelope had organised the bow contest to allow Odysseus to kill them, and consequently, Penelope prevailed. The other example is about Eidothea's long thinking to find a trick to mislead her father Proteus and allow Menelaos to overpower him, so that he could obtain the necessary information to go home. Her trick accomplished its objectives. Three important things should be remarked. First, all three Odyssean examples refer to female characters who are thinking about a trick. Secondly, these three examples are related

---

83 It has been argued since Simone Weil that especially this passage and the passage about the mourning of Hektor indicate that the *Iliad* was actually an anti-war poem.

by men, which seems to indicate that men distrust women. Thirdly, the female characters eventually prevailed.

The Iliadic example of δόλος and "having in mind" is of a somewhat different nature, as it does not refer to a real threat. It is, however, still revealing that even in funeral games Odysseus was willing to use his tricks in order to achieve his goals. Akhilleus intervened, however, and proclaimed both men to be winners. As a consequence, Odysseus only succeeded in part, because he had to share the first prize with Aias. It is remarkable that this is one of the few instances where an Odyssean trick failed to achieve all its objectives.

The category "suspecting a trick" had five examples, from which four can be found in the *Odyssey*. Three examples of "suspecting" a trick involve male characters who were afraid that they might become the victim of a trick whereas the two others did not foresee the danger. The four Odyssean examples can be catalogued into two categories. The first one involved Proteus' lack on insight into the possible danger of a trick. As such, he did not suspect anything and counted himself as a seal. By doing so, he encountered the limitations of his own world and was overpowered by someone from the new world. The other three examples refer to the Kirke episode. Both Odysseus and Eurylokhos suspected that there could be a trap somewhere, and therefore acted with caution. Kirke put a spell on Odysseus' men and turned them into swine. Eurylokhos ran away but Odysseus was able to overcome the danger by help of a god, Hermes, who gave him an antidote and told him that he had to make her swear not to harm him. Even after that oath, Odysseus was still cautious, and refused to eat with her. This reluctance led Kirke to ask if Odysseus was wary of something. He told her that he could not eat while his men were still swine. This story

proved that men needed to distrust women in order to survive and that they could only overcome female tricks if they were aware of them. If one was not aware of the possibility of a female trick, he was lost as was proved by the stories of Proteus, Agamemnon (as we will see later), Odysseus' men and the suitors.

The Iliadic example came from the description of the Hephaistean Shield for Akhilleus. The story described how two shepherds were tending their cattle and were ambushed by scouts of the enemy. This story did not refer to any specific event in the *Iliad* although the similarity in theme to the *Doloneia* is striking. In addition, it combined the use of "suspecting a trick" with male characters.

One can therefore ask the question if thinking about (using) δόλος, is a female trait, and suspecting one is more specific for men. This could indicate that the use of δόλος is indeed a female trait and that it was also perceived by men to be that way. The fact that the verses about "having δόλος in mind" are all pronounced by men seems to confirm this. Antinoos accused Penelope of deliberately misleading him and the other suitors. The verse about Eidothea appears to be a bit different because Menelaos related the story. Upon a closer look, however, the story confirms the division that thinking and devising tricks is a female trait. Menelaos specifically asked Eidothea to set up a trap for her father. The examples also show that the female δόλος is very strong. Odysseus is the only one who succeeded in overcoming it, and he could only do so because of divine intervention, violence and an oath. Even after he had secured his safety by the oath, he still remained cautious, which led Kirke to think that Odysseus suspected yet another trick.

This apparent gender-based division seems to be somewhat tempered by the fact that in the description of Klytaimnestra and Aigisthos, the word δολόμητις is only used once for her but five times for him, although the word is a compound of δόλος and a word of "thinking". The same applies to the adjective δόλιος and the verb φράζομαι. Aigisthos was often (more than Klytaimnestra) depicted as "thinking about the trick, devising a tricky scheme", as can be seen in verses like αὐτίκα δ' Αἴγισθος δολίην ἐφράσσατο τέχνην "and immediately Aigisthos devised a tricky scheme"[84] or Αἴγισθος ἐμήσατο οἴκοθι λυγρά "Aigisthos devised baneful things at home".[85] Unfortunately, the analysis of the compounds falls outside the scope of this thesis, but they seem to nuance the black and white distinction between man and woman, and they also give the impression that not all the blame can be put on Klytaimnestra. On the other hand, one has to point out that Proteus' resistance against Menelaos' attack is described by βάλλομεν οὐδ' ὁ γέρων δολίης ἐπελήθετο τέχνης "(around him) we threw (our hands), but the old man did not forget his guileful craft".[86] It seems that δολίη τέχνη is subordinate to female δόλος. Proteus could not resist Menelaos because Menelaos had received the help from a female character who had devised the δόλος. Aigisthos on the other hand was supported by the δόλος of Klytaimnestra, and therefore his evil plans achieved their goal. If this assessment is true, it would be a powerful argument for the existence of a gender division. The exact goals of mentioning Klytaimnestra and Aigisthos depend on the person speaking and that discussion have to be left for another study.[87]

---

84 *Odyssey* 4,529
85 *Odyssey* 3,303. See also Bertolín-Cebrián 1996a:214.
86 *Odyssey* 4,455
87 It would be interesting to analyse the use of δολόμητις, and see how Klytaimnestra and Aigisthos are generally depicted. It is noteworthy that the *Odyssey* never mentioned what Klytaimnestra's motives were and

The analysis of verbs indicating a mental activity and δόλος points at a gendered use of δόλος in the Homeric poems. Women are described as contriving the schemes, whereas the word is used for men when they perceive a female threat and as such, this usage seems to indicate that female thinking was distrusted by men. When a female character thinks about (using) δόλος, she prevails. In addition, the word is often related with gender inversion in both directions when it comes to actually acting on the trick (as we will see in the following chapters). This could be of interest to gender studies with regards to the differences between men and women in (poetic) language.[88] This is also important,

she was never considered by the gods to be the instigator of evil. Hermes was sent to Aigisthos to warn him about not seducing Klytaimnestra.

88 The study of a female language and poetics is not new. For a general assessment on the studies in female language see Kramer-Thorne-Henley 1978. For an analysis of a female non-classical writer see Feit Diehl 1978. Pomeroy 1991c is a good overview of the evolution until 1990 with an extensive bibliography. In recent times the study of female writers, female language and the role of female characters in literature has become more developed. The Homeric poems have also been treated, as can be seen by the articles in Bertolín-Cebrián 2008a (thematic volume of *Phoenix* which contained the presentations of a colloquium of female Homerists called *Penelope's Revenge*). I refer to Clayton 2008, Fletcher 2008, Nieto-Hernández 2008 (who actually argued that Penelope was underrepresented in the *Odyssey* and as such, called her article *Penelope's absent song* -underlining is mine), Bertolín Cebrián 2008c (gendered use of the loom and mast), and Levaniouk 2008. Already before the thematic *Phoenix* volume studies into the gender aspect of Homer and other Greek poets had been performed. I refer to Bowra, C. "Erinna's Lament for Baucis." In *Problems in Greek Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953. 151-163 (for Erinna-non vidi- I owe this reference to my fellow student Crystal Dean), Lefkowitz 1973, Hallet 1979, McIntosh Snyder 1991 (for Sappho), Skinner 1991 (for Nossis who lived in IVᵃ-IIIᵃ and had the very conspicuous adjective θηλύγλωσσος "speaking only to women"), and Rayor 1993 (for Korinna). Sappho received a lot of attention, but that was not only because of her poetic skills or difficult language. The study of her as a writer has also been instrumental in the study of gay and lesbian studies, although the exact nature of her sexual orientation will never be known, and is in my opinion actually irrelevant. This should actualy not matter, but it unfortunately does, as can be seen in Devereux 1970 (who argued that she had some kind of gay anxiety attack) an the reaction to that by Marcovich 1972. Recently Sappho is also being appreciated for her literary capacities (Lefkowitz 1973, McIntosh-Snyder 1991:17). Athena's gendered (or rather ungendered) role has been treated in Strauss-Clay 1984 and commented upon in Cantarella 1983:28, who argued that she was the only powerful goddess because she was a non-woman. Holmberg also treated gender extensively: Holmberg 1990 dealt with women and deceit, and Holmberg 1998 with female μῆτις in Apollonios. Pomeroy 1975 and Cantarella 1983 are general works on the position of women, but with completely different views on their position in Antiquity, particularly in Homeric society (Pomeroy's book was met with some skepticism as the following rather controversial quote from one reviewer, the male scholar Baldson, proves: *Perhaps one day, after whatever series of cataclysms, man will regain his one- time equality and somebody will write a book about Man in the Ancient World- not, it is to be hoped, with the title, Gods, Pimps, Rapists, Husbands and Slaves*. Part of this criticism was caused by the fact that Baldson was the only scholar who had written an extensive book on women until 1975. Nash, a female reviewer of Pomeroy, pointed that out, but nevertheless, she was also sharp: *Pomeroy's book is of mixed merit. At best it is a good narrative from the sources; at worst, notably in the Hellenistic and Roman sections, it shows little sign of original work on the evidence. It is neither*

because the poet of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* was a man,[89] because it has been argued that female writers use a different poetic lexicon. It is important to note that in this respect the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* display the same treatment of δόλος.

---

scholarly nor well argued enough to be a satisfactory textbook for students. Because it fails to transcend the limitations of its predecessors it is too unreliable for the general reader interested in this aspect of the history of women - though doubtless it will be used and cited for this purpose.). A short assessment of the mythological evidence for the position of the Greek women is Walcot 1984. I can refer for a general study on women in Antiquity to Fletcher 2008. Doherty 2008 discusses the relationship between poems and the gender-ideological constructions (for the *Odyssey*) and to Green 2005 for a collection of studies on female writers in Antiquity. Lefkowitz 1983b takes a look at some gender inversions, particularly Antigone.

89 The author does not subscribe to the thesis of Butler that the poet of the *Odyssey* was a woman (and in particular Nausikaa). Clayton 2008:109-110 nevertheless argues that Butler's thesis is a good starting point for a female look at the Homeric poems.

Chapter 3. Versatility and δόλος.

Versatility is used in the following meaning from the *Oxford English Dictionary*: *The faculty or character of turning or being able to turn readily to a new subject or occupation, esp. of an intellectual nature; facility in taking up varied pursuits or tasks with some success or distinction; many-sidedness.*[90]

This chapter will look if there are uses of δόλος that can be analysed from the perspective of a character's many-sidedness. We think that there are ten instances where an character based analysis can be provided for the use of δόλος. There are nine instances where a character's use of δόλος is a result of his intellectual nature. Eight of the ten instances refer to the use of δόλος as specific traits of Odysseus, who has the epithets πολύμητις "of many wiles", πολύτροπος "of many turns" and πολυμήχανος "inventive, resourceful, clever". The other example is pronounced by Odysseus when he described his dealings with Kirke, and related her trick in contrast or as a consequence of her πολυμηχανίη. One example does not refer to a character per se, but is used to contrast the Greeks' lack of resourcefulness with Odysseus' abundant resourcefulness and use of guile.

There are six instances of a combination of δόλος and the root παν-, one of δόλος and πολυμηχανίη "resourcefulness", one of δόλος and κεκασμένε "well known", two instances of δόλος and ἇτ' "insatiable". These last three instances display the extreme manifestation of versatility: not only is the character able to turn readily and take on various

---

90 Oxford English Dictionary, online version under the word *versatility*, meaning 2, a, b and c. (2nd edition, 1989)

pursuits, he feels the need to act like that all the time and is known for that doing so at many occasions. As such, in two of those three examples the extreme version is considered a clear insult. Nine instances display the noun in the plural, and they all revolve around Odysseus, and his famous accomplishments. As a consequence, these instances refer to more than just the two events for which Odysseus was most famous, namely the Trojan Horse and the blinding of the Kyklops. The most striking fact is that there is no difference between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Another remarkable fact is that with one exception, all the sentences were pronounced by characters who knew Odysseus well and who showed in both poems that they too were clever and sometimes used questionable schemes to accomplish deeds. Therefore, these depictions give a thorough insight into how others perceived Odysseus. There is only one apparent exception, but the fact that even Sokos (a minor Trojan fighter) knew Odysseus' most conspicuous trait, is an indication of Odysseus' reputation for tricks. Odysseus himself also knew that he was a constant cause of trouble, because when he used πᾶς and δόλος, there were problems for the people involved.

There is one instance where the versatility did not apply to Odysseus. Odysseus described Kirke in the same terms in which he was described by the poet. This indicates that Kirke had the same intellectual prowess as he. This is not a coincidence because after her initial threat to him, she became his most important ally and gave him the information on how to enter Hades, how to interpret Teiresias' predictions and how to act against the Sirens and Skylla and Kharybdis. As such, Odysseus described her, although in only one verse, with the same words with which he himself was described.

The conclusion of this chapter is that Odysseus was generally considered the king of tricks but that depiction was not entirely positive, as there were two examples (one from the

Iliad and one from the *Odyssey*) where his ability to use of δόλος at almost any occasion

was criticised. In addition, his use of tricks brought him much fame but it also brought to

him and his men many troublesome situations.

3.1. Examples.

The first two examples come from Nestor's description of Odysseus in response to

Telemakhos' questions. In the first book of the Odyssey, Athena urged Telemakhos to go to

Pylos and Sparta, in order to obtain vital information on his father and his whereabouts. He

first arrived in Pylos to seek information. Nestor started describing Odysseus' character, his

traits, and what happened in Troy.

παντοίοισι δόλοισι, μόγις δ' ἐτέλεσσε Κρονίων (*Odyssey* 3,119)
(for nine years we were busy putting together evil against them) with all kinds of tricks, but
the Son of Kronos hardly made it happen.

παντοίοισι δόλοισι, πατὴρ τεὸς εἰ ἐτεόν γε (*Odyssey* 3,122)
"(Odysseus was far superior (to all)) in all kinds of tricks, your father, if in truth (you are
his offspring)."

I will treat both instances together, as they belong to the same context. The formula

παντοίοισι δόλοισι is repeated in both verses, but the context is different. Scholars have

pointed out that these verses were not very well written, and that a logical sequence was

missing. Stanford thought that the mere reference of δόλοισι made Nestor think about

Odysseus and caused him to switch the topic to Odysseus.[91] West's assessment of how the

verses were written was negative because she considered the repetition of παντοίοισι

---

91 Stanford 1959:253-254

δόλοισι *clumsy* and was surprised that the formula παντοίοισι δόλοισι was used for the Greeks, because that usually referred to Odysseus' actions.[92] The first passage (3,119) talked about the fruitless efforts of the Greeks in conquering Troy whereas the second passage described Odysseus as the "champion of tricks". It is remarkable that the Greek efforts to take the city are described as tricks, because we do not have any information on that in the tradition. In the second instance, Nestor switched to Odysseus and repeated the same formula to stress Odysseus' superiority when it came to tricks. By describing the vain attempts to take Troy in the same terms as Odysseus' superiority in tricks, Nestor might have alluded to the fact that it was actually Odysseus who brought down the city. De Jong mentioned the contrast between the two verses, but assumed that the next part of the verse meant that Zeus eventually finished off the city,[93] but that is not exactly what the Greek said, because its states that Zeus actually made the capture very hard.[94] Given the fact that the *Odyssey* often used verbal repetitions to stress or contrast different actions or persons, I think that these lines might have been intended to stress Odysseus' tricks and the Horse. Nestor is one of the characters who assumed that they knew Odysseus well and considered themselves to be of equal intelligence.[95] As such, he fits within the general scheme in the *Odyssey* that Odysseus' versatility is commented upon by people who shared his opinions and considered themselves of the same calibre. We will see later that also the Iliadic Nestor had many traits similar to Odysseus'.

---

92 S.West 1988:167
93 De Jong 2001:74
94 LSJ states that μόγις means "with a lot of problem, (hence) scarcely, hardly".
95 De Jong 2001:77, with reference to *Odyssey* 3,128 where Nestor used the dual to describe their equalmindedness and equal intelligence.

When the blind singer Demodokos started to sing at the court of the Phaiakians about how Odysseus was able to conquer Troy with the Trojan Horse, Odysseus began to cry. Nobody noticed his tears, except king Alkinoos. He then asked why he cried and who he was. Odysseus answered by these verses.

εἴμ' Ὀδυσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν (*Odyssey* 9,19)
I am Odysseus son of Laertes, who with all (kind of) tricks (am well known to mankind)."

This verse is remarkable because of the enjambement and the meaning. The verse is incomplete and is marked by the unusual position of the verbal form εἴμ' "I am", which receives strong emphasis as a result of its position.[96] The verse has a strong enjambement into the next verse (ἀνθρώποισι μέλω). In addition, it is ambiguous, because the dative πᾶσι "all" (dative plural) could go with δόλοισιν (tricks) and ἀνθρώποισι (men, mankind).[97] Depending on the connection, the meaning changes: "to all men"[98] or "with all my tricks".[99] It can be argued that since πᾶσι stands before δόλοισιν, it is probably to be linked with δόλοισιν, but there is no absolute certainty about that. In addition, the verb μέλω is also ambiguous, because it can mean "I am renowned"[100] but also "I cause trouble".[101] This element is probably deliberate on part of Odysseus[102] and the poet to present it this way, because Odysseus knew all kinds of tricks he could use and he used

---

96 Ameis-Hentze 1908:66
97 Segal 1983 (1988):131-132; Peradotto 1990: 141-142
98 Lynn-George 1996:20; the Loeb uses this interpretation as well.
99 This is the opinion of Ameis-Hentze 1908:66.
100 This is the meaning LSJ, Merry 1876a:313 and Ameis-Hentze 1908:66 assign to the word. See also Strauss-Clay 1983:107.
101 Segal 1983(1988):131-132; Peradotto 1990:141-142
102 Segal 1983(1988):131-132; Morrison 2003:90

them indeed against humans and gods. Therefore, he was renowned but also a cause of trouble for them. This double ambiguity was probably intentional.

An important element in Odysseus' presentation is that he introduced himself as the man of all tricks, and not as the sacker of cities. Barnouw thought that δόλοισιν referred to the Trojan Horse,[103] whereas De Jong thought that Odysseus presented himself as the specialist in tricks because of Demodokos' story about the Horse.[104] Odysseus' presentation has been used to indicate that the *Odyssey* had a different world view than the *Iliad*.[105] That statement cannot be defended, however, because, as we will see later on, the same description of Odysseus also appeared in the two Iliadic examples. The fact that the *Iliad* depicted Odysseus in a similar way seems to argue against Barnouw's suggestion that the word δόλοισιν in this verse refers to the Trojan Horse. A second important element is that, in contrast to many other instances (encounter with Athena, initial encounter with the Kyklops, first encounter with Penelope),[106] Odysseus portrayed himself in these verses as the person who he really was. He therefore told of his wanderings and stressed his miserable conditions because he wanted the Phaiakians to grant him a convoy to reach his homeland. The most important element in this story, however, is that Odysseus was completely telling the truth and even foretelling the future. Odysseus became a cause of problems for the Phaiakians as well, because after they assured Odysseus a safe trip by guiding him, a ship was petrified before their eyes and effectively blocked their island.[107]

---

103 Barnouw 2004:54
104 De Jong 2001:227-228
105 Segal 1983(1988):138; Doherty 1995:164; Morrison 2003:95
106 The theme of Odysseus' disguises is treated in Stewart 1976, who, rightly in my opinion, points at Odysseus' exaggeration in the use of disguise and false stories. See also Barnouw 2004:5 for Odysseus' attempts to become Odysseus again.
107 *Odyssey* 13,168-169

When they saw that, they knew that Poseidon had fulfilled a prophecy that told the Phaiakians that one day their helping of strangers would put them at odds with the gods.[108] As such, Odysseus was again the cause of problems for mankind. This is in my opinion another good argument against Barnouw's assumption that the δόλοισιν refer to the Trojan Horse.

From the metrical point of view, there is a pause before the relative clause starts. In addition one can argue to put a metrical pause before or after πᾶσι as well. The need is not absolute because the formula πᾶσι δόλοισιν receives the stress by both being at the end of the verse and by determining the verb in the next verse. If we decide to use a metrical pause, it is probably better to put it before πᾶσι, because that way the verse has a bucolic diaeresis and the formula πᾶσι δόλοισιν remains "intact".

The following passage comes from Odysseus' story to the Phaiakians about his dealings with the Kyklops. When Odysseus and his men arrived on the island of the Kyklopes, his men suggested to take some cheese and meat and leave the island, but Odysseus decided to stay and look for the inhabitants of the island to receive guest gifts.[109]

εὑροίμην πάντας δὲ δόλους καὶ μῆτιν ὕφαινον (*Odyssey* 9,422)
"(if) I could find (some release from death for my comrades or myself), I wove all kind of tricks and cunning."

As a consequence, he came in contact with Polyphemos who did not live by the normal standards and decided to eat Odysseus' men. Eventually, they succeeded in blinding Polyphemos (the exact nature of that famous trick will be discussed later), but they had not

---

108 *Odyssey* 13,171-183
109*Odyssey* 9,229

yet been able to escape the cave. Odysseus was thinking about an escape route and eventually decided that his men and he should cling to the bellies of Polyphemos' sheep and ram. The striking element about this line, which described Odysseus' thought process, is that it combined the negative πάντας δὲ δόλους with the more positive μῆτιν "cunning", although one could argue that the idea of πάντας also applied to μῆτιν.[110] Helen's description of Odysseus also combined these two elements.[111] Odysseus decided to go for a positive element, because his final decision is called βουλή "plan". The combination of the verb "weaving", the imperfect tense and the use of both negative and the positive terms for "cunning" to describe Odysseus' thought processes are, according to De Jong, an indication that Odysseus had a lot of trouble in finding a suitable solution for this problem.[112] In addition, one can point at the two verbs for the same action in one verse: εὑροίμην "I could find" indicates the attempt to find the way out and the rest of the verse indicates the intense intellectual effort to escape from the cave. It needs to be said that the presence of μῆτιν here can also be an allusion to the pun μή τις "not one" and μῆτις "cunning", which allowed Odysseus to escape the Kyklops because he could not alarm his fellow Kyklopes, as we will see later on. Earlier on, we said that the presence of πᾶς and δόλος in Odysseus' own words indicated that he was a constant cause of problems for all men. The Kyklops episode confirmed this. If he had not entered the cave in the first place, he and his men would never have met Polyphemos, and many of his men would not have been

---

110 Ameis-Hentze 1908:93
111 I assume here that the roots μηδ (μήδεα) and μητ (μῆτις) are etymologically related, as is argued in Bertolín-Cebrián 1996a:208-209, and 220-222. The nouns do not have the negative connotation that can often be found with the verbs of those roots, see LSJ s.v.
112 De Jong 2001:244-245

eaten.[113] Odysseus made another mistake that would cause problems for his men but also for him. When they sailed away, he yelled his name at the Kyklops and thus enabled him to seek revenge from his father Poseidon. We will discuss his more in detail later on. Although weaving is a female occupation, the figurative use of it is confined to men. Men therefore weave "cunning" or "tricks" or "poetry",[114] whereas women weave garments, with Penelope as the only exception. This will be discussed in detail later on.

ἐν πάντεσσι δόλοισι, καὶ εἰ θεὸς ἀντιάσειεν (*Odyssey* 13,292)
"(who would go beyond you) in all kind of tricks, even if a god met you."

σχέτλιε, ποικιλομῆτα, δόλων ἆτ', οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλες (*Odyssey* 13,293)
"stubborn fool, with various acts of cunning on your mind, insatiable in (the use of) tricks, not even (when you were in your own land) did you (refrain from acts of deception)"

I analyse these two verses together. Both verses talk about Odysseus' preference to resort to δόλος in almost any circumstance. Line 292 is remarkable because Athena considered Odysseus' use of guile so convincing and effective, that even gods would not be able to outsmart him. Line 293 is the extreme manifestation of versatility: not only is the character able to turn readily and take on various pursuits, he feels the need to act like that all the time.

Verses 292 and 293 belong to Pallas Athena's rebuke of Odysseus. When Odysseus arrived in Ithaka, he did not recognise his homeland nor did he perceive Athena when she approached him. Therefore, he told her a false story about his name and origin. Athena heard the story, smiled and answered him with these verses. Pucci pointed out that lines 291-300 have almost all the words for resourcefulness and deceit in the Greek language.[115]

---

113 Odysseus admitted this himself, see *Odyssey* 9,228.
114 For the general idea of weaving poetry one can refer to Schmitt 1967:295-306.
115 Pucci 1987:58-59

Athena's terms were quite strong as σχέτλιε is used for heroes in a bad sense because it indicates that they do not want to give in against better knowledge.[116] Consequently, some scholars have interpreted Athena's answer as anger and irritation.[117] I translated "stubborn fool" to put enough emphasis on the strongly negative term. In the Homeric poems ποικιλομῆτα is only used for Odysseus,[118] but in Hesiod and the Hymns it is used for Hermes and for Zeus.[119] This is remarkable because it could indicate that Odysseus' resourcefulness was of the same level as that of Zeus and Hermes. Strauss-Clay argued that Odysseus' intellectual superiority, which seems to be confirmed by lines 291-292, was the reason that Athena refused to help him during most of his homecoming.[120] It is unclear whether Athena was genuinely upset that he did not recognise her or she was only pretending to be, but most scholars argue that the goddess was actually praising his heroic trickery.[121] Athena was the protectress of Odysseus and knew him better than anybody else, with the exception of Odysseus himself. The combination of πᾶς and δόλος, and the extreme example of versatility indicate this.

We have to point out, however, that Odysseus was not irrationally cautious. He did not know where he was, and after what he had experienced with the Kyklops, Kirke and Kalypso, he was cautious not to make a similar mistake again. In addition, it was Athena herself who blinded Odysseus, so that he did not recognise his own land.[122] As a

---

116 Merry 1876b:29 *used to express any sort of "pertinacity" or "hardness"; like the Latin improbus*; LSJ sv: *mostly in bad sense*; Stanford 1958:210 *obstinate, stubborn*. Schein 1996b:11 made the comparison with Akhilleus' description of Odysseus in the *Iliad*.
117 Strauss-Clay 1983:46-47; Barnouw 2004:73
118 Dunbar-Marzullo 1971:310; Dunbar-Prendergast
119 Dunbar-Marzullo 1971:310; LSJ sv
120 Strauss-Clay 1983:209-211. The title of the book is revealing: *The Wrath of Athena* (underlining is mine).
121 Harsh 1950:4; Trahman 1952:36 *she is amused and admiring (...) there is no reproach here*; Stewart 1976:84; Detienne-Vernant 1978:227-228; Hoekstra 1989:181; Felson-Rubin 1994:50; De Jong 2001:329; Barnouw 2004:21
122 Pucci 1987:105-106

consequence, one could even consider Athena's answer as a failure to completely understand Odysseus and what he was going through. As such, these lines might confirm that Odysseus was indeed superior to Athena because even when she removed part of his perceptive powers, he was still able to defend himself and invent a story.[123]

The following example deals with Odysseus' description of his travels. Once Penelope had recognised him and she and Odysseus had had sex, he started relating his adventures. This verse talks about his encounters with Kirke.

κα Κίρκης κατέλεξε δόλον πολυμηχανίην τε (*Odyssey* 23,321)
"and he enumerated the snare and resourcefulness of Kirke."

This passage refers to the double role Kirke played during Odysseus' travels, and as such I am not entirely convinced that this story only refers to Kirke's bad and dangerous side, as is sometimes argued.[124] As we have seen before (chapter 2.2), Kirke planned a snare by luring the men inside and turning them into pigs. Hermes warned Odysseus and he was made immune to the spell. As such, she posed a threat to Odysseus and his men. On the other hand, she was also very helpful, because she gave him directions on how to get into Hades and how to make contact with the ghosts. Moreover, she provided him with useful information after he had already spoken to Teiresias. She also advised him on how to avoid the destructive song of the Sirens, and what he needed to do to escape from Skylla and Kharybdis. I therefore think that it is no coincidence that the poet combined the word δόλον and πολυμηχανίην.[125] Πολυμήχανος was one of Odysseus' epithets and was not

---

123 For the analysis of the rest of the dialogue between Athena and Odysseus, I refer to Strauss-Clay 1983, who stresses Odysseus' intellectual superiority and the Olympians' unease with that.
124 De Jong 2001:563
125 Neither De Jong nor Hoekstra mention this link in their commentaries.

a bad term as it was also used for Apollon in the *Hymn to Hephaistos*.[126] As such, it seems to point at the fact that the use of δόλος was an indication of resourceful nature and cleverness. As such, it could be another illustration of the fact that the perception of the persons involved decided if an act was δόλος or not. Kirke's help on reaching the Underworld and her information afterwards, were obviously not a δόλος, but her spell on Odysseus' men under the other hand was described as δόλος in three different instances (four if we include this one).

The use of the words δόλον and πολυμηχανίην indicates a positive and a negative trait of Kirke. The only other instance where δόλος is combined with the root μηχαν-, is in the description of Hera's trick during the *Deceit of Zeus*. Zeus used two negative words to describe Hera whereas in this instance, Kirke eventually had a very positive influence.

The description of Kirke only received one verse in the enumeration of all Odysseus' trials and tribulations, but Kirke is the only character who was described by a word of "cunning" and "guile". Kalypso's wooing was described in more lines but her character was not described in an equally detailed manner. This could be an indication that Kirke waqs actually the most imprtant character whom Odysseus met during his long travels home.

The following verse belongs to the *Teikhoskopia* "the watching from the walls", before the duel beween Paris and Menelaos. After nine years of war, both Trojans and Greeks agreed to decide the war by a duel between Paris and Menelaos. When this was arranged, Iris (a messenger of the gods) called Helen and summoned her to go to the wall to

---

126 LSJ s.v.

watch.[127] There she and Priam watched the battle from the walls, and Priam asked her to describe every Greek hero. With these words she described Odysseus.

εἰδὼς παντοίους τε δόλους καὶ μήδεα πυκνά (*Iliad* 3,202)
"knowing all kinds of tricks and cunning devices."

After Helen spoke, Antenor confirmed what she said by relating what happened during the Greek embassy to Troy to get Helen back. The Greeks sent Menelaos and Odysseus to argue for Helen's return. Antenor described Menelaos as having a more kingly stature than Odysseus, but Odysseus' voice was so impressive that all Trojans looked in amazement at him and did not know if any mortal would surpass Odysseus.[128] Kirk argued that Antenor's additional information about Odysseus was useful because Helen might not have known Odysseus that well.[129] This assessment underestimates Helen in my opinion. She described Odysseus in a twofold manner namely by ascribing to him the negative aspect of the "all kinds of tricks" but also the more positive μήδεα πυκνά, where μήδεα has the notion of "cunning" or "prudence", and πυκνά means "shrewd".[130] This gives the idea of Odysseus as a clever person who could use tricks if he needed to, but it also states that Odysseus had positive intelligence. Antenor's description of Odysseus on the other hand did not include the aspect "guile", and as such, it seems that her description is more accurate than that of Antenor. Her knowledge of Odysseus is remarkable, because she had not yet met him. She was not present when the Greek embassy arrived in Troy to ask for her return, and the *Doloneia* had not yet occurred. In addition, her behaviour during that expedition is only

---

127 *Iliad* 3,129-134
128 *Iliad* 3,204-224
129 Kirk 1985:294
130 LSJ s.v.

related in the *Odyssey*. Nevertheless, she knew that Odysseus was a man of intelligence and tricks. This means that she must have had a very sharp mind. Helen's sharp mind is confirmed immediately after the duel. Paris lost but escaped death by Aphrodite's intervention.[131] She removed Paris from the battlefield, led him to Helen's room and suggested in the disguise of an old woman that Helen should have sex with him. Helen saw through the disguise of Aphrodite, although she was the goddess known for her deceit, and called her δολοφρονέουσα "with a trick on her mind".[132] In my opinion, this indicates that the Iliadic Helen was as intelligent and perspicacious as the one of the *Odyssey* who recognised Telemakhos immediately.

The following example is Agamemnon's exhortation of Odysseus. The fragment is revealing because it shows that Odysseus' reputation of wiles and guile was already known in the *Iliad* but the passage also gives a good insight into the view of the Greeks on having too much δόλος.

καὶ σύ, κακοῖσι δόλοισι κεκασμένε, κερδαλεόφρον (*Iliad* 4,339)
"(son of Peteos, king nurtured by Zeus), why (then) do also you, excellent in evil tricks, and of crafty mind, (stand apart shivering and wait for others)?"

Agamemnon was inciting his troops to fight more bravely, and treated most of his senior commanders with respect, as he did not exhort the two Aiantes because they were brave enough anyway,[133] nor did he say anything bad to Nestor out of respect for his old age.[134] But when he met Odysseus, he addressed him with these blistering words. He accused

---

131 *Iliad* 3,374-384
132 The *Hymn to Aphrodite* is a good example of that, but that is of a later date than the *Iliad*. Helen's word is used in *Iliad* 3,405. For Aphrodite's deceitful nature see Pomeroy 1975:6 and Pratt 1993:73-76.
133 *Iliad* 4,285-286
134 *Iliad* 4,310-316

Odysseus of cowardice in spite of Homer's description that he and his contingent were not.[135] Although it is doubtful that Agamemnon really thought that Odysseus was a coward, the fact that he spoke these words, reveals that Odysseus' use and knowledge of tricks was not always considered positive and that he was not universally admired for it. As such, Agamemnon portrayed Odysseus as a highly unworthy character. In addition to the combination of κακοῖσι and δόλοισι, which is already a negative description, he also used the word κερδαλεόφρον "with a mind aiming for personal gain, craftyminded", which is a very insulting term because it stresses predominantly the aspect of personal gain, often at the expense of others.[136] I believe that the fact that Agamemnon used this term and not Odysseus' normal epithet πολύμητις, proves that the word κερδαλεόφρον was a particular negative and therefore not synonymous with πολύμητις, as Dunkle assumed.[137] Δόλος and κέρδος could not be used to refer to a positve event, but μῆτις was not always used in an openly negative meaning. Agamemnon wanted to stress the negative aspect to exhort Odysseus, and therefore he did not use a compound of μῆτις, because words of the root μητ- could be positive as well, as we have indicated in chapter 3. We therefore have a description of Odysseus as he is known in the later tradition.[138] Consequently, we could say

---

135 *Iliad* 4,330
136 H. Roisman 1990:24, 26 and 35; Holmberg 1990:96-97. It is the same term that Akhilleus used to insult Agamemnon during their quarrel which led to his withdrawal.
137 Dunkle 1987:1
138 During the build up of the Trojan expedition, Odysseus already displayed his cunning and guile on several occasions. As they are not mentioned in the *Iliad*, we cannot use them as evidence, but we can assume that the audience was well aware of these stories. In his attempt to avoid to go to Troy, Odysseus feigned insanity by ploughing the beach. Palamedes forced Odysseus to join the expedition by placing the newly born Telemakhos before the ploughshare. Odysseus avoided Telemakhos and thus betrayed his sanity. When Akhilleus was hidden by his mother on the island Skyros, dressed as a woman, Odysseus lured him out by offering a gift out of different toys, of which one was a helmet. Akhilleus chose the helmet. Two more infamous examples are the murder of Palamedes and the fake marriage offer to Iphigeneia. Odysseus set up Palamedes by hiding gold in his tent and adding a forged letter in which Priam supposedly thanked Palamedes for his support. Palamedes was subsequently stoned to death. When the Greek expedition was stranded without a favourable wind in Aulis, the seer Kalkhas told the expedition that Artemis wanted the sacrifice of

that this is one of the few instances where having δόλος is considered a morally reprehensible trait.

Our last example is the description by Sokos when he was about to engage in battle with Odysseus.

<p style="text-align:center">ὦ᾽Οδυσεῦ πολύαινε δόλων ἆτ᾽ἠδὲ πόνοιο (Iliad 11,430)
"O much praised Odysseus, insatiate in tricks and hard toil, (today you will rejoice....)"</p>

The same remark on the versatility and its extreme manifestation is applicable here. This passage is even more outspoken because even Sokos, a minor Trojan fighter, seemed to be aware of Odysseus' reputation. The description of Odysseus here is rather strange, because there is nothing in the upcoming or preceding battles that could explain why this description is used. Just before the fight Odysseus even reiterated that brave soldiers fight and cowards run away, and Odysseus seems in this specific passage to be following the Iliadic heroic ideal.[139] Hainsworth pointed out that this description fits more the Odysseus of the *Epic Cycle* and *Odyssey*, than the one from the *Iliad*.[140] Helen's description of Odysseus and Odysseus' behaviour during the wrestling game seem to contradict Hainsworth's analysis. I would therefore conclude that the different passages regarding versatility provide a picture of Odysseus that is consistent in both *Odyssey* and *Iliad*.

3.2. Conclusion: versatility and δόλος.

Agamemnon's daughter Iphigeneia. Odysseus was then asked to lure Klytaimnestra and Iphigeneia into Aulis. He decided to do so by promising a marriage to Akhilleus, and both Iphigeneia and Klytaimnestra fell for the promise of the fake marriage. For more details I can refer the reader to the sections on Odysseus in Preller 1892, Gantz 1995, and Harris-Platzner 2004. For the Palamedes story one can also consult Meulder 2002. The *Bibliotheca* of Apollodoros is also an important source for these mythical stories.

139 *Iliad* 11,409-410 see also Finkelberg 1995(2007):24

140 Hainsworth 1993:272

Almost the Odyssean examples are pronounced by characters who know Odysseus and consider themselves to be at the same intellectual level. In addition, Nestor and especially Athena assumed that they could compete with Odysseus in tricks and wiles. In the *Iliad* Nestor is often considered to be a second Odysseus, as we will see in our analysis of *Iliad* 7,142 and 23,585. Athena told Odysseus that they would form an impressive couple that could withstand almost anything or anybody. It is interesting that the examples actually show that the idea that they are of equal intelligence is not entirely true. Nestor's examples show that when the Greeks tried different stratagems, Troy did not fall. He then went on to describe Odysseus and his tricks with the same words, so I think that the poet wanted to point out that Odysseus was of a different calibre. Athena's descriptions seemed to indicate that Odysseus was superior to her as well. She did state that she saw through his disguises and that she was the most cunning of gods but also said that he could even compete with a god. Odysseus' description of himself is not as fortright as it might seem. First of all, the verses are very ambiguous, and I think that they are supposed to have both the meaning "fame" and "problem". He needed the Phaiakians to be well disposed but he also could no longer deny his true identity, because he started crying when the Trojan War was related. I think that his use of πᾶσι δόλοισιν refers to his general nature, and not to the Trojan Horse. There are two reasons for that assumption, the first one being that Odysseus will later on relate his equally renowned trick when fighting the Kyklops, and secondly because Odysseus will eventually also cause problems for the Phaiakians. It is remarkable that when Odysseus combined πᾶς and δόλος, he meant that there were problems for the people involved. The Phaiakians would lose their sea faring privileges as a result of their support for Odysseus. Odysseus and his men faced the Kyklops as a result of his curiosity. The

result of that story was that several of his companions were eaten and that his journey was prolonged significantly.

The last example of the *Odyssey* is remarkable because it is pronounced by Odysseus but it talks about Kirke. Throughout the *Odyssey* Odysseus came in contact with many female characters, but only Kirke provided him with useful information. Initially (as we have seen in chapter 2) she posed a threat for him and his men, but once the threat was neutralised, she became a very reliable ally and explained him to go to Hades and talk to Teiresias. After the trip to the Underworld, he returned to her and she interpreted Teiresias' prophecy and told him how to avoid the dangers of the Sirens, and Skylla and Kharybdis. As such, Odysseus decribed her in the same terms as he would describe himself. She was resourceful and guileful. She received the description πολυμηχανίην, which must have reminded the audience of Odysseus' own epithet πολυμήχανος. It is no coincidence that Kirke is the only character who was described with those words in Odysseus' tales to Penelope after they had recognised each other. By doing so, Odysseus put Kirke on his intellectual level.

Helen's description of Odysseus is also noteworthy. We cannot use Helen's behaviour in the *Odyssey* to explain her description in the *Iliad*, nor was she present when Odysseus was pleading for her return, but even in the *Iliad* she showed her shrewd nature by seeing through Aphrodite's disguise and accusing her of trying to trick her into sex with Paris. There is one important similarity between the descriptions of Helen in the *Iliad* and the one of Nestor. Both indicate that Odysseus did not depend solely on his guile to succeed. Helen pointed at his prudence and shrewdness, whereas Nestor pointed at their agreement and Odysseus' superiority in counsel. Odysseus' description of the Kyklops

episode shows that he actually needed cunning but also a more negative trait to escape Polyphemos. An interesting observation is that the extreme manifestation of versatility, δόλων ἇτ′ "insatiable in wiles", was made by a character who knew Odysseus very well (Athena) and someone who had never met him previously (Sokos). This points to the fact that Odysseus was widely renowned for his guileful nature.

A last remark should be made about the fact that all these instances have δόλος in the plural. This is not a coincidence because they refer to the many different schemes and tricks that Odysseus used throughout his entire life. It is true that the Homeric poems do not mention how he lured Akhilleus into Troy, how he contrived a devious trap for Palamedes and how he persuaded Klytaimnestra and Iphigeneia to come to Aulis, but the audience must have been aware of Odysseus' nature. As such, I believe that the poet of both poems wanted to depict Odysseus as the king of tricks, and consequently, there is no difference in the image of Odysseus in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. This seems to be confirmed by the fact that even a minor Trojan fighter knew Odysseus' reputation.

Chapter 4. Δόλος and its connection to concrete activities.

The current chapter deals with the connection of δόλος to words that can be defined as concrete actions, and are as such opposed to mental activities. When δόλος is used with words of concrete actions, it has often a more concrete meaning, such as "bait" or "net". In combination with weaving, the trick is often described as the result of a long thinking process. Δόλος in combination with handicraft confirms that thorough preparation is often involved when using δόλος. More important are the gender inversion in five of the six instances, as is shown by the depictions of Hephaistos, Odysseus, Klytaimnestra and Penelope, and the clear link in the story of Hera and Zeus between female δόλος and female sexuality. These instances are, again, an indication of the gendered use of δόλος. The use of δόλος to describe Menelaos' reaction, but also the descriptions of Odysseus and Penelope (and to a lesser extent also Hera) show that the difference between μῆτις and δόλος often only lies in the eye of the beholder. The person against whom δόλος was employed described the action by the word δόλος, but when the person who made use of δόλος described his/her actions, s/he often used the word μῆτις. Detienne-Vernant already stated this but they did not explicitly contrast victim and perpetrator.[141]

The first category has one example and deals with δόλος in its more original and concrete meaning, namely "a bait to catch fish". Secondly, we proceed to the combination of δόλος and words that refer to handicraft. The description of Hephaistos' trick used δόλος in a concrete meaning as well, namely "a net". Four instances indicate to some

---

141 Detienne-Vernant 1977:13

degree a gender inversion. As such, this seems to confirm the gender aspect of δόλος, as we have seen in chapter 2 and will see in chapter 5. Our third category is the use of δόλος as the object of "weaving". Weaving in Homer is often combined with different actions and is used differently for men and women. Weaving clothes is a female occupation, but δόλος is more often woven by men. There is only one exception, Penelope. The fourth and last category deals with δόλος and the action of "impeding". Both instances come from the *Iliad*. One talks about Antilokhos' trick to put Menelaos' chariot out of the race, and Menelaos' wronged reaction to the use of δόλος. The other talks about Apollon's attempts to impede Akhilleus' assault on Hektor and Troy.

4.1. Δόλος as a bait to catch fish.

The first section of this chapter deals with the original meaning of "a bait to catch fish". The story refers to Odysseus' vain attempts to fight and defeat the sea monster Skylla. The verse describes Odysseus' encounter with Skylla and Kharybdis. When one was sailing past them, it was impossible to avoid both of them. Kirke warned Odysseus to avoid battle with Skylla, but he disregarded her advice, and geared for battle anyway. Skylla took six of Odysseus' men and had them flinging in the air like a fish that had been caught by a bait and that was being drawn ashore by the fisherman. Then she tore them apart and devoured them.

ἰχθύσι τοῖς ὀλίγοισι δόλον κατὰ εἴδατα βάλλων (*Odyssey* 12,252)
"throwing food as a bait for a few fish."

The fish metaphor is interesting because there is a link between fishermen and tricks.[142] Fishermen depend for their survival on their cunning and on their ability to outsmart the prey.[143] In this passage the use of the trick is final. When a fish is caught and brought on land, it cannot escape anymore. The same is true of Odysseus' men who were snatched by Skylla. Odysseus was faced with a more powerful opponent who also had knowledge of δόλος. Odysseus did try to fight but he did not accomplish anything. This is one of the few passages where the poet did not elaborate on how Odysseus could overcome the threat. He just stated that Odysseus and his men escaped. This is an indication that it is impossible to outsmart an opponent who has force and δόλος.[144] This seems to be in line with the conclusion of chapter 6.1 where we state that a forceful character can only be defeated by a smarter opponent who is able to use δόλος. In addition, Odysseus geared for battle and that could therefore be seen as anticipating the use of force, whereas Skylla's fishing would be the use of δόλος, albeit not in its meaning of trick.

4.2. The combination of words indicating handicraft and δόλος.

The next section of this chapter analyses the combination of δόλος and the terms indicating handicraft. There are several examples where the word δόλος is combined with a word that is normally used in a context of craftsmen. As such, Hephaistos was mentioned in three examples.

---

142 Detienne-Vernant 1978:295
143 See particularly Detienne-Vernant 1978, but also Slatkin 1996:236, Levine 2002/3:151
144 Dunkle 1987 made a similar argument, although he used it in the context of the chariot race in *Iliad* 23. He argued that μῆτις and βίη could not be separated in order to be succesful. I believe that a distinction should be made between δόλος and μῆτις, and I also think that the particular example of the chariot race is not the best illustration of this, as will become obvious in 6.4.

The fourth example was Odysseus who described himself as the maker of the Horse as a craftily designed tool.[145] Odysseus and Hephaistos were often put on the same level because of the precision, careful preparation and calm devotion to their tricks.[146]

The fifth example discussed Klytaimnestra's preparation of Agamemnon's murder. She was described as a craftsman, and, as such, that description provides another instance where the story of Klytaimnestra involved some blurring of gender lines. It is even more remarkable that it was Odysseus who equated her with a craftsman, because he faced the possibility that Penelope would become a second Klytaimnestra. Those five examples showed a gender inversion, because the male characters were compared to women and Klytaimnestra was described by a word that is usually used for smiths.

The last example discussed Zeus' reaction to Hera's attempt to render him unconscious. He responded angrily and accused her of constantly plotting and scheming against him. That passage provided a clear link between the use of female δόλος and the use of female sexuality, and indicates a highly gendered use of δόλος.

This section confirms the statement of 2.1 that carefully prepared δόλος by females (or female acting characters) is very effective.

4.2.1. Examples.

We now proceed to the analysis of the examples. Three of the six examples come from songs sung by Demodokos, who was the bard at the court of the Phaiakians. The three examples that refer to Hephaistos' trapping of the bed will be dealt with together. The main idea was that the crafty Hephaistos was able to outsmart the quick and forceful Ares,

---

145 The horse was assembled by Epeios, but the invention was Odysseus'.
146 De Jong 2001:207

although the conclusion was more ambiguous. The passage about Hephaistos' entrapping Ares and Aphrodite is a famous one. Hephaistos suspected their adultery for a long time and decided to set a trap. The trap fell down as soon as they entered the bed and Hephaistos called upon all gods to witness the event. He then angrily exclaimed that he would only release them if he received indemnity for the sustained damages. Poseidon agreed to vouch for Ares and make sure that he would pay.[147]

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῦξε δόλον κεχολωμένος Ἄρει (*Odyssey* 8,276)
"but when he had craftily designed the trap/net out of anger against Ares"

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα δόλον περὶ δέμνια χεῦεν (*Odyssey* 8,282)
"but when he had set up the complete trap/net around the bed,.."

εὕδειν· ἀλλά σφωε δόλος καὶ δεσμὸς ἐρύξει (*Odyssey* 8,317)
(soon both of them will not be longing for) sleep (anymore) but the trap/net and the bonds
will keep both of them"

Hephaistos' trap consisted of building an invisible net around and above the bed that would fall down on the lovers as soon as they entered the bed. The Greek is much more vivid as it describes the making of the trap by pouring (χεῦεν literally means "he poured")[148] the trick on the bed as if it were some kind of glue. The meaning "net" seems to link the word δόλος to one of its more original meanings.[149] As such, his trick is a concrete thing but also the result of long thought process, and therefore combines the meanings of "net" and "trap but also "guileful act".[150]

---

147 Garvie (1994:309-310) is right when he states that Hephaistos did not have any guarantee that Poseidon would actually make sure that Ares paid his debt.
148 Ameis-Hentze 1908:45. The Greek word is related to the Latin *fundere* "pour" and the German *giessen* "pour" and Dutch *gieten* "pour".
149 Nordheider 1984:329: *Netz heißt auch* δόλος.
150 Ameis-Hentze1908:48; Garvie 1994:297

The description of the trick by the words of "pouring" and "bonds that keep" is strengthened by Homer's description of it as ἀράχνια λεπτά "fine spider webs".[151] As such, there is a link with "weaving a trick", but more important is the link between his net and a spider web, because the web is a trick for the insects which did not see the web and, most importantly, because the Greeks thought that only the female spider wove webs.[152] By making a parallel between Hephaistos' craft and the weaving of a spider, his artful creations were equated to female occupations.[153] Although I do not entirely agree with Holmberg's assumption that female μῆτις is necessarily bad,[154] I still think that we have another instance of gender inversion here. It is true that Hephaistos is usually depicted as lame, but he is still a male god, and as such the equation between his craft and one of the prototypical female occupations (weaving in its concrete meaning) is remarkable.

It has been argued that the victory of the lame but crafty Hephaistos over the wild and strong Ares presaged the victory of Odysseus over the suitors.[155] As such, this passage is used to put Odysseus and Hephaistos on the same level of craft, cunning intelligence and tricks. The most important similarity between them is that Hephaistos and Odysseus both looked undistinguished but had hidden capacities,[156] and as a consequence their guile

---

151 The description is found in *Odyssey* 8,280. Detienne-Vernant 1978:284; Felson-Rubin 1994:134 and 143; Holmberg 1997:13.
152 Aristotle, *Historia Animalium*, 623a23. Many Native American mythological stories shared that belief, according to the *Encycopaedia Brittannica*. According to the same article in the *Encyclopaedia Brittannica* both male and female spiders weave webs, although there are species where only the females weave and there are also species where the male weaves a net to catch insects as a gift for the female before mating. I would like to thank Lesley Bolton for pointing this out.
153 Holmberg 1997:4 and 13
154 Holmberg 1990, 1998:136
155 Peradotto 1990:57; Felson-Rubin 1994:137
156 Braswell 1982:132-135

remained unnoticed. De Jong saw in this story another illustration of the "cunning versus force" theme.[157]

In reaction to the story of Ares and Aphrodite, Odysseus asked the bard Demodokos to sing about the fall of Troy, the creation of the Horse and its maker. He stated that if Demodokos could sing that story as it happened,[158] he would be rightly praised and considered a very well versed singer. As such, Odysseus asked about his own famous trick, and wanted to receive credit for it. In the following verse Odysseus described the Horse as his own stratagem.

ὅν ποτ'ἐς ἀκρόπολιν δόλον ἤγαγε δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς (*Odyssey* 8,494)
"(the horse) that at that time godlike Odysseus led into the citadel as a trap"

It is remarkable that Odysseus described his own invention as δόλος, but that he did not describe himself as πολύμητις. We have seen that there is a clear distinction in the usage between δόλος and μῆτις. By using δόλος and by not using μῆτις, Odysseus almost pointed out that the trick was disadvantageous to him. While Demodokos was singing this episode, Odysseus could no longer hide his tears and his crying was compared to that of a captive woman whose husband had been killed during that siege.[159] The fall of Troy brought for most Greeks nothing but sorrow, as can be seen in the many stories about the baneful homecomings,[160] and could almost be described as a Pyrrhic victory *avant la lettre*. The victory therefore led to role reversal,[161] as the prime victor became the conquered. In

---

157 De Jong 2001:207
158 For an analysis of Odysseus' request that Demodokos be truthful, see Adkins 1972:17.
159 Moulton 1977:130-131; Pucci 1987:222; Garvie 1994:339-340; De Jong 2001:216 (the other scholars in this note are also mentioned in De Jong)
160 Garvie 1994:339-340; De Jong 2001:215-217
161 The term is used in De Jong 2001:217. According to Garvie 1994:339-340 Foley had already used that term in 1978.

addition, there was also a gender reversal because the strong and intelligent Odysseus was depicted as a broken and pitiful captive woman without male support.[162] I would therefore say that this passage is not an entirely positive use of δόλος, because it brought Odysseus only sorrow. As such, one could compare this passage and its use of δόλος to that of the Kyklops episode. Odysseus' trick let him escape from Polyphemos but, as a result, his homecoming was prolonged significantly. Both episodes brought him fame for eternity, but at a very high personal cost.[163] The request of Odysseus to be described as the king of tricks can be compared to the description that he gave of himself when Alkinoos asked him who he was, as was analysed in chapter 3. He described himself as a person versed in all tricks, but also as a problem for everybody.[164] The Trojan Horse also became a problem for almost all Greeks, because their homecomings proved extremely toilsome, with the exception of Nestor's.

After Odysseus' request, Demodokos started singing about the Horse. As such, it seems that Odyseus' reputation of destroying Troy was already known when Odysseus arrived on the island of the Phaiakians.[165] By crediting Odysseus with the invention of the Trojan Horse, Homer effectively gave him the glory of having taken Troy.[166] What the armies of Agamemnon, the force of Aias and Akhilleus and the wisdom of Nestor could not achieve, was fulfilled by the tricks of Odysseus. This episode, together with the ones in

---

162 *Odyssey* 8,523-530
163 When Odysseus met Akhilleus in the Underworld, he told him that he would have preferred to die at Troy like him, instead of wandering over the earth. For the contrast between Odysseus and Akhilleus, I refer to Nagy 1979 and to De Jong 2001:217. The latter points out that this story made Odysseus aware of the grim reality of war.
164 *Odyssey* 9,19-20 (we analysed this passage in chapter 3)
165 Heubeck 1989:6; Doherty 1995:175; De Jong 2001:217. It is remarkable that Demodokos did not sing about Helen's attack on the Horse by impersonating the voices of the warriors' wives and Odysseus' thwarting of her guileful act or about the eagerness of Neoptolemos to jump out of the Horse and fight.
166 Heubeck 1989:6; Doherty 1995:175

3,119 and 3,122, seems to indicate that it is not enough to use tricks to achieve something, but that the one who uses the tricks must be capable and wily too: the Greeks vainly used all kinds of stratagems against Troy, but when Odysseus came up with the horse, the city was finally destroyed. It therefore seems that Odysseus is again depicted as the king of tricks and stratagems. More importantly, it indicates that Odysseus himself was well aware that he was the best in trickery, and he wanted to know if other people knew this as well.

Metrically this verse provides some interesting features as well. Parry's theory about noun epithet formulae and formulaic verse as verse fillers is debated and not generally accepted anymore,[167] and this verse is in my opinion one of the examples where the use of a certain noun-epithet clause is significant and deliberate. The description of Odysseus as "godly Odysseus" after the bucolic diaeresis is more than just a verse filler. It emphasises the inventor of the Horse and is the most important element of the verse.[168] It is also remarkable that the other metrical pause in this verse should probably be put after ἀκρόπολιν. As such, both the action of "making (the Horse) enter as a trick" and the actual inventor are stressed.[169]

---

167 Although this might seem an oversimplification, Parry stated that a formula of a noun and a epithet was only a verse filler. The same applied for descriptions of action such as "he answered" (Parry 1928:17-18 (=A.Parry 1971:15)). In his opinion, there was no intrinsic value in it. This became a hot topic and many scholars have looked into the exact nature of "Parryism". There is no real agreement to what extent the poet used the formulaic expressions like "to him spoke back and answered godly Odysseus", but there seems to be some kind of consensus that not all formulae are mere verse fillers. One example that I can give is the phrase τοῖς δὲ δολοφρονέων μετέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς (*Odyssey* 18,51) "to them answered with guile on his mind many-wiled Odysseus". The verse stresses that the words of Odysseus are not genuine but entail a guileful act. It communicates more than just the idea of "X answers Y with a certain tone in it", but it stresses the idea "X answers Y and tricks him".
168 Garvie 1994:333
169 The word δόλον is used in the accusative case. Aristarkhos and Aristophanes suggested the dative δόλῳ "with guile". The editions of the *Oxford Classical Texts* and the *Bibliotheca Teubneriana*, and both Cambridge and Oxford commentaries did not adopt the suggestion of the Alexandrian scholars. The Homeric dictionary of Mehler 1930 (on page 204) suggested that the dative was a better reading. The accusative case can be found in all manuscripts and is better because it stresses the trick more. It means "(the Horse) that godly Odysseus brought into the city as a trick".

The next passage deals with the conversation between Odysseus and Agamemnon during his visit in the Underworld. Agamemnon related to Odysseus in an openly misogynous rant against women how his wife had treacherously killed him, and accused all women of bad intentions.[170] Odysseus responded by saying that only Helen and Klytaimnestra were evil, because Zeus was angry at the house of Atrids.[171] He stated that many men (expressed in the first person plural!) died for the sake of Helen,[172] but that Klytaimnestra only killed Agamemnon. As such, the generalisation that all women were prone to evil and deception was nuanced.

σοὶ δὲ Κλυταιμνήστρη δόλον ἤρτυε τηλόθ' ἐόντι (*Odyssey* 11,439)
"and against you Klytaimnestra set up a trap, when you were far away."

When Agamemnon came home, Klytaimnestra received him with feigned happiness and organised a banquet. During that banquet, most of Agamemnon's men, Agamemnon himself and Kassandra were killed. The verse emphasises the murder of Agamemnon by a strong use of the pronoun in the verse initial position, and provides a strong and chiastic contrast with the many deaths that Helen caused.[173]

Both Agamemnon and Odysseus described Klytaimnestra as planning the ambush in advance. Agamemnon used the expression οἷον δὴ καὶ κείνη ἐμήσατο ἔργον ἀεικές "such an unfitting evil act she had devised",[174] and we have seen that this verb is often used for female characters. Odysseus stressed Klytaimnestra's planning by using the imperfect

---

170 Odysey 11, 427-434. Stanford 1959:396; De Jong 2001:288. The bibliography on who is to blame in the *Odyssey* for Agamemnon's murder is extensive. The only agreement seems to be that Homer does not entirely blame Klytaimnestra.
171 Heubeck 1988:103
172 *Odyssey* 11,438:Ἑλένης μὲν ἀπωλόμεθ' εἵνεκα πολλοί "for Helen's sake many of us died". The word placement of the Greek is very remarkable.
173 Ameis-Hentze 1908:164
174 *Odyssey* 11,429

ἤρτυε "she set up", which indicates repeated or long action.[175] The verb ἀρτύω indicates an action that requires skill or cunning, is often used for smiths, and is related to the Latin word *ars, artis* "art, skill".[176] As such, Klytaimnestra's action was almost equated to a male occupation. This could be another indication of a gender inversion. When we look at the descriptions of the murder, this gender inversion seems to be confirmed. Klytaimnestra and Aigisthos were the only two characters in the *Odyssey* who were described as δολόμητις. This is interesting, because in other stories the events were sometimes described from the perspectives of both parties, and depending on whose perspective was described, the word δόλος or μῆτις was used. For the murderers, only the compound δολόμητις was used, which seems to indicate that this murder was intrinsically bad. Aigisthos received the word five times and Klytaimnestra only once. Therefore we cannot say that all women are bad or that evil is only prepared by women. In the story of the murder by Klytaimnestra and Aigisthos the gender boundaries faded away because on the one hand Klytaimnestra was described as a man and Aigisthos as a woman, but on the other hand Aigisthos received on three occasions the description πατροφονῆα "father killer" together with the epithet δολόμητις,[177] whereas Klytaimnestra was only called δολόμητις when she killed Kassandra.[178] As a consequence, it is not clear who is more responsible, but in spite of that uncertainty, the story is another illustration of the careful preparation of female δόλος.

---

175 Goodwin 1896:11
176 Nagy pointed out that the root *teks* has verbal forms in Latin (*texere* "to weave"), but not in Greek, whereas the root *art-* (*h₂ert*) has verbal forms in Greek but not in Latin.
177 He was called δολόμητις in *Odyssey* 1,300; 3,198; 3,250; 3,308 and 4,525. He received the name πατροφονῆα in *Odyssey* 1,299; 3,197 and 3,307.
178 *Odyssey* 11,422

The following verse belongs to Zeus' negative reaction to Hera's *Deceit of Zeus*. After Akhilleus withdrew from battle, he asked his mother to plead with Zeus that the Greeks be driven back until they treated him with respect. Zeus agreed and forbade any god to intervene on behalf of the Greeks. Because the Greeks consequently suffered serious setbacks, Hera decided to intervene. She asked for Aphrodite's veil to seduce Zeus. She persuaded Hypnos (the god of Sleep) to put Zeus to sleep by promising him a Grace whom he had been desiring for a long time, and finally persuaded Poseidon to support the Greeks once Zeus had fallen asleep. When Zeus awoke, he saw what had happened and put the situation back to its original state. He then verbally attacked Hera for her constant causing of problems, bickering and trickery.[179]

ἦ μάλα δὴ κακότεχνος, ἀμήχανε, σὸς δόλος, Ἥρη (*Iliad* 15,14)
"verily indeed, impossible woman, your hideously concocted trick, Hera, (has kept godly Hektor from the battlefield and has terrified the army)"

The basic idea of this verse is that the use of tricks is bad as can be seen by the word ἀμήχανος. That is a negative term, it means "without means; (here) against whom nothing can be done, impossible" and is used for a person who cannot be corrected.[180] As such, it contrasts with the use of δόλος and πολυμηχανίην in the description of Kirke's positive value for Odysseus, as we saw in chapter 3. In addition, δόλος is also determined by an adjective with a negative meaning, namely κακότεχνος. The Greek stem τεχν- comes from the root *teks* and is related to the Latin word *texere* "weave".[181] The word

---

179 Pomeroy 1975:8-13; Holmberg 1990:7; Janko 1992:138; IJsseling 1994:68
180 LSJ s.v.
181 I can refer to the section of these words in the respective etymological dictionaries of Frisk, Chantraine, Ernout-Meillet and De Vaan. What the exact nature of the root *teks* was and how it could have produced Greek τέχνη and τέκτων, is still the issue of much debate. The most common suggestion, which is not without problems, is to posit *tekþ* with the so called *thorn* or *Brugmann Spirant*. This is accepted by Rix 1976, Janda (Stefan Bauhaus, one of professor Janda's students in Münster, confirmed this to me),

κακότεχνος therefore means "contrived in an evil manner". As such, this verse is another

illustration of the combination of δόλος and a word meaning "handicraft" and "weaving" at

the same time (although the notion of "weaving" is less prominent in the Greek root than in

the Latin cognates). This is an additional example of gender inversion. Hera's δόλος is

described as the product of a craftsman and as such she is depicted as a man. In addition,

she is described as "having woven a bad trick". Weaving tricks and cunning, as we will see

in the next section, is a predominantly male occupation. This complements the other

inversions, such as Klytaimnestra's portrayal as a craftsman.

It is interesting that Hera and Klytaimnestra are described in similar terms, because

the description links two female characters who were considered to be bad women.[182] This

story provides an interesting insight into the marriage of Zeus and Hera, and into the

perception of female sexuality in general, because the words ἀμήχανος and κακότεχνος

indicate that δόλος is here considered to be bad. This verse talks about Hera's character

and the tools she used to accomplish her objectives. The *Deceit of Zeus* is also an indication

that Hera was willing to use δόλος and her own sexuality to achieve her goals. First, she

lied to Aphrodite in order to receive her magic girdle. When she addressed Aphrodite, her

---

Klingenschmitt 1982, 1990 and most other Indo-European scholars in the German speaking world, with exception of Meier-Brügger 2003. Weiss ftc also accepts its existence. The main problem is that one would have to explain why this *Thorn* yielded τ or σ in the words of the root *tekþ, but an aspirate in words such as φθείρω or χθών. This would mean that the preceding consonant determined the reflex of *þ. In addition, these last two instances would assume a progressive assimilation of aspiration (Bartholomae's Law) for Greek (so Kuryłowicz 1973) but Greek usually has a regressive assimilation as can be seen in the formation of the passive aorist or the deverbative adjective in τός. I personally believe that it is not necessary to assume a phoneme or allophone *þ for PIE. For many different attempts to explain these clusters one can refer to Kretschmer 1932 (his suggestion that a cluster *TK either underwent metathesis into *KT or was simplified into *K is generally accepted, with exception of the Leiden School as can be seen in Kloekhorst 2009), Schindler 1973 and Willi 2008. Personally I believe that the words χθών and φθείρω can be best be explained as originating from *$d^h(e)\hat{g}^hom$ and *$d^h(e)g^{wh}er$.

182 Zeus himself stated that Hera was difficult to live with, when he agreed to Thetis' request. He told her that Hera's reaction would not be very "agreeable" (*Iliad* 1,518-519).

speech was described as δολοφρονέουσα "with guile on her mind, planning guile".[183] Her shameless offering of a Grace to Hypnos proved that she was prepared to use sex if it meant that she could achieve her goals. In several Iliadic instances the motives of Zeus or Hera are described by compounds of δόλος. Hera described Zeus with the word δολομῆτα "thinking about guile",[184] after he agreed to Thetis' request. Hera, on the other hand, was described two times as δολοφρονέουσα,[185] when she came to Zeus to seduce him. The overall impression of the marriage between Zeus and Hera is one where both partners constantly think that the one is using δόλος against the other. This is proved by the descriptions δολομῆτα and δολοφρονέουσα that are used for both partners. Zeus was aware that Hera was plotting something, but was overwhelmed by her sexual attractiveness and, consequently, was unable to react adequately. This was exactly the reason why Hera wanted to be attractive.[186] The example of Zeus' and Hera's conflict confirms that there is some gender role assigned to the use of δόλος, and indicates that there is a link between female δόλος and female sexuality. This seems to be confirmed by the fact that other females who used their sexuality to influence men were described by compounds of δόλος. Kirke and Kalypso slept with Odysseus, and wanted to keep him as their husband, which was visible by the phrase λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι "desiring to have him as husband".[187] Both were described as δολόεσσα. One can also refer to Helen's scoffing at Aphrodite with the words Τοὔνεκα δὴ νῦν δεῦρο δολοφρονέουσα παρέστης "for this reason then have you now come here with tricks on your mind" when she wanted to force Helen to

---

183 *Iliad* 14,197
184 *Iliad* 1,540
185 *Iliad* 14, 300 and 329.
186 Holmberg 1990:6
187 For Kirke this phrase was used in *Odyssey* 9,32, and for Kalypso in *Odyssey* 1,50.

have sex after Paris lost the duel with Menelaos.[188] Consequently, we can conclude that this verse offers again an indication that female characters achieve their goals by using their δόλος in a thoroughly and carefully prepared manner.

4.2.2. Conclusion: the combination of words indicating handicraft and δόλος.

Three examples of this chapter used δόλος simultaneously in its concrete meaning "net" and in the more abstract meaning "trap". Demodokos' description of Hephaistos' booby-trapped bed is very vivid and his trap is compared to glue on the bed and to a finely woven spider web. As such, it gives a clear depiction of Hephaistos' craftmanship, but also of his guile. Just as a spider web is invisible for the insect, his web or net was invisible for the adulterers.

A second element is the gender aspect of δόλος. Zeus' reaction to Hera's trick in the *Iliad* provided a clear example of the negative and gendered use of δόλος. It depicted Hera as a prototypical female who used her guile and sexuality in order to achieve whatever she wanted. In addition, there are several instances of gender inversion. Hephaistos is described as a spider weaving a web, weaving concrete things was a female occupation and the Greeks considered a spider to be a female animal. As such, the male god Hephaistos was described in female terms. Klytaimnestra's scheming was described with words that were normally used to describe craftsmen and as such, the female Klytaimnestra was put on the same level as a male character. The story about Odysseus is somewhat diferent because he did not describe his own δόλος as a female act, but he was depicted as a powerless and crying woman after the capture of a city, and as such, it seems that the effect of Odysseus'

---

188 *Iliad* 3,405

δόλος on himself was that it made him into a woman. This is sometimes referred to as "role reversal".

Hera's δόλος also illustrated that sometimes δόλος is considered to be morally reprehensible. Her trick is described as the product of some crafty activity, but at the same time she is described as ἀμήχανε "impossible" and her trick is called κακότεχνος "contrived in an evil way". We saw the morally bad use of δόλος already as a part of the (extreme) versatility that Odysseus sometimes displayed. The description of Hera as ἀμήχανε because of her use of δόλος, contrasts with the depiction of Kirke as πολυμηχανίη. Kirke helped Odysseus to a large extent, whereas Hera was very often a problem for Zeus.

Remarkable is Odysseus' own request to be praised as the inventor of the Trojan Horse. It seems that he wanted to know if the Phaiakians were already aware of what he accomplished. Demodokos knew the story and related it. It had a strong effect on Odysseus and he started crying. His crying is explained by the suffering of his own person and that of all the other heroes who were involved in the sacking of Troy. As such, Odysseus' δόλος did not achieve its goals. He therefore did not use the word μῆτις, because the actual capture of Troy did not only bring him glory, but also many personal problems. This is reminiscent of the Kyklops episode. His use of "Nobody" made him famous, but at the same time prolonged his journey home significantly. This story also confirms that, as we saw before, Odysseus was aware of his own use of guile and that he also knew that his use of tricks often caused problems. This became evident in his response to Alkinoos' question on who he was, as we have already seen in chapter 3.

4.3. The combination of weaving and δόλος.

We now analyse the combination of δόλος and weaving. Weaving is a very common occupation in the Homeric poems. Weaving clothes is a typically female occupation.[189] Because some of the female weaving characters were also engaged in deceptive behaviour, it has been argued that weaving is a metaphor for female deception,[190] but not all weaving females are untrustworthy, as can be illustrated by Andromakhe. Although weaving as female activity is undoubtedly the oldest meaning, there are also remnants in other Indo-European traditions of weaving as metaphor of poetry and speech.[191] This usage is visible in both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and also in Pindar. Therefore this must be an old inherited feature as well. The suggested negative connotation for the word weaving itself is consequently questionable, because in the instances where the phrase "weaving the web of words" is used,[192] the meaning is not negative. Weaving also often appears in conjunction with words of "cunning" and "tricks".[193] The examples involve many different characters (such as Athena, Laertes, Odysseus, the suitors),[194] and as such the negative connotation

---

189 Wace 1948:54; McIntosh Snyder 1981:193-194, with reference to Wace-Stubbings, *Companion to Homer*, pp. 531-532 and Chadwick, *The Mycenaean world*, pp. 151-152 (non vidi); Bergren 1983:72, and 1993:12; Jenkins 1985:114; Olsen 1992:227; Pantelia 1993:493; Austin 1994:37-38; Doherty 1995:195; Holmberg 2003:10; H. Roisman 2006:9; Bertolín Cebrián 2008c:95

190 Jenkins 1985:115; Goldhill 1988:5

191 Schmitt 1967:295-306. Besides Greek, it is also found in Sanskrit, Avestan, and Germanic. The clearest example in my opinion is Latin, where the word *textus* "woven" evolved into "text", and has as such survived into almost all European languages.

192 An interesting Graeco-Germanic isogloss is the use of verbs of the root $*h_2ub^h$-(for the root see Peters 1980:124) for "weaving poetry", as Greek ὑφαίνω "weave" and English *web* and *weave* are related. Old English has *wordcræft wæb* "I weave poetry"(Cynewulf), and Greek has μύθους καὶ μήδεα πᾶσιν ὕφαινον "when he wove words and plans to all" (*Iliad* 3,212). See Schmitt 1967:300 and also the introduction of this thesis.

193 Ameis-Hentze-Cauer-Bierl-Latacz-Führer-Stoevesand 2008 :74 *geläufige Metapher*.

194 For Athena, see *Odyssey* 13,303; for the suitors see *Odyssey* 4,678; for Laertes see *Odyssey* 4,739. All these examples involve weaving μῆτις, and are as such excluded from our discussion.

does not come from the word itself[195] but from the person to whom it refers. It seems that when Odysseus and Penelope weave a trick, the trick accomplishes its goals, at least for a certain period. When another person, such as the unknown god or Iobates, wants to weave a trick, the trick remains uneffective.

There are four instances where δόλος and weaving are combined, and three have a male subject. The first one involves Odysseus and (for Odysseus) an unspecified god. The dealt with Odysseus' long thought process to find an escape route out of the Kyklops' cave. The third instance involved Penelope and her shroud. She kept the suitors away by weaving and unraveling the shroud. As such, she succesfully combined the roles of a woman and the absent man. The last example comes from the *Iliad* and has a different context. The story refers to the attempt by king Iobates to kill Bellerophon treacherously. That story was related by Glaukos in response to Diomedes' question about his lineage.

4.3.1. Examples.

We now proceed to the analysis of the examples, and start with Odysseus' distrust of Leukothea's advice to swim to the shore. When Kalypso finally decided to let Odysseus continue his journey, he built a raft and he started sailing on it. When Poseidon noticed his raft, he decided to send storms to make his trip very difficult.[196] During the storms, Odysseus' raft capsized and he almost drowned. Leukothea noticed Odysseus' perilous situation and shouted that he had to leave the raft and swim to the shore.[197]

---

195 Moulton 1979:289-290; McIntosh Snyder 1981:194; Pantelia 1993:494; Holmberg 2003:10 but they do not discuss the weaving of poetry as an Indo-European inherited feature.
196 *Odyssey* 5,286-290
197 Many scholars (especially Holtsmark and Nagy) have pointed at the name of Leukothea "white goddess" who saved Odysseus from the "black sea of death". The symbolism is therefore enough in my opinion to accept the passage as genuine (against Marzullo).

ὤμοι ἐγώ, μή τίς μοι ὑφαίνῃσιν δόλον αὖτε (*Odyssey* 5,356)
"woe to me! Let not one (of the immortals) weave yet again a trick against me."

Odysseus, who built the raft himself and still remembered what happened with Kalypso, distrusted the advice.[198] Stanford linked Odysseus' reaction to his trickster nature and assumed that he suspected a trick because a trickster was by nature prone to suspect other people's motives.[199] I agree that certain aspects of Odysseus' behaviour point at a trickster creature (as we will see in the *Appendix*), but I do not think that this fact alone could explain his reaction here. After his stay with Kalypso he assumed tricks and traps where there were none (as his encounters with Athena and Penelope showed). He was correct in assuming that a god was weaving a trick against him, but he was wrong to distrust Leukothea.

Odysseus' use of μή τίς is reminiscent of the use of μῆτις/ μή τις and οὔ τις / Οὖτις in the Kyklops episode. As we will see later on as well, the words μή τίς "nobody" and μῆτις "cunning" are often used in a play of words. In this case, the phrase μή τίς appears in the negative wish "let not somebody weave". A Greek negation could be expressed by forms starting with οὐ- or μη-. In this context the negative words appeared in a wish, and therefore the form μή τις has to be used. The word group μή τίς μοι can also be interpreted as a wordplay with μῆτις and in that case the sentence would mean mean "my cunning is weaving a trick". This could refer to the fact that he mistakenly interpreted the advice of Leukothea as being dangerous instead of useful. The verse would then mean that Odysseus' own cunning mind was deceiving him. This is actually exactly

---

198 Barnouw 2004:60
199 Stanford 1959:305

what happened, because Odysseus almost drowned as a result of his refusal to accept Leukothea's advice.

The example as such confirms the idea that a trick that is not woven by Odysseus or Penelope is not succesful. In addition, this instance illustrates Odysseus' overcautious nature because there actually is no trick on Leukothea's part, only from Poseidon's part who consistently tried to thwart Odysseus' homecoming.

The following example related and described Odysseus' intensive thought process to find an escape route from the cave of the Kyklops, after he had blinded the Kyklops.

εὑροίμην πάντας δὲ δόλους καὶ μῆτιν ὕφαινον (*Odyssey* 9,422)
"(if) I could find (some release from death for my comrades or myself), I wove all kind of tricks and cunning."

We have analysed this passage in chapter 3. The first important element is the combination of weaving with both δόλους and μῆτιν. As the action of a male character, the weaving is used in a figurative context. The word μῆτιν is an allusion to the word play on μῆτις and μή τίς, which prevented the Kyklops from getting help from his fellow Kyklopes. The second important element in this passage is the use of the plural of δόλος and the adjective πᾶς. This indicates that the situation will be troublesome for the people involved.

Now we proceed to the most famous example, Penelope and her trick of the weaving and unravelling of the shroud. Penelope related to Odysseus how she kept the suitors away for more than three years. She promised the suitors that she would marry one of them, as soon as she had finished the shroud for Laertes. She worked at it during the day but at night she unraveled the shroud and, as a consequence, she never finished it. One

servant, Melantho, eventually found out and informed the suitors. As a result, Penelope was forced to finish the shroud.

> οἱ δὲ γάμον σπεύδουσιν, ἐγὼ δὲ δόλους τολυπεύω (*Odyssey* 19,137) "
> "they are urging a marriage, I on the other hand am finishing the weaving of tricks"

She told Odysseus that now she had no longer any possibility to keep the suitors at a distance[200] and that her situation had become precarious.[201] This is visible in the use of the present forms σπεύδουσιν "are urging" and τολυπεύω "am finishing", which indicate that at the moment Penelope was speaking, the suitors still wanted to marry her but that she has no other defence options. As such, the second part is the more important part of the verse.[202]

Penelope's use of tricks is often ascribed to her female nature and is used as an indication that women use δόλος, because they *must work indirectly against the stronger sex*.[203] As such, this is another illustration of a gendered use of δόλος.[204] On the other hand, it is true that Penelope on her own could not resist the hundred suitors, but her reaction also proves that she acted across gender lines. The verb that Penelope used here to describe her tricks, τολυπεύω, literally means "finish weaving", and as such she is clearly alluding to the fact that her shroud was her trick.[205] By this word she also indicated that she was out of options. This is the only instance where a verb with the meaning of "weaving" is used in its

---

200 Bertolín-Cebrián 2008c argues that there is also a real physical aspect in the separation as the loom is not visible for the suitors, see especially Bertolín-Cebrián 2008c: 93-94.
201 Holmberg 1990:172-173
202 Ameis-Hentze-Cauer 1911:11
203 Richardson 1992:150-151
204 Stanford 1958:320 did not discuss gender issues, but his description is quite accurate in this context: *The metaphor is particularly apt on the lips of so industrious a housewife as Penelope.* (Underlining is mine)
205 The link with weaving is made in Ameis-Hentze -Cauer 1911:11; LSJ states that Penelope deliberately used the word in its two meanings. Whallon 2000:335 *a figure of speech and a literal truth* follows that assessment.

double meaning.[206] Weaving wiles, guile and tricks was usually done by men, and Athena

was the only exception. Penelope was able to overcome this barrier. The word τολυπεύω

is usually combined with πόλεμον and, as such, alludes to a male activity,[207] as can be

seen in Hektor's remarks to Andromakhe that men should engage in warfare and women in

working wool.[208] These two elements could be an indication that Penelope is capable of

acting as a man.[209] As such, it is sometimes argued that Penelope could only survive in the

Odyssey because she acted as a man (and more particularly as Odysseus).[210] Her weaving

encompassed both aspects. Weaving kept the household in good order and defended it

against chaos, which was especially true in the case of Penelope's defence of Odysseus'

palace and kingdom.[211] As such, it protected Odysseus' kingdom from collapsing. The

figurative part is also visible, because Penelope's exceptional powers and cunning enabled

her to keep the suitors at a distance for so long. As a result, that protected her marriage. The

fact that Penelope was aware of these two aspects adds even more weight to her shrewd

nature.[212] This highly elaborate and cunning act puts Penelope on the same level as

Odysseus.[213] The fact that the only female who is described as "weaving cunning" is

Athena,[214] puts her on a level of intelligence comparable to that of Athena. In addition,

Penelope ascribes her intelligent plot to the intervention of a god, probably Athena.[215] She

is as such linked to Odysseus by her use of guile and to Athena by her weaving of guile.

---

206 Papadopoulou-Belmehdi 1994:82-83, repeated by Doherty 1996:275; Thomas 1988:261 mentions that
Penelope weaves garments and wiles, but does not say that she is the only female who says this about herself.
207 Rutherford 1992:150-151
208 Fletcher 2008:79
209 Papadopoulou-Belmehdi 1994:82-83, repeated by Doherty 1996:275
210 I owe this interpretation to my fellow student Lesley Bolton.
211 Pantelia 1993:496
212 Russo 1992:80-81; Whallon 2000:335 *a figure of speech and a literal truth*.
213 Goldhill 1988:3; Schein 1996b:26; Chaston 2002:13; Nieto-Hernández 2008:39-40
214 *Odyssey* 13,303
215 Marquardt 1985:33

Penelope was described in terms that were usually preserved for men (weaving guile) and she performed actions that men normally were supposed to do (keep the estate and kingdom in good order). This is an indication of gender inversion, because Penelope was only able to preserve the kingdom because she successfully combined the roles of a woman and the absent man.[216] In addition, she was compared to Athena, who is was the patroness of craftsmen but also of weaving.[217] This could also be seen as some kind of gender inversion. The last remark that we have to make, is that Penelope's woven trick achieved its goal for at least three years. As such, Penelope is put on the same level as Odysseus, because his woven tricks against the Kyklops also attained their goals.

The metrical pause in this verse provides a convenient division with regards to the content. It separates the acts of the suitors from Penelope's reaction to them.[218] Rutherford thinks that stresses the powerlessness of Penelope in comparison with the powerful suitors.

This story has three important elements. It reinforces Penelope as a typical female because she was weaving clothing. It also indicates, however, a gender inversion because Penelope was involved in weaving tricks and ruling the kingdom of Odysseus in his absence. Weaving tricks was a male occupation. Thirdly, Penelope described her own lack of resources after she had been found out as οὔτε τιν' ἄλλην μῆτιν ἔθ' εὑρίσκω "and I cannot find another cunning (act)", which is another illustration of the recurring contrast between μῆτις and δόλος. She considered her act to be μῆτις because it served her purpose well, but the suitors, as we have seen before in chapter 2, felt cheated and

---

216Levaniouk 2008:14 and 20-21
217 IJsseling 1994:68
218 Rutherford 1992:150

perceived the act as δόλος. As such, I would not interpret this passage negatively, in contrast to what Holmberg stated.[219]

The last example comes from the *Iliad* and relates the story of Glaukos and Diomedes. Diomedes met Glaukos in battle and asked his opponent who he was. Glaukos related his origin and as a consequence, Diomedes found out that they were related through guest friendship. The main idea was that guest friendship should be honoured, but the example of Glaukos showed what the consequences were when guests were not respected.

τῷ δ'ἄρ' ἀνερχομένῳ πυκινὸν δόλον ἄλλον ὕφαινε (*Iliad* 6,187)
"against him when he was coming back, (the king) wove another thick/well wrought trick."
Glaukos started his lineage with Sisyphos, and continued to Bellerophon. He then told the story of Bellerophon. When Bellerophon was at the court of king Proitos and queen Anteia, she tried to seduce him, but he turned her down. She then claimed that he had tried to seduce her, and forced Proitos to kill him. Proitos sent him to Iobates with a message that he should be put to death.[220] But Iobates only opened the letter after nine days and had in the mean time already eaten with Bellerophon, so that he was a genuine guest.[221] In order to fulfill the request of the letter, Iobates decided to send Bellerophon away on a number of tests to make sure that he would die, but with the help of Athena Bellerophon succeeded in performing the tests. Eventually, when he was succesful in all his works, Iobates decided to ambush him on his return. Bellerophon, however, was able to kill all the people involved in the ambush.[222] Afterwards, he enacted revenge on the king and his wife. Diomedes answered Glaukos that Bellerophon had been a guest in the house of his ancestors, and that

---

219 Holmberg 1990:172-173
220 Preller 1894 II:177-185
221 Slater 1968:333-336
222 *Iliad* 6,188-190

as a consequence, he was a long standing guest friend to Glaukos through Bellerophon. Therefore, they exchanged gifts and decided not to fight each other.

The use of the trick in this story is interesting for several reasons. Iobates claimed that he did not want to kill Bellerophon because he had eaten with him and had become a guest friend,[223] and as such, the king was obliged to act secretly against Bellerophon. The use of a trick against someone who is returning from a trip or a war is a common motif, and permeates the entire *Odyssey*.[224]

The use of letters as the tool of deceit is highly remarkable, because it is the only passage where writing is alluded to.[225] It is therefore tempting to see an allusion to Palamedes in this story.[226] The fact that this is the only instance where we have a written trick is also remarkable because one could see an evolution in the use of δόλος. From an act of the mind, it became something more concrete. The passage of Hephaistos' net showed the same. He thought of a way to take vengeance on Ares and turned his idea into a tangible object by assembling the fine spider webs.

The trick is described as πυκινόν, which seems to echo Helen's description of Odysseus as εἰδὼς παντοίους τε δόλους καὶ μήδεα πυκνά.[227] Πυκ(ι)νός can mean

---

223 Slater 1968:333
224 There is an entire "section" of the *Epic Cycle* that dealt with the different homecomings. These stories are called the *Nostoi*.
225 Murray-Wyatt 1999 I:287. This would be an indication for the existence of writing in the period between the Mycenaean and Archaic period, and would agree with Ruijgh's assumption in his 1995 and 1998 articles that the alphabet came into use in Greece in 1000ª.
226 Odysseus set up Palamedes by hiding gold in his tent and adding a forged letter in which Priam supposedly thanked Palamedes for his support. Palamedes was subsequently stoned to death. He was credited with inventing the alphabet in some traditions, whereas other people think that Homer invented, or at least imported, alphabetic writing into the Greek world. Palamedes' absence from the Homeric poems is with this reasoning explained as jealousy on the part of Homer and by his intention to depict "his" Odysseus as cleaner than he actually was. Both aspects (the set up of Palamedes and the "preference" of Homer for Odysseus) are related in Philostratos' *Heroikos*. One can refer to Meulders 2002 for an analysis of Odysseus' behaviour in this story.
227 *Iliad* 3,202, see chapter 3.

"thick" but also "cleverly wrought" and even "hidden, concealed". The combination of δόλος and words indicating mental action is common.[228] The message was closed and, as a result, Bellerophon did not know about the content of the letter. Therefore, the meaning "concealed" is best. As such, the idea is that the trick is a highly elaborated scheme. This is explained by the fact that Bellerophon could not be killed by Iobates because he had already treated Bellerophon as a guest. The trick does not achieve its goals because Bellerophon was able to overpower his attackers. Glaukos' story therefore illustrates the importance of respecting guest friendship, and as a result of the existing bonds between the families of Glaukos and Diomedes, they decide not to fight each other.

4.3.2. Conclusion: the combination of weaving and δόλος.

Weaving in Homer is used to indicate different activities. Most common is the literal meaning as weaving garments and represents a female activity. Because several weaving women were involved in deceitful behaviour, the assumption was made that the mention of weaving alluded to female deceit. Weaving is also used as a complement to "poetry", "speech" and "words". This usage is inherited from Indo-European and did not have a bad connotation. Therefore it is likely that it did not have this connotation in Greek either and that, consequently, weaving itself cannot have been a reference to female deception.

We have four examples where δόλος is used as an object of weaving. Three are about men. The first one involves Odysseus' distrust of Leukothea's advice to swim to the shore. The second instance is Odysseus' extensive thinking about how to escape from the Kyklops' cave after he blinded him. The last story involving a male weaving δόλος comes

---

228 Ameis-Hentze-Cauer-Bierl-Latacz-Führer-Stoevesand 2008:74

from the *Iliad*. Diomedes met Glaukos in battle and asked who he was. Glaukos related his genealogy and described the trick that Iobates wove against one of his ancestors, Bellerophon.

The most famous example is Penelope's weaving of the shroud. Her use of "weaving" is remarkable because she was aware of the double use of it. She wove and as such kept the household in order, but she also wove tricks and prevented the suitors from marrying her. As such, she acted as a woman and as a man. I do not think that it is a coincidence that the only woman who is involved in weaving "cunning" is Athena. This provided a clear link between the two women who were closest to Odysseus, and who helped him the most in maintaining and regaining his kingship.

This section illustrates the importance of the perspective of the action. This confirms what we have seen in chapters 3, 5 and 6. If a person is trying to accomplish something, the term is μῆτις used, but when the story is related from the perspective of the victim, the word δόλος is used. Odysseus' comment on the Kyklops story to the Phaiakians seems to indicate that he considered his blinding to be μῆτις, whereas the Kyklops saw it as a δόλος, as we will see later on. When Penelope talked about the suitors' intentions, she described her act as δόλος, because they did not appreciate that trick, but when she talked to Odysseus about her own situation, she used μῆτις.

4.4. Δόλος as a tool to impede.

We now proceed to the analysis of the examples where δόλος is used to impede someone. The first one refers to Apollon's attempts to keep Akhilleus away fom Troy and Hektor.

The second one is more interesting as it refers to Menelaos' complaint about the chariot race. That verse contrasts the use of δόλος and μῆτις, and shows that the difference is sometimes only in the perception of the person who acts as subject or object.

After Patroklos was killed and Akhilleus received new armour, he decided to enact a relentless vengeance on the Trojans, and started killing indiscriminately in an especially heinous manner.[229] This caused a panic among the Trojans, including Hektor. Apollon tried to gain time for Hektor. He disguised himself as Antenor and ran in front of Akhilleus who followed him in an angry pursuit. This gave the Trojans the opportunity to flee. Apollon's attempts were described with the following verse.

αὐτὰρ ὁ Πηλείωνα δόλῳ ἀποέργαθε λαοῦ (*Iliad* 21,599)
"he (Apollon sc.) however kept the son of Peleus away from the (Trojan) people by guile"

Apollon could have physically stopped him (as he did with Patroklos),[230] but Apollon decided to impede Akhilleus' assault on Hektor and Troy, until Fate decided who would eventually die. As soon as Zeus had Fate weigh the fates of both heroes and Hektor's one was to die, Apollon left Hektor. As a consequence, Apollon did not directly intervene, and only used a phantom instead of his usual force, because he could not overrule Fate.

Our second example comes from the funeral games for Patroklos, and allows for a more in-depth analysis. Before the chariot race Antilokhos was contemplating how he could compete since his horses were slower than those of the other competitors. His father, Nestor, advised him to use μῆτις "cunning" and apply Menelaos' weakness against him.

---

229 One example could be that he scoffed at a fallen opponent begging for mercy because Patroklos had to die and did not receive mercy, he should not expect any mercy either. In *Iliad* 22,346-347 he even threatened to eat parts of Hektor's body himself. Later in Book 23,175-176 he sacrificed 12 Trojan youth on the funeral pyre for Patroklos.
230 He told him that it was not fated that he would take Troy (*Iliad* 16,698-709). Akhilleus would not participate in the final raid either, and Apollon confirmed this to Patroklos (*Iliad* 16,709).

Nestor argued that Menelaos was almost certain that his horses would be faster and therefore was not going to be on his guard. So it happened, and Menelaos was outsmarted by Antilokhos, but he complained and wanted him to swear that he had not used any trick. This verse quoted Menelaos' request to Antilokhos.

ὄμνυθι μὴ μὲν ἑκὼν τὸ ἐμὸν δόλῳ ἅρμα πεδῆσαι (*Iliad* 23,585)
"swear that you did not willingly and trickily impede my chariot"

He claimed that Antilokhos deliberately impeded him,[231] and consequently robbed him of a possible victory. Antilokhos made the impeding manoeuvre when he surpassed Menelaos on the narrow part of the turning point of track and pushed Menelaos to the outside of the track. This movement effectively impeded Menelaos' horses, because they had to slow down if they wanted to avoid a collision.[232] Menelaos became afraid and slowed down. After the race Menelaos was upset because of the unexpected manoeuvre,[233] and wanted Antilokhos to swear solemnly that he had not intentionally blocked his way. Antilokhos did not want to swear to something that was not true, and therefore admitted guilt, offered Menelaos his price and attributed what happened to youthful irresponsible behaviour.[234]

The word δόλος in this verse is remarkable. First of all, Nestor had not suggested that his son should use an unacceptable trick, but he had advised him to be clever, because he assumed that the other racers would not possess more cleverness than his son.[235] In a chariot race, the speed of the horses was important, but passing another chariot at the right

---

231 See especially *Iliad* 23,571-572 where Menelaos described Antilokhos' trick: τοὺς σοὺς πρόσθε βαλών (you have put shame on my skill by hurting my horses and) by throwing yours in front of them. (Underlining is mine)
232 *Iliad* 23,433-437
233 Detienne-Vernant 1978:202 stress the fact that Menelaos was unaware of what was going to happen, and that he therefore was not prepared to deal with it during the race.
234 Levine 2002/3:146-149 for a general analysis of irresponsible youths, and 153-155 for Antilokhos' behaviour. See also Murray-Wyatt's comments on line 441 (Murray-Wyatt 2004 II:525)
235 *Iliad* 23,311-312.

moment was even more important.[236] Therefore, Nestor used the words μῆτις and

μητίομαι "possess μῆτις" to describe what Antilokhos had to do. The last word is

especially interesting, because it means not only "possess μῆτις", but also "to use it at the

right time".[237] Menelaos' perception on the other hand makes clear that what one person

perceives to be acceptable and clever can be interpreted by another as an unfair trick.[238]

Menelaos felt unjustly treated and used the term δόλος. As such, this verse fits in with

several other instances in this chapter but also in other chapters where we have pointed out

that the difference between μῆτις and δόλος depends on the eye of the beholder.

Secondly, this episode illustrates that Nestor was aware that inferior fighters and

competitors could overcome their opponents by cunning.[239] As a consequence, this verse

can be put among the instances of De Jong's so-called "cunning versus force" motif

throughout the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* where a weaker opponent won the fight against a stronger

one.[240] The fact that Nestor's suggestion achieved its intended goal and the argumentation

that he used for it would fit in with the description of Nestor that we found in other

instances, namely that of a clever and resourceful person, comparable to Odysseus' level of

intellect and cunning. The last remark on this verse has to do with the apology of

Antilokhos. He ascribed his trick to irresponsible and youthful behaviour, but he was

actually advised to do so by Nestor.[241] I therefore disagree with Dunkle's assumption that

---

236 *Iliad* 23,318-325. See also Dunkle 1987:7 and Bertolín-Cebrián 1996a:192.
237 Bertolín-Cebrián 1996a:192 *μῆτις haben bedeutet nicht nur "Maßnahmen treffen können", sondern "sie in dem richtigen Moment anwenden zu können".*
238 Detienne-Vernant 1978:13 discuss the importance of the perspective but they do not explicitly state that the difference might be explained as a consequence of who used it and against whom it was used.
239 Detienne-Vernant 1978:12. Nestor stated this very clearly in *Iliad* 23,315: μήτι τοι δρυτόμος μέγ' ἀμείνων ἠὲ βίηφι "by cunning is a woodcutter far better than by might".
240 De Jong 2001 only applied this to the *Odyssey* as she only dealt with that work.
241 Detienne-Vernant 1978:202

Antilokhos had to yield because μῆτις could never achieve anything in the *Iliad*.[242]

Menelaos insisted he be given the reward of Antilokhos, but this did not happen.[243] If

Akhilleus had felt such a dislike for the behaviour of Antilokhos as he had for Odysseus

and his tricks throughout the entire *Iliad*,[244] he would have intervened and would have

forced Antilokhos to give Menelaos what he wanted, but that did not happen. It is

remarkable, however, that Akhilleus did intervene to prevent Odysseus from beating Aias

during the wrestling game.[245] In this context, however, Nestor received an honorary prize,

which seems to contradict the assumption that μῆτις should never be rewarded.

As such, this seems to indicate that experience in resourcefulness was required to be

effective. This would fit with the conclusion we made after chapter 3 that Odysseus was the

king of the tricks. Only Nestor, Helen and Penelope could compete with Odysseus in

resourcefulness. That Antilokhos had to yield would be an indication that his use of guile

has not yet reached the necessary level of maturity.[246]

The metrical structure underlines the unexpected nature of the trick that Antilokhos

has used. The position of δόλῳ between the article and possessive pronoun (τὸ ἐμὸν

"my") on the one hand and the noun on the other hand (ἅρμα "chariot") almost literally

robs Menelaos of his chariot and ruins his chariot race. The stress in this verse clearly lies

on the unfair tricks used by Antilokhos against Menelaos. The main ideas of this verse are

that Antilokhos should swear that his action was not intentional and deceitful. Therefore I

suggest the following pauses in the verse: after ὄμνυθι, after ἐκὼν, and after δόλῳ.

242 Dunkle 1987:8
243 Beck 2008:173-174
244 Dunkle 1987:8; Beck 2008:165
245 Dunkle 1987:13-15 made the same analysis about the wrestling contest but did not think that it
contradicted his assumptions.
246 Detienne-Vernant 1978:202 but they do not make the comparison between Odysseus, Helen and Nestor.

4.5. Conclusion: δόλος and its connection to concrete activities.

Several instances in this chapter used the word δόλος in a concrete meaning, namely "bait" or "net". The example of Skylla used δόλος exclusively in the concrete meaning "bait", but for the descriptions of Hephaistos' trick, δόλος had both the meanings "net" and "trap". As such, it stressed the crafty and guileful nature of Hephaistos. The description of the "poured" net, the combination of δόλος and δεσμός "bonds" and the comparison with the spider webs provide a clear picture of how strong and deceitful Hephaistos' ambush was.

The use of weaving and δόλος was an important part of this chapter. Weaving itself was associated with many objects such as garments, poetry, cunning and guile. In the case of poetry, cunning and guile the verb was normally used with a male subject. Athena and Penelope were the only two exceptions. I do not think that it is a coincidence that they were the two female characters who were the closest to Odysseus.

An important element in this chapter is the careful and thorough preparation that the use of δόλος required. Hephaistos thought about his net on the bed and Klytaimnestra's careful preparation for Agamemnon's ambush were described with the imperfect, which stressed the long action. Penelope's use of present forms to describe the suitors' attempts to marry her and her use of woven tricks as a defence mechanism indicate that this was a situation that continued even until the moment when she pronounced the words. This confirms what we noticed in chapter 2 where we stated that female characters intensively thought about their δόλος.

Related to the previous two points is the gendered aspect of δόλος. Klytaimnestra, Hera and Penelope are clear examples of females who acted after intensive thinking. Penelope's weaving of the shroud is a typically female activity. Hera's use of guile is equated with her use of seduction and sexuality. That example provides the clearest link between female sexuality and female δόλος. It is remarkable that in that particular instance the use of δόλος is explicitly described as something morally bad, and therefore seems to indicate that female δόλος is dangerous. This would confirm our conclusion in chapter 2, where we stated that that male characters could only avoid female δόλος if they were aware of its existence. Hera deliberately used Aphrodite's looks to seduce Zeus and prevent him from noticing her bad intentions. In addition, the assembling of Hephaistos' net is described in terms that are usual for female creatures. These examples, however, also indicate a gender inversion. Several actions were performed by female characters who acted as a man. Penelope wove the shroud but also wove tricks and maintained Odysseus' kingdom. Weaving guile and tricks, and maintaining the good order of the kingdom were protypically male occupations. To describe Klytaimnestra's actions the poet used a word that was normally reserved for actions that required a certain amount of skill and preparation. This seems to confirm the gender inversions of Aigisthos and Klytaimnestra during the murder of Agamemnon. Hephaistos' creation of the booby-trapped bed also involved a gender inversion, but in the opposite direction. He was a male god, but was described as a female animal (in the opinion of the Greeks) and with a female occupation, namely weaving clothing and webs. The last possible instance of gender inversion is more indirect. Homer described Odysseus' crying as that of a captured woman, and one could

therefore see both a role reversal (conquerer becomes conquered) and a gender inversion (man becomes woman). The link between Odysseus' use of δόλος and the reversal is indirect, because Odysseus only started crying after Demodokos' description, not after his own request. Nevertheless, it is clear that Odysseus' trick with the Horse and the subsequent fall of Troy caused almost as much pain for the Greeks as it did for the Trojans. In short this chapter again showed a clearly gendered use of δόλος, although it also involved a substantial amount of gender inversion.

Two characters in this chapter displayed a similar behaviour, namely Odysseus and Penelope. Both of them engaged in cunning and tricks to survive, and both of them assumed roles that were opposite to their gender. The most obvious example is the weaving of Penelope. The actual weaving of Laertes' shroud was a sign of Penelope's female nature, but her simultaneous use of the weaving to weave tricks and withstand the beleaguering of the suitors, is a very male action. As such, she was put on the same level of cunning as Odysseus. She was the only mortal female who is able to successfully challenge Odysseus, as opposed to the immortal Helen, Kirke and Athena, and therefore, it is no coincidence that she was the only woman who was described as weaving tricks.

In this chapter we also noticed that Nestor was another mortal who possessed a level of cunning comparable to Odysseus. His argument for fighting with a certain amount of tricks to overpower resembles very closely the Odyssean method of fighting, as we could observe in the description of Odysseus' fight with Aias. The similarity became even more obvious when he advised his son to use μῆτις during the chariot race. By focusing only on

the positive effects of his actions for himself, he became much like Odysseus. We saw that Odysseus was described by Agamemnon as only interested in his own profit.

The foregoing example brings us to a very important element in the discussion of δόλος. In the earlier chapters we noticed already that the use of δόλος and μῆτις depended on the perspective of the persons involved. This chapter has provided some additional examples of that. Nestor's use of μῆτις and δόλος has been discussed already, but also Odysseus and Penelope provided examples of that distinction. She told Odysseus that the suitors were urging a marriage but that her δόλος was able to keep them away. After she was betrayed by a servant, she told Odysseus that she no longer had any μῆτις to fight back. The same distinction can be seen in the Kyklops episode, where Odysseus' μῆτις is the actual δόλος to prevent Polyphemos from fighting back. An additional illustration of this distinction can be seen in the use of δόλος-compounds for Zeus (by Hera) and for Aigisthos and Klytaimnestra. They were described as δολόμητις, and that word indicates clearly that the person who used these words perceived a clear disadvantage or disapproval in the related actions.

To sum up, this chapter provides examples of all the important conclusions that can be drawn from the use of δόλος in the Homeric poems. It proves the gendered and gender-inversed use of δόλος. It highlights the distinction between δόλος and μῆτις . The stories of Odysseus, Penelope and Hephaistos provided examples of the "cunning versus force" motif. Odysseus' versatility is also mentioned in this chapter, and finally the actions of

Penelope and Odysseus prove that they are worthy of one another and of similar intellectual

capacities, with Penelope maybe even being Odysseus' superior.[247]

---

247 Nieto-Hernández 2008:40

Chapter 5. δόλος as a tool of secrecy.

In this chapter, we look at the use of δόλος as a tool of secrecy. The examples give the impression that the word δόλος had a negative meaning, because the word was twice contrasted with the word ἀμφαδόν "openly", and was used as a dative of means with the verbs meaning "to hide, mislead", and with the verb "enchant". In one instance it was complemented by other adverbs (originally datives as well) with the meaning "in a hidden way". It is remarkable that the instances all have the dative form δόλῳ, which means that δόλῳ is not described as the action itself but as the tool in order to achieve the action.

An important issue in this chapter is the justifiableness of the trick. There are four passages where the person using δόλος is faced with a stronger opponent. De Jong called this contrast the "cunning versus force" motif.[248] These instances deal with the suitors, and the tricks were used as defence against their numerical superiority. In addition, the frequent mentioning of the suitors' misdeeds seems to confirm that using tricks against them was justified. The passages deal with the "opponents" of the suitors. The first two passages involved Telemakhos and Odysseus, whereas the other two passages involved Penelope. The Iliadic example describes Apollon's temporary attempt to keep Akhilleus away from Troy and impede his killing of Hektor.

5.1. Examples.

The first two instances deal with the prediction of the suitors' murder by Odysseus and Telemakhos. During the actual killing the trick was that the weapons had been removed and

---

248 De Jong 2001:103

that Odysseus was transformed by Athena, but the killing itself was still visible. The first instance was pronounced by Athena, disguised as Mentor, who wanted Telemakhos to stop acting childishly, and become braver and more active against the suitors.She wanted him to go to Pylos and Sparta to obtain information about his father.[249]

κτείνῃς ἠὲ δόλῳ ἢ ἀμφαδόν· οὐδέ τί σε χρή (*Odyssey* 1,296)
"(how) you can kill (the suitors in your palace) either by using a trick or openly; it is not fitting for you (to perform childish acts...)".

The use of tricks is stressed by the contrast between δόλῳ "trick" and ἀμφαδόν "openly". Athena suggested that Telemakhos and Odysseus should decide whether they were going to kill the suitors with a trick or openly. The murder of the suitors incorporated both aspects.[250] The suitors died openly as they were killed by Odysseus, but the tricky aspect was that Telemakhos had already removed the weapons so that they could not really fight back.

In the following verse the killing of the suitors is foretold in almost the same words but the context and the meaning are different. Teiresias was talking to Odysseus in the Underworld about the killing of the suitors. The main differences are the inclusion of the "bronze" to kill them and the description the killing as an already accomplished fact.

κτείνῃς ἠὲ δόλῳ ἢ ἀμφαδὸν ὀξέι χαλκῷ (*Odyssey* 11,120)
"(when) you have killed (the suitors in your palace) either by use of tricks or openly by the sharp bronze."

---

249 For an analysis of Athena's arguments the bibliography is vast. De Jong 2001 and West 1988 provide a good overview, although their overall approach is different.
250 De Jong 2001:526

The phrase is very similar in wording to the previous instance but the context and the meaning are different. The inclusion of ὀξέι χαλκῷ alludes to the actual killing of the suitors. That detail was missing in the previous verse. Teiresias was here talking about what Odysseus had to do after he had killed the suitors. The verbal form κτείνῃς is the same, but the subjunctive aorist refers here to the fact that the future action of the temporal clause has already taken place before the action of the main clause.[251] As such, this verse depicts the slaying of the suitors as an accomplished fact.[252] In the previous instance it is part of a subjunctive in an object clause after verbs of "thinking, seeing to it that... will happen", and is as such an action that has not yet taken place in the mind of the speaker. In both instances the aorist refers to a single action. This fine verbal distinction cannot be conveyed in English, but the verbal echo between the two verses is deliberate. The reason for the verbal echo is that the stories are related and have a common goal. The poet wanted to indicate that both protagonists in the slaying of the suitors were informed beforehand of what would happen.[253] Athena informed Telemakhos and Teiresias told Odysseus about the slaying of the suitors.

The next two examples also indicate the use of δόλος against the suitors, but now Penelope is the protagonist of the trick. She did not have the power to physically and openly confront the suitors, so she wove and unravelled the shroud. This allowed her to keep the suitors away for three years.

ὣς τρίετες μὲν ἔληθε δόλῳ καὶ ἔπειθε ᾿Αχαιούς (*Odyssey* 2,106)

---

251 Smyth 1956:524 and 543
252 Ameis-Hentze 1908:144 *Konjunkt. Aoristi* and 143: *Konj. Aor im Sinne des Fut. exact.*;De Jong 2001:278
253 S. West referred in her *Odyssey* commentary on *Odyssey* 1,296 to the passage with Teiresias.

"and so for three years she kept it secret from the Akhaians by her trick and made them believe (she was finishing the shroud)."

This verse belongs to the reaction of the suitor Antinoos. The context has been analysed before, but there are some interesting remarks to be made about this verse. The first one is that the imperfects ἔληθε "hid" and ἔπειθε "made believe" indicate that Penelope succeeded in fooling the suitors for a very long time. In this verse the word "trick" is combined with an act of concealing as I think that the dative δόλῳ "by her trick" is linked with ἔληθε "she kept it secret" rather than ἔπειθε "she made them believe". The metrical build up confirms this, because the pause after μὲν, and one after δόλῳ, stress Penelope's different actions. This verse could be an indication that Penelope was only able to keep the suitors away if she used some kind of hidden scheme, because on her own she would not have been able to chase them away.

The following verse was pronounced in the Underworld by the suitor Amphimedon, when Agamemnon asked him about who those with him were and what they had done to come to Hades in such big numbers. The analysis of this passage has been given when we discussed 24,128.

ὣς τρίετες μὲν ἔληθε δόλῳ καὶ ἔπειθε ᾿Αχαιούς (*Odyssey* 24,141) "and so for three years she kept it secret from the Akhaians by her trick and made them believe (she was finishing the shroud)."

This verse is an obvious echo from the previous one (2,106), but contrary to the relation between verses 2,93 and 24,128, I believe that there is not much difference between 2,106 and 24,141. It is indeed true that at that specific moment the bow contest was Penelope's biggest scheme in the eyes of the suitors, but they were obviously still upset about how they

were fooled for three years.[254] The obvious difference is that Agamemnon heard about Penelope's repeated attempts to remain faithful and this made him praise her faithfulness in the highest terms.[255]

The following Odyssean instances, the murder of Agamemnon, and Odysseus' refusal to reveal himself to Penelope, indicate a negative meaning for δόλῳ. Agamemnon's murder is described by an entire verse of negative words. Odysseus' behaviour towards Penelope was unnecessary, because it made her suffer even more, and as such, δόλῳ has indeed a negative meaning. Klytaimnestra's description is somewhat different, because the story was probably intentionally told in this manner by Menelaos to absolve himself of his inertia in this whole episode. Δόλῳ has therefore a negative meaning in this passage. We have to be careful when discussing Klytaimnestra's role in the murder scheme, because the *Odyssey* generally did not consider her the main protagonist.

The following verse describes Klytaimnestra's evil deeds in contriving Agamemnon's death. This verse was spoken by Menelaos as a reaction to a remark by Telemakhos, who asked Peisistratos, the son of Nestor, if he had ever seen such a wealthy palace.

<div align="center">

λάθρη, ἀνωιστὶ, δόλῳ οὐλομένης ἀλόχοιο (*Odyssey* 4,92)
"(at that time another killed my brother) by stealth, off guard and by the treachery of his baneful wife"

</div>

Menelaos overheard this remark and started explaining that earthly wealth was worthless in comparison to Zeus' palaces. He also told them how he acquired the wealth in Egypt and

---

254 As such, I do not agree with Krischer' 1993, who assumed that the bow contest was borrowed from the Herakles sagas and that the three different instances of the shroud trick could not all three have been genuine, and that it would not have been logical that the bow contest and shroud trick were mentioned by the suitors.
255 Segal 1983(1988):134-135; Marquardt 1985:47

added that, while he was in Egypt, other companions of his were murdered on their way home. He gave the example of his brother Agamemnon and stated that he was therefore not happy with his riches, because Agamemnon's wealth was not able to prevent his murder.

Menelaos described briefly, but very emotionally, what happened to his brother.[256] If one looks at this passage alone, the blame is definitely put on Klytaimnestra because she is mentioned, whereas Aigisthos is only described as "the other". As such, this passage is one of the few instances where Klytaimnestra is considered more responsible. The passage is indeed short, but we find here more than one word with the meaning of deceit or treacherous acts. The sequence of words moves in a crescendo towards the end of the verse where it is revealed who this evil treacherous creature is. De Jong rightly points out that this line is completely asyndetic, and that stresses the emotion even more.[257] The metre confirms this, and there are pauses after λάθρῃ, ἀνωιστὶ, δόλῳ, and maybe even after οὐλομένης "destructive", but even without a pause there the destructive nature of Klytaimnestra is stressed.

There are some questions to be asked about the reasons why Menelaos so vehemently stressed the treacherous and hidden actions and depicted Klytaimnestra as such an evil-contriving woman.[258] Is Menelaos therefore trying to protect or excuse himself for the fact that he did not attend the funeral, and that he was not there to protect his brother by shifting the blame to the hidden and hideous tricks of an evil woman?[259] I believe that he is

---

256 Schmiel 1972:465-466; De Jong 2001:95
257 De Jong 2001:95
258 A detailed comparison between the different versions of the murder of Agamemnon would be interesting, but it falls outside the scope of this thesis. Proteus gave a detailed description of what happened on Agamemnon's homecoming, including who was involved and how. He related how Aigisthos ambushed Agamemnon and killed him and his comrades after preparing a feast for them. Proteus did not mention Klytaimnestra .
259 S.West 1988:225 and De Jong 2001:110 point out that since Proteus did not mention Klytaimnestra, Menelaos could not have known her exact involvement.

indeed trying to excuse himself for what happened. West argued that Menelaos could not bring himself to pronounce Aigisthos' name,[260] but I think that he deliberately left out the name because, if he did mention the name, his guests could start wondering why Menelaos did not avenge his brother, knowing who killed him. In addition, Menelaos made assumptions and vows about the murder of his brother and other fighters at Troy ("I would prefer to have only one third of wealth if the men at Troy did not die"),[261] and he stated that his brother's riches did not stop him from being killed,[262] but that event did not stop Menelaos from gathering riches anyway.[263] This is a strong indication about Menelaos' less than genuine feelings and his cowardly refusal to avenge his brother. As such, the depiction of δόλος as a tool of secrecy puts the blame on Klytaimnestra in strong words, but the person who pronounced those words was not without blame himself.[264] Therefore, I think that Menelaos used this line to absolve himself of any responsibility, especially when we consider that Proteus did not mention her involvement.[265] As we have said before, the role of Klytaimnestra was not yet so outspokenly evil in the *Odyssey* as in to the tragedies,[266] and Aigisthos was described five times with the adjective δολόμητις, whereas Klytaimnestra received that epithet only once.[267]

We now analyse Odysseus' stern and cold reaction to Penelope's tears. This passage belongs to the long conversations that Odysseus and Penelope had before Penelope finally

---

260 S.West 1988:199
261 *Odyssey* 4,97-99, analysed in Bolton 2008:4
262 Clader 1976:26
263 Bolton 2008:4
264 One could of course also ask the question why Menelaos thought that divine riches were better than mortal ones, when he would become immortal as well? This, again, shows Menelaos' less than genuine feelings. See West 1988:199. De Jong (2001:95) thinks that Menelaos was genuinely modest here. She assumes that he did not want to upset the gods.
265 S.West 1988:225; De Jong 2001:110
266 Graver 1995:57
267 One can refer to Dunbar-Marzullo 1971 and Nordheider 1984. See also De Jong 2001:111.

recognised Odysseus. Penelope asked the stranger in front of her about Odysseus. He told an invented story and the details of it made Penelope cry. Odysseus felt pity for his wife but did not reveal himself.

ἀτρέμας ἐν βλεφάροισι· δόλῳ δ' ὅ γε δάκρυα κεῦθε (Odyssey 19,212)
"(but his eyes stood) fixed in their lids, and with guile he hid his tears."

One could argue that Odysseus' behaviour was not entirely irrational. As we have seen before, Agamemnon told him in the Underworld that he should not trust women, not even Penelope, and that he should proceed with caution.[268] Agamemnon reassured Odysseus afterwards about her fidelity, but this advice, together with the lingering doubts that were already instilled into Odysseus in the Ares and Aphrodite episode, made Odysseus even more suspicious. As such, we have to be careful when discussing Odysseus' behaviour. Russo and Rutherford (and later also De Jong) stated that this passage belonged to the examples of Odysseus' self-control that made him famous.[269] I would interpret this passage somewhat differently, however. Odysseus felt pity for his wife,[270] but still decided to continue to torment her. I do not see how that could be "self control", but rather I would consider Odysseus' behaviour a trickster trait (harming for the sake of harming), because it would have been better to divulge his identity.[271]

We now proceed to the only example from the *Iliad*. In this verse, Apollon used guile to keep Akhilleus away from Troy. He did so by impersonating the Trojan Antenor.

---

268 *Odyssey* 11,441-444 and especially 454-456
269 Russo 1992:88; Rutherford 1992:166-167; De Jong 2001:420
270 H.Parry 1994:14
271 For a full analysis of Odysseus' trickster characteristics I refer the reader to the Appendix.

As such, he temporarily blinded Akhilleus and removed him from normal observation, and therefore this passage could be included in the chapter of δόλος as a tool of secrecy.

τυτθὸν ὑπεκπροθέοντα, δόλῳ δ' ἄρ' ἔθελγεν'Απόλλων (*Iliad* 21,604)
"(turning him (Akhilleus) towards the river deep-eddying Skamandros) running a bit in front, by guile, however, Apollon was trying to deceive him"

The use of δόλος here can be explained by the fact that Akhilleus had embarked on a murderous rampage against the Trojans, and at this moment the final battle between Akhilleus and Hektor was about to start. Apollon's tricks allowed Hektor and the Trojans to flee for a brief period of time, while Akhilleus still thought that he was chasing Antenor. He could have stopped him (as he did with Patroklos), but Apollon decided to keep Akhilleus away from Hektor until Fate decided who would eventually die. The influence of Fate is one of the reasons that Apollon did not directly intervene.[272]

I included "was trying to" to express the notion of the attempts of Apollon to keep Akhilleus away from Troy; one could also argue that the imperfect form ἔθελγεν indicates repeated actions. I followed the Loeb translation "deceived" for ἔθελγεν,[273] although the word means more than just "deceive", and has the notion of magic and seduction, as can be seen in the different uses of this word in the *Odyssey*.[274]

---

272 Later on, Apollon helped Paris kill Akhilleus, and Hektor prophesied Akhilleus' death to him but Akhilleus' death is not related in detail in the *Iliad*. See *Iliad* 22,358-360 and also Richardson 1993:143
273 LSJ s.v. translates "cheat".
274 Riess 1925:226; Griffin 1980:41; I hope one day to conclude the analyses of this word, and the other words meaning "deceive", "enchant", and so on. In the *Odyssey* the word θέλγω is used to describe poetry in general (Pucci 1987:193), Aigisthos' attempts to seduce Klytaimnestra (*Odyssey* 3,264; Doherty 1995:188), the enchantment of Kirke (*Odyssey* 10,291 (I owe this reference to Reyes Bertolín Cebrián); Doherty 1995:188), the attempts of Kalypso to keep Odysseus (*Odyssey* 1,57; Riess 1925:226), the Sirens' songs (*Odyssey* 12,40-44. See also Pucci 1987:194; Papadopoulou-Belmehdi 1994:175; Doherty 1995:188), Penelope's influence on the suitors (*Odyssey* 18,282. Pucci 1987:194; Papadopoulou-Belmehdi 1994:180; Doherty 1995:188), the influence Odysseus' stories had on Eumaios, the swine herd (*Odyssey* 17,521; see Block 1985:6 for an analysis of Odysseus' motives in testing Eumaios, but see Chaston 2002:12.), and even

5.2. Conclusion: δόλος as a tool of secrecy.

The use of δόλος as a tool of secrecy is predominantly found in the *Odyssey*. It alludes to a contrast between the clear and open action, and the hidden trick as a means to react to a dangerous situation. There are seven instances of which six can be found in the *Odyssey*. Of those, four are positive and two are very negative.

The four "positive" δόλος examples relate to the suitors, of which two refer to their murder. Athena exhorted Telemakhos to become braver and suggested that he had to start thinking about how to kill the suitors. Teiresias told Odysseus what he had to do after the suitors were killed. The two other instances referred to Penelope and her famous shroud trick. She openly said that she would marry a suitor once the shroud was finished, but secretly at night she unravelled the shroud.

Two instances seem particularly negative. The first one is Menelaos' description of Agamemnon's murder. He used very strong words to blame Klytaimnestra for the murder. The second example is Odysseus' cold reaction to Penelope's tears. Penelope asked him who he was, and he invented a story about how he knew Odysseus. Penelope started to cry, but Odysseus did not reveal himself.

The last example comes from the *Iliad* and describes the attempt of Apollon to keep Akhilleus away from Hektor and the Trojans. Apollon could not intervene with force, because Fate had not yet decided whether Akhilleus or Hektor had to die.

Half of the examples of this chapter indicate that δόλος was used as a tool against more powerful opponents, and as such were an illustration of De Jong's "cunning versus

---

the Trojan Horse (*Odyssey* 8,509; Riess 1925:226).

force" theme. In addition, the examples also confirm the gendered use of δόλος. The actions of the female characters in the *Odyssey* are described as hidden, whereas the killing of the suitors is described by a contrast between δόλος and ἀμφαδόν. We could therefore see another gendered use of δόλος, because the two instances seem to indicate that δόλος as a tool of secrecy is a specifically female course of action. If the suitors had not been informed about the trick, they would never have found out. The same applies to Klytaimnestra's description. She planned her ambush carefully and Agamemnon did not suspect anything. This would confirm the idea of chapter 2 that a female δόλος can only be avoided by male characters if they are aware of its existence.

Chapter 6. Death and dying as a result of δόλος.

This chapter analyses the link between δόλος and death. The first subsection of this chapter is used to indicate that killing may be be achieved through δόλος. The focus here is on the perpetrator: the verb is active and the perpetrator is the subject. The second subsection deals with δόλος as a cause of death. In that section, the emphasis is on the victims. The verb has a passive meaning and the subject is the victim. There is another distinction: the first subsection relates single events, whereas the second one refers to recurring threats. The most important conclusion that comes out of this chapter is the distinction between δόλος and μῆτις, which depended on the perspective of the persons involved. We have noticed this also in the previous chapters.

6.1. δόλος as a means to kill.

The three examples of the first section of this chapter are an illustration of what De Jong called the "cunning versus force" motif. The Odyssean examples refer to Odysseus' dealings with the Kyklops. Odysseus was physically inferior to Polyphemos, but was nevertheless able to blind him. He then prevented him from alarming his fellow Kyklopes by a clever pun on his invented name "Nobody". The Iliadic example referred to Areithoos with his club who could not be fought in a normal battle. As such, one also had to use a trap. Nestor used this example in his argument that stronger fighters did not always win the battles, and that with the help of the gods, any fighter could prevail.

6.1.1. Examples.

We start by analysing the Kyklops episode. After Polyphemos ate several of Odysseus' men, Polyphemos asked Odysseus' name. Odysseus told him that his name was Οὖτις "nobody", gave him very strong wine, and as a result he fell asleep. Odysseus and his men burnt and sharpened a big wooden stick and drove it into the Kyklops' eye. The Kyklops cried out in pain, and his fellow Kyklopes responded asking if someone was trying to kill him[275] or steal his sheep. This was their question.

ἦ μή τίς σ'αὐτὸν κτείνει δόλῳ ἠὲ βίηφιν; (*Odyssey* 9,406)
"or is someone (of the mortal men) trying to kill you yourself by guile or violent acts?"

There are two important elements in this verse. The first one is word play on the similarity between μή τίς "someone" and μῆτις "cunning". The second one is the contrast between δόλῳ "with a trick" and βίηφιν "by force". Both elements will be explained in the next instance.

The following verse is Polyphemos' response to the question of his fellow Kyklopes, quoted above. They wanted to know whether someone was killing him with a trick or by force. The Kyklops wanted to exclaim that the person called "Nobody" was not killing him by violence, but by guile. The Greek grammar, however, did not allow Polyphemos to say that.[276]

ὦ φίλοι, Οὖτίς με κτείνει δόλῳ οὐδὲ βίηφιν (Odyssey 9,408)
"Friends, No One is trying to kill me by guile or by violent acts"

---

275 For the conatative aspect see Ameis-Henzte 1908:92
276 Stewart 1976:55

In Greek two negatives strengthen each other, if the second is a compound.[277] That is the case here, so Polyphemos said exactly the opposite of what he wanted to say.[278] His fellow Kyklopes responded by saying that if nobody was killing him, the pain originated from Zeus. As a consequence, they answered that they could not help him either, and advised him to ask his father Poseidon for help.

This story illustrates the contrast between cunning and force very well.[279] The Kyklops was a forceful but lawless creature who did not abide by the general societal rules and, as a consequence, harmed his guests. Odysseus decided to use his cleverness against him and used the name "Nobody". Polyphemos only relied on his force and was unaware that someone could actually use guile against him.[280]

The answer of Polyphemos' fellow Kyklopes illustrates the effect of Odysseus' guile as well, because they responded with the following phrase εἰ μὲν δὴ μή τίς σε βιάζεται οἶον ἐόντα "if nobody/cunning is seriously harming you, while you are alone". Depending on the type of clause in Greek, the negation could take the form οὐ- or μη-. In this case there was a conditional clause and therefore the negation had to start with μη-. As such, they did not understand that Polyphemos meant a person called "Nobody" and not the negation "nobody, no one". The combination of the negation μή and the indefinite pronoun τις, created one word, because was an enclitic and as such not an independent word. As such, the word μή τις appeared, which is in sound very close to μῆτις, "cunning". This is the only story where μῆτις is the δόλος. This is another illustration of Odysseus' pun on

---

277 Stewart 1976:55
278 Merry 1876a:320; Ameis-Hentze 1908:92
279 De Jong 2001:244
280 Strauss-Clay 1983:118-119

the name "nobody". Odysseus was well aware of that pun because he commented on the episode with the following words ἐμὸν δ'ἐγέλασσε φίλον κῆρ ὡς ὄνομ' ἐξαπάτησεν ἐμὸν καὶ μῆτις ἀμύμων "my heart laughed because my name and flawless cunning had deceived them". The fact that Odysseus used μῆτις to indicate how he interpreted the situation and the Kyklops' exclamation that someone tried to kill him δόλῳ "with a trick/ by guile", illustrates again that the distinction between μῆτις and δόλος depended on the perspective of the persons involved. Polyphemos was the victim, and therefore he used the word δόλος to indicate what happened to him, but Odysseus was the perpetrator and therefore he called his act μῆτις ἀμύμων.

This episode has become a legendary illustration of Odysseus' unlimited guile and intelligence, and of the fact that weaker characters can in fact defeat and outsmart violent opponents. We must, however, ask the question if this story is really that flattering for Odysseus after all. The answer to that question is negative. We saw before that Odysseus' own description of his story by using πᾶς and δόλος meant that there would be problems for the people involved. Odysseus' curiosity and greed led him to enter the cave, despite the pleas of his men not to do this. After Odysseus blinded Polyphemos and escaped, he boastfully revealed who he was, although his men urged him not to do that.[281] This enabled Polyphemos to ask his father Poseidon to enact revenge.[282] His travels were prolonged

---

281 Brown 1996:6; Barnouw 2004:45,75; for the pleading of his men see Brown 1996:25, Barnouw 2004:76
282 The authenticity of the passage about Polyphemos' prayer to Poseidon has been doubted in the past. Düntzer and Marzullo doubted the use of the episode in which Polyphemos prayed to his father Poseidon, but it is important for the story that a link is made between Odysseus' boasting (and the limitations of his intelligence and tricks) and the plea of Polyphemos (and subsequent anger of Poseidon). The connection between those two events has an important role later in the *Odyssey* because it explained Odysseus' overly cautious behaviour, and it also indicated that Odysseus' visit to the Phaiakians would cause them problems with Poseidon. (see Marzullo 1952:110; Heubeck 1989:40 with reference to the different arguments)

significantly because he was so over-confident, arrogant and reckless.[283] Therefore, it is ironic that Odysseus called his act μῆτις ἀμύμων, because his act ended in a rather negative note. As such, the event could be seen as an indication of Odysseus' overconfidence and of the limits of Odysseus' guile and cleverness.

Now we proceed to the Iliadic example. Nestor used this example to argue that strong opponents did not always win battles because clever warriors could use their intelligence to neutralise their opponents' strength. As such, this line fits very well with the idea of "cunning versus force".

τὸν Λυκόοργος ἔπεφνε δόλῳ, οὔ τι κράτεΐ γε (Iliad 7,142)
"him killed Lykourgos in a trap and in no way by force (on a narrow road)"

Nestor addressed these words to the Greek army after Agamemnon stopped Menelaos from engaging in battle with Hektor. Nestor expressed disbelief that the Greek leaders were avoiding the battle with Hektor out of fear. Nestor related this story to contrast the hesitation of the Greeks with his own courage. He explained how Lykourgos treacherously killed Areithoos, and how he stripped him of his armour. At the end of his life, Lykourgos gave Areithoos' armour to Ereuthalion, who was already strong and powerful. As a result of his strength and the armour he received, Ereuthalion was almost invincible and was a feared opponent. Nestor argued that, when he was a young fighter, he was not afraid but faced Ereuthalion and killed him with Athena's help.

The story of Lykourgos and Areithoos is an example of "cunning versus force". Areithoos had a powerful advantage over his opponents because he killed them by wielding

---

283 Lloyd-Jones 1971:29; Stewart 1976:37; Foley 1978(1988):101; Griffin 1980:80; Segal 1983 (1988):132, 136-138; Scully 1987:403; Brown 1996:24-26; De Jong 2001:246 *Odysseus acts -with fatal results- according to the heroic code*; Morrison 2003:24,95

his mace. As a consequence, he could therefore only be defeated if he were unable to use his mace. Lykourgos therefore attacked him in a narrow road, where the mace was useless.[284] The idea therefore is that even a very powerful creature such as Areithoos was not invincible, if one used the proper means.

In my opinion Nestor used this example for two reasons. First of all, it stressed that force alone was not sufficient to win a battle, because the strong one was overcome by the clever one.[285] Secondly, Nestor wanted to stress the importance of the help of the gods. Nestor overpowered Ereuthalion with Athena's help, so Menelaos should not be afraid of Hektor.[286] The mentioning of tricks to outsmart opponents, and the fact that Athena helped Nestor were an indication of Nestor's cleverness and cunning, and this seems to put him on an intellectual level that was comparable to that of Odysseus. We saw before that he advised his son to use his cunning to win the chariot race. In the *Odyssey* he considered himself to be on the same intellectual level as Odysseus.

The main idea of this verse is the guileful killing of Areithoos by Lykourgos. This is reinforced by a metrical pause after δόλῳ. The pause could be put before δόλῳ as well. That way the killing and how it happened would be stressed. Personally, I would put the metrical pause after δόλῳ because this would stress the guileful and non-valiant killing. Kirk points out that the entrapment described in this verse requires two pauses and he would put them before and after δόλῳ. As such, the narrow road is stressed because that was the only place where the effect of the mace could be neutralised.[287]

---

284 Kirk 1985:253-254
285 Nagy 1979:330; Griffin 1980:53
286 This story indicates in my opinion that Nestor between the lines assumed that Akhilleus' absence was not that destructive after all, since even the best warriors could be overcome by clever opponents.
287 Kirk 1985:254

6.1.2. Conclusion: δόλος as means to kill someone.

The three examples illustrate the idea that a clever creature can overcome a powerful opponent very well. In her commentary on the *Odyssey* De Jong has called this the "cunning versus force" contrast. Polyphemos' enormous force, his brutality and lack of respect for the general rules of hospitality were put in contrast with Odysseus' clever and guileful nature. Polyphemos cried out in pain and rallied his fellow Kyklopes who asked him what happened, but the clever nature of the name Οὖτις/οὔ τις (a negative compound) did not allow him to say what he wanted.

The Iliadic example is very similar. Nestor wanted to exhort the Greeks to stand up against Hektor. In order to do so, he used the example of Areithoos' murder by Lykourgos to argue that stronger opponents did not always win. This story showed that Nestor had good insights into the use of intelligence, cunning and tricks, and in addition, he was also aware of the usefulness of the help of the gods. We saw Nestor's cleverness already when he advised his son during the chariot race. As a consequence, Nestor is put on a level of guile and cunning that can be compared to that of Odysseus.

6.2. Death as a result of δόλος.

This section of the chapter will look at the use of δόλος as a cause of death. Because δόλος is used as a cause of an action, it appears in the dative. The passages of this subchapter are focused on the victims who might die as a result of δόλος. As such, this contrasts with the previous subsection where δόλος was potentially a means of killing, but

where the subject was the person who executed the killing. The two examples of this section deal with the only two recurring threats for the male protagonists (Odysseus, but especially Telemakhos) in the *Odyssey*. The first threat is the real and physical threat that the suitors pose for Odysseus and Telemakhos. The second passage refers to the possibility that Penelope might have become a second Klytaimnestra. As such, it is less of a real threat but its frequent repetition throughout the poem makes this threat concrete.

6.2.1. Examples.

The first instance talks about the suitors' attempt to kill Telemakhos on his return from Pylos and Sparta. After Telemakhos told Eurykleia that he was going to visit Nestor in Pylos, she told him that she did not want him to go because she feared that the suitors would try to murder Telemakhos in a cowardly manner. She told him that, if he died, they would become the owners of all Odysseus' possessions, his palace and his reign.

ὥς κε δόλῳ φθίῃς, τάδε δ'αὐτοὶ πάντα δάσονται (*Odyssey* 2,368)
"(they will contrive thereafter evil things for you as soon as you leave) that you may die in a snare and they themselves may divide all these possessions.

In this instance I translated δόλῳ by "snare", because δόλῳ referred to the ambush that the suitors were preparing. This example illustrates the perspective of the victim and perpetrator. As we saw before, an act may be perceived differently as a trick, scheme or cunning trick according to the different observer. The attempt on Telemakhos' life is a clear example of this. Eurykleia used the word δόλος to describe the ambush, but when the herald overheard the suitors debating their own plan, Homer described it as οἱ δ'ἔνδοθι

μῆτιν ὕφαινον "the ones inside wove their cunning (act)",[288] because for the suitors it would have been convenient if Telemakhos died. As such, this is yet another illustration of the fact that the distinction between δόλος and μῆτις depended on the perspective of the persons involved in the action.

The next example comes from a description of Agamenon's murder. In this instance, the story was related by Athena, disguised as Mentor, who answered a complaint by Telemakhos about the lack of divine support. She argued that gods could grant safe returns to a mortal, if they wanted to, but that gods could not avoid a mortal's death if that has been fated.[289] The story of Athena could refer to his own return and that of his father. In addition, the murder of Agamemnon was used as a warning and incitement to Telemakhos.[290] As such, the idea was that Telemakhos had to make sure that he trusted the gods and that he should not be worried because if his time had not come, he would not die and the gods would protect him.

> ὤλεθ᾽ ὑπ᾽ Αἰγίσθοιο δόλῳ καὶ ἧς ἀλόχοιο (*Odyssey* 3,235)
> "(as Agamemnon) died by the hands of Aigisthos and his wife in a trap."

Telemakhos heard the episode of Agamemnon's murder for the second time from Athena disguised as a mortal.[291] This story made Telemakhos aware of the fact that his mother could be a dangerous person as well, because she might become a second Klytaimnestra. As a result of this story, Telemakhos asked Nestor about the murder and Menelaos' role in

---

288 *Odyssey* 4,678
289 The most famous example of gods being unable to protect their favourites and children is probably Zeus' son, Sarpedon. Zeus thought in the *Iliad* about saving him, but was advised against it by Athena, who pointed out that other gods would not approve, or want to save their children as well.
290 De Jong 2001:281
291 In *Odyssey* 1,252-305 Athena had told him the story already when she visited him disguised as Mentes.

it, and Nestor related in detail about Orestes' revenge.[292] Nestor's story made Telemakhos again aware of the possibility that his mother might have become dangerous and that her motives might not be as pure as they seemed.[293]

The metrical structure and word order of this verse are interesting. The verb ὤλεθ' "he died/was killed" occupied the first place in the verse because of the enjambement and served as a powerful emphasis on the murder, and I would therefore put in a metrical pause after the verb. The position of δόλῳ "in a trap" is remarkable as it is put between Αἰγίσθοιο "by Aigisthos" and ἧς ἀλόχοιο "by his wife". I would put a metrical pause before and after δόλῳ, to stress the main ideas of this verse, the trap responsible for Agamemnon's death and the persons responsible for it.

6.2.2. Conclusion: death as a result of δόλος.

This subsection discussed death as a result of δόλος. The action is described with the victim as subject of the verb and the instances, therefore, are focused on the victims. As such, it indicates that it is a scheme often perceived by the victims to be δόλος, but not so much by the perpetrators.

The subchapter shows that the two male protagonists faced two possible dangers at home, and each example refers to one specific danger. The first one refers to the clear and present danger of the suitors, who planned to kill Telemakhos in an ambush. The second example is less concrete and points to the possibility of Penelope becoming a second

---

292 S.West 1988:175
293 This becomes obvious later in the poem. At a certain moment Telemakhos questioned if there were spider webs in Penelope's bed, as spider webs would indicate that she was no longer sleeping in it.

Klytaimnestra. The story of Klytaimnestra's evil plotting is a recurring theme and, as such, becomes almost a real threat.

I think it is remarkable that the two statements were made by persons with close connections to Odysseus and Telemakhos. Eurykleia knew Odysseus and Telemakhos very well, was aware of what was going on in the palace and was therefore able to warn Telemakhos about the danger he faced. The second verse was pronounced by Athena (in disguise). On the one hand, she alluded to the fact that Penelope might become a second Klytaimnestra, but on the other hand she seemed to imply that Telemakhos and Odysseus would be protected on their way home.

6.3. Conclusion: death and dying as a result of δόλος.

This chapter dealt with death and dying as a result of δόλος. It approached the situation from two different perspectives. The first subchapter dealt with instances where there was an active verb and the focus was on the perpetrator and therefore a verb with the meaning "to kill" was used. The second section analysed death by δόλος from the perspective of the victims and in those instances a verb meaning "to die" was used.

Another difference between the two subsections of this chapter is that the first one treated three instances where the threat was a single event. The two threats of the second part of this chapter were almost a *Leitmotiv* throughout the *Odyssey*. The suitors were an obvious threat to Penelope and Odysseus, and their kingdom. The frequent mentioning of Klytaimnestra and the murder raises doubts about Penelope and, as such, the threat surfaces that she might become a second Klytaimnestra.

The first section discussed two stories, which were both illustrations of the contrast between "cunning" and "force". This contrast is an important and recurring element in the usage of δόλος in the Homeric poems. The most famous one is undoubtedly Polyphemos' description of his blinding. The focus in that story, however, was not on him but on the person who actually blinded him. That person was Odysseus, who had called himself "Nobody", and that name effectively made it impossible for him to call for help. The trick by Odysseus was therefore not so much the actual blinding or the escape by clinging to the bellies of sheep and rams, but rather the use of the name. That story has become a legendary example of cunning and guile overpowering a strong opponent, and confirms the conclusion of chapter 3 that Odysseus is the king of tricks. Nestor's example of Lykourgos' slaying of Areithoos was another example of the same idea. Lykourgos was aware of the strength of Areithoos and thought of a place where that force was useless. He confronted him therefore on a narrow road and as a result he won. With the help of Athena Nestor was able to defeat Ereuthalion who had become almost invincible because of his strength and Areithoos' weaponry. Nestor's argument was therefore that with the support of the gods and the right amount of cleverness, any opponent could be defeated. As such, this places Nestor on a level of cunning comparable to that of Odysseus.

The second important contrast is the distinction between μῆτις and δόλος. This depended on the perspective of the person. If the trick was considered to be in one's advantage, the word μῆτις was used, but if the person was disadvantaged, the word δόλος often appeared. We have already seen several examples, especially in chapter 3 and 6, but in this chapter we can refer to the attempt on Telemakhos' life: Eurykeia described the

possible ambush by the suitors as δόλος, but the suitors themselves were described as weaving μῆτις when their preparations for the murder were narrated. This perspective based distinction seems to indicate that δόλος was often a perception. This confirms part of the conclusions in other chapters (chapters 4, 5 and 6) where the same perspective based distinction could be discerned.

Conclusion.

The initial intention of this thesis was to analyse the concept of "deceit" in the Homeric poems. This turned out to be a topic that was too large for a Master's thesis, as there are approximately 20 to 25 words that have some nuance of deceit in their respective meaning. We therefore decided to focus on the most common word, namely δόλος.

We used a thematic approach to see if δόλος was used in combination with certain categories and persons. Our analysis revealed the following categories which were applicable to both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. We started by the use of δόλος and verbs of mental activity. The next category was the use of δόλος as an indication of versatility. Then we analysed δόλος in connection with concrete activities. The next category was δόλος as a tool of secrecy, and finally we discussed the use of δόλος in order to kill someone or as cause of death. This division allowed us to distinguish several oppositions, common usages and motifs throughout the different chapters.

The combination of δόλος and the verbs of mental actions showed that female characters were capable of planning and preparing δόλος in an effective manner, as Penelope and Eidothea succeeded in overpowering opponents by a carefully executed scheme. The chapter also indicated that male characters who suspected female δόλος were able to avoid its destructive effects, as Eurylokhos' and Odysseus' reactions towards Kirke's snare showed. Proteus was, however, not aware that his daughter was planning anything against him and, consequently, he fell in her trap.

The chapter of δόλος as an indication of versatility focused mainly, but not exclusively, on Odysseus. The descriptions were mostly by characters who knew Odysseus

well. They discussed the positive and negative aspects of his use of δόλος. As such, the Trojan Horse and the Kyklops episode were related, but also his excessive self-serving and his willingness to resort to false stories at almost any occasion. It was noteworthy that Odysseus himself did not try to depict himself in an exclusively positive manner, because he presented himself to the Phaiakians as a "famous problem causer".[294] It is even more remarkable that he depicted Kirke in a way that closely resembled the descriptions that were normally used for him.

The largest chapter evolved around the connection of δόλος and words indicating concrete activities. In several examples δόλος was used simultaneously in its concrete and abstract meaning. As such, the word sometimes meant both "(an assembled) net" and "trap". That Hephaistos appeared in three instances is not remarkable, but that Hera and Klytaimnestra were described in similar terms is noteworthy and indicative of a gender inversion. Another important combination was that of δόλος and the verb "weaving". Weaving itself was a feminine occupation, but the combination weaving and poetry, cunning and guile was a male trait. The Odyssean stories in which weaving guile appeared involved Odysseus and Penelope. The last category was the use of δόλος as a tool to impede. Antilokhos' impeding action and Menelaos' subsequent reaction were remarkable because of the word use employed.

In the next chapter δόλος was contrasted with or suggested as an alternative for actions that were performed openly. Four Odyssean examples dealt with the fight against the suitors. Telemakhos and Odysseus received the advice that they should decide on how to kill the suitors. Penelope was described as having fooled the suitors for three years by

---

294 This is my attempt to render the ambiguity of *Odyssey* 9,19-20.

keeping the unravelling hidden. As such, these examples are an illustration of the "cunning versus force" motif. Another Odyssean example is the very negative description of Klytaimnestra's hidden preparations of the murder. As such, the passage provides a very damaging image of the female gender, one that would continue throughout most of Antiquity. The last example is Odysseus' emotionless reaction to Penelope's tears which serves as an illustration of his lack of compassion for Penelope.

The last chapter discussed the link between δόλος and dying. There were two categories, and the difference was based on the perspective of the people involved. In the first subsection the perspective of the victims was described and, as a consequence, the stress lay on the fact that someone died as a result of δόλος. The other category described the use of δόλος in order to kill someone, and those examples were described from the perspective of the perpetrators. It is interesting to see that these examples provide a good illustration of the distinction between δόλος and μῆτις.

The following important conclusions could be derived from the investigation of δόλος.

The first one, and probably the most important one, is the gender-based use of δόλος. The combination of the verbs indicating a mental activity and δόλος provide the clearest examples of the gendered use of δόλος in the Homeric poems. Women were described as contriving the schemes, whereas men were described as perceiving a female threat. When a female character thought about (using) δόλος, she prevailed. In addition, the word is often related with gender inversion in both directions when it comes to actually acting on the trick. The suspicion of δόλος is the male reaction to the planning. The

examples of Proteus and the shepherds showed that male characters were only able to avoid the effects of the female δόλος if they suspected it. As such, this usage seems to indicate that it was necessary for men to distrust female thinking if they wanted to survive, as is best illustrated by Odysseus' initial distrust of Kirke. The other chapters displayed this gender related usage of δόλος as well. The example of the constant fighting between Zeus and Hera confirmed the gendered use of δόλος. Moreover, it proved that, in order to achieve their goals, females were willing to use their charm and sexuality to complement their δόλος. Connected to the gendered use, is the frequent gender inversion when δόλος is applied. When Hera and Klytaimnestra used δόλος, they were described by words that were frequently related to craftsmen. This is remarkable because both women have been used as archetypes for the evil or troublesome woman. Consequently, their behaviour links female δόλος, female sexuality and the female gender in general. This has contributed to a very negative *Nachleben*. The inversion also happened with male characters. Hephaistos was described as weaving the net as a spider, and that equated him (both for the activity as for the animal) to the role of a female. His carefully woven web proved to be a very effective trap, because neither Ares nor Aphrodite could perceive it. Penelope was able to assume both gendered roles. When she was weaving the shroud, she performed the duties of an industrious housewife, but by keeping the suitors away and by not remarrying, she also preserved Odysseus' estate and kingdom. As such, she acted as a man and proved to be the perfect counterpart of Odysseus. The description of her weaving therefore summarises her roles in the *Odyssey* very effectively. In answer to the issue that was raised in the Introduction, we can state that there is indeed a difference between the masculine and

female use of δόλος.

The second important element that can be noticed is the "cunning versus force" motif, as De Jong called it. Throughout the entire *Odyssey* many characters were faced with more powerful opponents. As a result, the weaker characters resorted to the use of other means. There are several examples of this conflict. The presence of the more than hundred suitors wanting to marry Penelope was the most blatant instance. The suitors were fought with two different kinds of δόλος. Penelope used her shroud trick to protect herself, but Odysseus and Telemakhos ambushed the suitors during the bow contest and had removed all weapons from the hall. The most famous instance is undoubtedly the episode of Odysseus' blinding of the Kyklops. There was a clear power imbalance between Polyphemos and Odysseus, but because of Odysseus' cleverness and Polyphemos' overconfidence in his own force, Odysseus was able to outsmarted him. He gave him strong wine, Polyphemos fell asleep and, consequently, was blinded by Odysseus. The most important element, however, was the use of the language itself as weapon because the Greek form of the name "Nobody" prevented the Kyklops from calling for help. Another example was Hephaistos' web and boobytrapped bed. Ares was stronger, better looking and therefore more attractive to Aphrodite, but the craftly designed net neutralised Ares and, as a result, he was subject of a degrading spectacle. The most remarkable point is that this "cunning versus force" contrast also appeared in the *Iliad*. Nestor argued for the use of guile against Hektor, instead of avoiding the fight with him. He also suggested to his son to use the weaknesses of his opponents in the chariot race against them. Odysseus tried to use his guile against Aias during the wrestling contest. In the Introduction the question was

asked if δόλος was used as a tool for self defence. The examples quoted above and the "cunning versus force" motif seem to prove that δόλος was indeed used as such.

The third important conclusion is the distinction between δόλος and μῆτις. Because of the "cunning versus force" contrast, scholars (Dunkle, Holmberg and De Jong) have often assumed that the two words were synonyms. It is indeed true that both δόλος and μῆτις are used as objects of the verb weaving, and that the "weaving" is only used to refer to men, but when we look closer at the actual descriptions, it becomes clear that in most instances there is a difference. We therefore argue that the distinction is based on the perception of the characters involved. It is interesting to note that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* display the same distinction: the word δόλος was used when the action was described from the perspective of the person who was disadvantaged by the action, whereas μῆτις was used when the story was told from the perspective of the person who benefitted from the action. Detienne-Vernant had already stated that there was a difference, but they had not explicitly argued that the perspective or perception was the deciding factor for the difference. The Kyklops episode provided some good examples of this distinction. Polyphemos and his fellow Kyklopes used the word δόλος to describe the blinding, but Odysseus described his own action with the words μῆτις ἀμύμων "my flawless cunning". Penelope's shroud trick was described by the suitors with the word δόλος, but when she described her own precarious situation, she said that her μῆτις was no longer able to provide her with a defence. When the suitors planned to kill Telemakhos in a snare, they were described by the poet as "weaving their μῆτις", because they would have benefitted from Telemakhos' death. When Eurykleia warned Telemakhos for the suitors' attempt, she

used the word δόλος because for her and him the murder would have been a disaster. Odysseus, himself, used the word δόλος as well, to describe actions that would not be beneficial to himself or his audience. The clearest example was his own "introduction" to the Phaiakians. He called himself "a famous troublemaker", and by doing so, he referred to the fact that his behaviour had already caused problems for him and his men and would eventually also create problems for the Phaiakians. He did not say that he was famous because of his μῆτις, and never described himself as πολύμητις. In the *Iliad* Nestor advised his son Antilokhos to use his μῆτις, because that was a trait that distinguished between men and it would allow him to neutralise the strength of his opponents. This story illustrates the distinction very clearly, because Menelaos reacted angrily to Antilokhos' action and asked him to swear that he had not used δόλος. Since Menelaos was harmed by Antilokhos, he used the word δόλος and not μῆτις. The distinction is also visible in the use of the compounds. The compound μητιόεις has a positive meaning "curing", but the compound δολόεις, on the other hand, never has that positive connotation. Μῆτις is sometimes used with the connotation "advice, information", as could be seen in *Odyssey* 3,18 when Athena advised Telemakhos to find out which μῆτις Nestor had in his mind, but such a meaning is never found for δόλος.

The fourth element that we have to stress is the use of δόλος as an illustration of versatility and its connection to Odysseus and to the persons who knew him. Odysseus was described as a person who made use of his δόλος at almost any occasion. As a result, Odysseus was depicted in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as the king of tricks, but that fact was not only interpreted or commented upon in a positive way. Nestor stressed the positive

aspects of Odysseus' cleverness by pointing at the powerlessness of the Greeks during the siege of Troy, and added that he and Odysseus almost always agreed. Helen's description in the *Iliad* confirmed this picture, and in the *Odyssey* she pointed at the fact that she recognised Odysseus, but decided not to betray him. Odysseus' versatility was also commented upon in a negative way. Agamemnon scoffed at him for his constant attempts to obtain personal gain. Athena attacked him when he tried to tell her a false story about who he was. Agamemnon apologised afterwards, and Athena might have been joking, but the negative undertone remained. It is therefore noteworthy that even Sokos, a minor Trojan fighter, was aware of Odysseus' reputation. It is even more remarkable that Odysseus himself did not depict himself as a solidly positive person either. He portrayed himself as a constant cause of problems. Consequently, there seems to be a negative aspect to his versatility. The last example is Kirke's description by Odysseus when he related his stories to Penelope. She was described in Odyssean terms with a combination of a word for resourcefulness and a word for guile. As such, Odysseus created a link between the two characters. This is not surprising, because Kirke's advice and tips proved to be of great value throughout the *Odyssey*. The stories about Odysseus' versatility were pronounced by characters who knew Odysseus very well (with one exception) and who had intellectual capacities comparable to his own. Odysseus' versatility in δόλος proved to be better, because he (and not Nestor nor Agamemnon) invented the Horse, he prevented Helen from destroying the Horse, and he almost misled Athena. As such, Odysseus' actions seemed to confirm that he was the king of tricks and guile.

The last element is in a way a continuation of the previous argument, and discusses the "perfect union" between Odysseus and Penelope. I believe that the question needs to be

addressed as to who was the better "trickster" (see also the *Appendix*) and who used δόλος

more effectively. Odysseus and Penelope received similar epithets, as Penelope was called

περίφρων "very intelligent" and Odysseus πολύμητις "of many wiles".[295] Their use of

δόλος also created a clear link between them. They behaved similarly and possessed the

same characteristics. They both wove δόλος and were often depicted in a gender inverted

way. They were both able to play a role and to assume a deceptive pose, as Odysseus was

disguised as a beggar and Penelope pretended to be interested in a marriage. As such, they

were the perfect match and their cooperation throughout the *Odyssey* provided a strong

counter example to the bad marriages of Zeus and Hera (Hera was described as

δολοφρονέουσα when she prepared her *Deceit of Zeus* and Zeus was called δολομῆτα by

Hera after he had consented to Thetis), Menelaos and Helen (whose marriage could only

survive because Helen administered φάρμακα μητιόεντα), and Klytaimnestra and

Agamemnon (Klytaimnestra was described as δολόμητις). Penelope proved throughout

the entire *Odyssey* that she was actually the stronger character. It is true that she ascribed

her shroud trick to a god, but she was, for most of the time, acting alone against a multitude

of suitors, but nevertheless succeeded in keeping them away and in playing them against

one another. Odysseus, on the other hand, received help from the gods Hermes and Athena,

and later on also from Kirke. Penelope set the bow contest, and as a result, Odysseus was

able to kill the suitors. Penelope succeeded in outsmarting the king of tricks by her bed

trick (although the word δόλος was not used in that particular instance). It is no

coincidence that she was able to maintain his kingdom by assuming simultaneously the role

---

295 Nieto-Hernández 2008:42

of a woman and a man. As a consequence, I agree with Marquardt and Nieto-Hernández that Penelope is the actual hero(ine) of the *Odyssey*. Odysseus was the king of tricks of both poems, but in the *Odyssey* Penelope was actually cleverer than he, and she also used δόλος more effectively.

Bibliography.

Primary Sources

Homeri Opera. Partes I-II: Iliadis; Partes III-IV: Odysseae. Recognoverunt brevique adnotatione critica instruxerunt David B. Monro et Thomas W. Allen. Oxford University Press, 1902-1908 (many reprints).

Homeri Odyssea. Recognovit P. von der Mühll. Stuttgart: Teubner. 1945 (reprint in 1984).

Homer, *The Iliad,* edited and translated by A. Murray and revised by W. Wyatt, Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, 1999.

Homer, *The Odyssey,* edited and translated by A. Murray and revised by G. Dimock, Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, 1994.

Homeri Ilias. Recensuit testimonia congessuit M. West, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, Leipzig-Stuttgart, 1999.

Van Leeuwen, J. jr – Mendes da Costa, M. 1906-1907. *Homeri Carmina.* Leiden: Sijthoff.

Secondary Sources

Adams, D. 1982/3. Tocharian A *śāku* "headhair" and AB *yok* "(body)hair". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 96.167-169.

Adams, D. 1984. The position of Tocharian among the other Indo-European languages. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 104,3.395-402.

Adams, D. 1994. A Tocharo-Germanic correspondence: TochB *tuk-* "be hidden" and OE *dēog* "she concealed himself". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 107.310-312.

Adkins, A. Truth, ΚΟΣΜΟΣ, and APETH in the Homeric Poems. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 22,1. 5-18.

Agard, W. 1959. Greek Prototypes of American Myths. *The Classical Journal* 54,8. 338-343.

Ahl, F. - Roisman, H. 1996(2007). Rival homecomings. Bloom 2007a.109-126.

Alden, M. 2005. Review Clayton 2004. *The Classical Review* 55,2.390-392.

Allen, T. 1924. *Homer. The origins and the transmission.* Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press.

Ameis, K. - Hentze, C. 1889. *Anhang zu Homers Odyssey Schulausgabe.* II Heft. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K. - Hentze, C. 1890. *Anhang zu Homers Odyssey Schulausgabe.* I Heft. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K.– Hentze, C. 1895. *Anhang zu Homers Odyssey Schulausgabe.* III Heft. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K.– Hentze, C. 1900. *Homers Odyssey.* Anhang 4. Ges. 19-24. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K.– Hentze, C. 1908. *Homers Odyssee I 2.* Gesang 7-12. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K.– Hentze, C. -Cauer, P. 1913a. *Homers Ilias* 4 volumes. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K.–Hentze, C.-Cauer, P. 1910. *Homers Odyssee 2 1.* Gesang 13-18. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K.–Hentze, C.-Cauer, P. 1911. *Homers Odyssee 2 2.* Gesang 13-18. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K.– Hentze, C. - Cauer, P. - Bierl, A. - Latacz, J. - Führer, R.- Stoevesand, M. 2008. *Homers Ilias : Gesamtkommentar. Sechster Gesang.* Auf der Grundlage der Ausgabe von Ameis-Hentze-Cauer (1868-1913), hrsg. von Joachim Latacz. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Arieti, J. 1983/4. Achilles' inquiry about Machaon: the critical moment in the Iliad. *The Classical Journal* 79,2. 125-130.

Arieti, J. 1988. Homer's Litae and Atê. *The Classical Journal* 84,1.1-12.

Armstrong, J. 1958. The arming motif in the Iliad. *The American Journal of Philology* 79,4.337-354.

Athanassakis, A. 1970. Hiatus, word end and correption in Hesiod. *Hermes* 98,2.129-145.

Austin, N. 1975(1988). The power of the word. Bloom 1988b.69-86.

Austin, N. 1994. *Helen of Troy and her shameless phantom.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bader, F. 2007. The language of the gods in Homer. Christidis 2007. 1377-1399.

Bakker, E. 1988a. *Linguistics and Formulas in Homer*, (dissertation to obtain the degree of Doctor). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamin.

Bakker, E. 1988b. Long diphthongs and hiatus in ealry Greek epic phonology and the rle of formulaic diction. *Mnemosyne* IV 41,1/2.1-26.

Bakker, E. 1995. Noun Epithet Formulas, Milman Parry and the Grammar of Poetry. Crielaard 1995. 97-126.

Bakker, E. 1997a. The study of Homeric discourse Morris-Powell 1997. 284-304.

Bakker, E. 1997b. *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Baldick, J. 1994. Homer and the Indo-Europeans. London: Tauris Publishers.

Ballinger, F. 1989. Living Sideways: Social Themes and Social Relationships in Native American Trickster Tales. *American Indian Quarterly* 13,1. 15-30.

Bally, C. - Gautier, L. 1922. *Recueil des publications scientifiques de Ferdinand De Saussure.* Genève: Payot.

Balsdon, J. 1977. Review Pomeroy 1975. *The Classical Review* NS 27,2. 207-208.

Barnes, M. - Faulkes, A. 2007a. *A new introduction to Old Norse.* Part I. Grammar. London: Viking Society for Northern Research.

Barnes, M. - Faulkes, A. 2007b. *A new introduction to Old Norse.* Part II. Reader. London: Viking Society for Northern Research.

Barnes, M. - Faulkes, A. 2007c. *A new introduction to Old Norse.* Part III. Glossary and Index of names. London: Viking Society for Northern Research.

Barnouw, J. 2004. *Odysseus, hero of practical intelligence. Deliberation and signs in Homer's Odyssey.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Bassett, S. 1918. Athena and the adventures of Odysseus. *The Classical Journal* 13,7.528-529.

Bassett, S. 1919. The theory of the Homeric caesura according to the extant remains of the Ancient Doctrine. *The American Journal of Philology* 40,4.343-372.

Bassett, S. 1923a. The second Necyia again. *The American Journal of Philology* 44,1.44-52.

Bassett, S. 1923b. The proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey. The American Journal of Philology* 44,4.339-348.

Bassi, K. 1997. Orality, masculinity and the Greek epic. *Arethusa* 30,3. 315-340.

Basso, E. 1988. The trickster's scattered self. *Anthropological Linguistics* 30,3-4.292-318.

Bechtel, F. 1914. *Lexilogus zu Homer.Etymologie und Stammbildung homerischer Wörter.* Halle: Niemeyer.

Beck, D. 2008. Character-quoted direct speech in the *Iliad. Phoenix* 62,1-2.162-183.

Beck, R. 1972. A principle of composition in Homeric Verse. *Phoenix* 26,3.213-231..

Beekes, R. 2007. *Pre Greek.* Leiden. (internet version: www.indoeuropean.nl)

Beekes, R. -Cuypers, M. 2003. Nekus, antikru and metrical lengthening in Homer. *Mnemosyne* 56, 4. 485-491.

Bekker, I. 1863. *Homerische Blätter. Beiträge zu Carmina Homerica.* Bonn: Marcus.

Bennett Anderson, F. 1927. The insanity of the hero- an intrinsic detail of the Orestes Vendetta. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 58.43-62.

Benveniste, E. 1935. *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen.* Paris: Klincksieck.

Bergren, A. 1980. Allegorizing winged words: simile and symbolization in *Odyssey* V. *The Classical World* 74,2.109-123.

Bergren, A. 1983. Language and the female in early Greek thought. *Arethusa* 16,2. 69-95.

Bergren, A. 1993. The (re)marriage of Penelope and Odysseus. Architecture gender philosophy. *Assemblage* 21.6-23.

Bertolín Cebrián, R. 1996a. *Die Verben des Denkens bei Homer.* Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag.

Bertolín Cebrián, R. 1996b. Homérico *pharmaka metioenta. Minerva* 10.29-32.

Bertolín Cebrián, R. 2001/2. Indo-European ideology in the *Ramayana* and the Iliad. *Studia Minora Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Brunensis, Series Classica* 6-7.63-71

Bertolín Cebrián, R. 2006. *Singing the dead. A model for epic evolution.* New York: Peter Lang.

Bertolín Cebrián, R. 2008a. Editor of *Penelope's Revenge.* Colloquium held at the University of Calgary in 2004.

Bertolín Cebrián, R. 2008b. Introduction. (the original introduction was much longer than the one printed in *Phoenix* 62,1-2). Bertolín-Cebrián 2008a.

Bertolín Cebrián, R. 2008c. The mast and the loom: signifiers of separation and authority. *Phoenix* 62,1-2.92-108.

Beye, R. 1974. Male and female in the Homeric poems. *Ramus* 3.87-101.

Block, E. 1982. The narrator speaks: apostrophe in Homer and Vergil. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 112.7-22.

Block, E. 1985. Clothing makes the man: a pattern in the *Odyssey*. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 115.1-11.

Block, E. 1986. Narrative judgment and audience response in Homer and Vergil. *Arethusa* 19,2.155-169.

Bloom, H. 1988a. *Homer's Odyssey*. Edited and with an introduction by Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers.

Bloom, H. 1988b. Introduction. Bloom 1988a.1-3.

Bloom, H. 2007a. *Homer's Odyssey*. Updated edition. Edited and with an introduction by Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing.

Bloom, H. 2007b. Introduction. Bloom 2007a. 1-4.

Blowsnake, S. 1959. Der Schelmenzyklus. Jung-Kerényi-Radin 1959. 13-89.

Boisacq, E. 1938. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la lange grecque. Étudiée dans ses rapports avec les autres langues indo-européennes*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Bolton, L. 2008. ὁμοφροσύνη at the court of Sparta. Final paper for the course GREK601 presented to Professor Westra. University of Calgary.

Bond, J. – Walpole, A. 1898. *Homer's Iliad. Book I, edited for the use of schools*. London: MacMillan.

Bornemann, E. 1958. *Auswahl aud Homers Ilias*. Griechische Schriftsteller. Wortkunde und Erläuterungen. Diesterwegs altsprachliche Textausgaben. Wiesbaden: Diesterweg.

Bowra, C. 1937. *The rise of the Greek epic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bowra, C. 1972(1988). The *Odyssey*: its shape and character. Bloom 1988b.49-69.

Braswell, B. 1971. Mythological innovation in the Iliad. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 21,1.16-26.

Braswell, B. 1981. *Odyssey* 8.166-77 and *Theogony* 79-93. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 31,2.237-239.

Braswell, B. 1982. The song of Ares and Aphrodite: theme and relevance to *Odyssey* 8. *Hermes* 110,2.129-137.

Brillante, C. - Cantilena, M. - Pavese, C. 1981. *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale*. Padova: Antenore.

Brixhe, C. 1983. Épigraphie et grammaire du phrygien. *Le lingue indoeuropee di frammentaria attestazione - die indogermanischen Restsprachen*. Pisa: Giardini.109-133.

Brixhe, C. 1990. Comparaison et langues faiblement documentées: L'exemple du phrygien et de ses voyelles longues. Kellens 1990.59-100.

Brixhe, C. 2004a. Phrygian. Woodard, R. 2004. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the world's ancient languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 777-788.

Brixhe, C. 2004b. Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes. Supplément II. *Kadmos* 43.1-130.

Brooks, D. - Louie, M. Sr. and Diana Brooks. 1990. Legend of the Coyote. *Wicazo Sa Review* 6,2. 56-58.

Brown, A. 1997. Aphrodite and the Pandora complex. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 47,1.26-47.

Brown, C. 1996. In the Cyclops' cave: revenge and justice in "Odyssey" 9. *Mnemosyne* IV 49,1.1-29.

Brugmann, K..- Thumb, A. 1913. *Griechische Grammatik: Lautlehre, Stammbildungs und Flexionslehre, Syntax*. München: Beck.

Buchan, M. 2004(2007). In the beginning was Proteus. Bloom 2007a. 197-222.

Buck, C. 1904. *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*. Boston.

Buck, C. 1949. *A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages: a contribution to the history of ideas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burkert, W. 1981. Seven against Thebes: an oral tradition between Babylonian Magic and Greek Literature. Brillante-Cantilena-Pavese 1981.29-48. (followed by discussion)

Burrows, R. 1965. Deception as a comic device in the "Odyssey". *The Classical World* 59,2.33-36.

Bury, J. 1922. The end of the *Odyssey*. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 42,1.1-15.

Buttmann, P. 1811. *Ausfühliche griechische Sprachlehre*. Berlin: in der Myliussischen Buchhandlung.

Buttmann, P. 1819. *Griechische Grammatik*. Berlin: in der Myliussischen Buchhandlung.

Buttmann, P. 1825. *Lexilogus, oder Beiträge zur griechischen Worterklärung, hauptsachlich für Homer und Hesiod*. Berlin: in der Myliussischen Buchhandlung.

Calhoun, G. 1940. The divine entourage in Homer. *The American Journal of Philology* 61,3.257-277.

Cameron, A. - Kuhrt, A. 1983. *Images of women in Antiquity*. London: Groom.

Cantarella, E. 1983. *Pandora's Daughters: The Role and Status of Women in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Trans. Maureen Fant. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Carroll, M. 1981. Lévi-Strauss, Freud, and the Trickster: A New Perspective upon an Old Problem. *American Ethnologist* 8,2. 301-313.

Carroll, M. 1982. Tricksters and Clam Siphons. *American Ethnologist* 9,1. 193.

Casu, J. 1975. Un conte doayo: Singe rouge et Lièvre (A Doayo (Namchi) Tale: Red Monkey and Hare). *Cahiers d'Études Africaines* 15,60. 699-713.

Chantraine, P. 1958. *Grammaire homérique*, II Volumes. Paris: Klincksieck.

Chantraine, P. 1964. *Morphologie historique du grec*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Chantraine, P. 1974. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck (completed by his students after his death).

Chantraine, P. - Coube, H. 1972. *Iliade Chant XXIII. Édition, introduction et commentaire*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France (2nd revised edition).

Chaston, C. 2002. Three models of authority in the *Odyssey*. *The Classical World* 96,1.3-19.

Christidis, A. 2007. *A history of Ancient Greek*. From the beginnings to Late Antiquity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (translation from the Greek original of 2001).

Cixous, H. 1981. Decapitation or castration? *Signs* 7,1.41-55.

Clackson, J. 1994. *The linguistic relationship between Armenian and Greek*. Oxford - Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Clackson, J. 2007a. The genesis of Greek. Christidis 2007. 185-192.

Clackson, J. 2007b. Indo-European linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clader, L. 1976. *Helen: the evolution from divine to heroic in Greep epic tradition*. Leiden: Brill.

Clarke, M. 1955. The hexameter in Greek elegies. *The Classical Review* NS 5,1.18.

Clayton, B. 2008. Afterword: beginnings and origins. *Phoenix* 62,1-2.109-114.

Cleasby, R. - Vigfusson, G.- Craigie, W. 1957. *An Icelandic-English dictionary*. Subsequently revised, enlarged and completed by G. Vigfusson. 2nd edition with a supplement by W. Craigie. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cochran, R. 2004. Black Father: The Subversive Achievement of Joel Chandler Harris. *African American Review* 38,1. 21-34.

Coffey, M. 1957. The function of the Homeric simile. *The American Journal of Philology* 78,2.113-132.

Combellack, F. 1944. Homer and Hector. *The American Journal of Philology* 65,3.209-243.

Combellack, F. 1946. Achiles. Bare of foot? *The Classical Journal* 41,5.193-198.

Combellack, F. 1948. Speakers and scepters in Homer. *The Classical Journal* 43,4. 209-217.

Combellack, F. 1950a. Words that die. *The Classical Journal* 46,1. 21-26.

Combellack F. 1950b. Contemporary Unitarians and Homeric originality. *The American Journal of Philology* 71,4.337-364.

Combellack, F. 1959. Milman Parry and Homeric artistry. *Comparative Literature* 11,3.193-208.

Combellack, F. 1965. Some formulary illogicalities in Homer. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 96.41-56.

Combellack, F. 1973. Three Odyssean problems. *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 6.17-46.

Combellack, F. 1974a. Odysseus and Anticleia. *Classical Philology* 69,2.121-123.

Combellack, F. 1974b. Hesiod's kings and Nicarchus' Nestor. *Classical Philology* 69,2.124.

Combellack, F. 1976. Homer the innovator. *Classical Philology* 71,1. 44-55.

Combellack, F. 1981. The wish without desire. *The American Journal of Philology* 102,2.115-119.

Combellack, F. 1982. Two blameless Homeric characters. *The American Journal of Philology* 103,4.361-372.

Combellack, F. 1984. A Homeric metaphor. *The American Journal of Philology* 105,3.247-257.

Combellack, F. 1987. The λύσις ἐκ τῆς λέξεως. *The American Journal of Philology* 108,2.202-219.

Coulon, L. 1643. *Lexicon Homericum*. Paris: Cramoisy.

Coulter, C. 1925. The happy Underworld and fairy mistress themes in the *Odyssey. Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 56.37-53.

Crielaard, J. 1995. *Homeric questions: essays in philology, ancient history and archaeology, including the papers of a conference organized by the Netherlands Insititute in Athens*. Amsterdam:Gieben.

Croiset, A. –Croiset, M. 1900. *Manuel d'histoire de la littérature grecque*. Paris: De Boccard.

Danielsson, O. 1897. *Zur metrischen Dehnung im älteren Griechischen Epos*. Uppsala: K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet.

Danielsson, O. 1909. Zur Lehre vom homerischen Digamma. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 25. 264-284.

Davies, M. 1995. Agamemnon's Apology and the unity of the Iliad. *The Classical Quarterly* 45,1.1-8.

Dawe, R. 1968. Some reflections on Ate and Hamartia. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 72.89-123.

De Decker, F. 2009. The position of Greek in the Proto-Indo-European language area. Paper as final exam for the course GREK601. Winter 2009. Calgary, Alberta.

De Jong, I. 1985. Iliad I.366-392. A mirror story. *Arethusa* 18,1.5-22.

De Jong, I. 1987. The voice of anonimity: *tis* speeches in the Iliad. *Eranos* 85.69-84.

De Jong, I. 1997. Narrator language versus character language: some further explanations. Létoublon 1997. 293-302.

De Jong, I. 2001. *A narratological commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Lamberterie, C. 1974. Les occlusives sonores aspirées de l'arménien. *Revue des études arméniennes* 10.39-44.

De Lamberterie, C. 1978/9. Armeniaca X: une isoglosse greco-arménienne. *Revue des études arméniennes* 13.31-40.

De Lamberterie, C. 1980a. Échange de gutturales en arménien. *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 1.23-37.

De Lambeterie, C. 1980b. Armeniaca IX: Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott. *Die Sprache* 26.133-144.

De Lamberterie, C. 1982a. Poids et force: reconstruction d'une racine verbale. *Revue des études arméniennes* 16.21-55.

De Lamberterie, C. 1982b. La racine *(s)pergh* en arménien. *Revue des études arméniennes* 16.57-68.

De Lamberterie, C. 1997. Review of Clackson 1994. *Kratylos* 42.71-78.

Detienne, M. 1996. *The masters of truth in Archaic Greece.* Translated by Janet Lloyd, with a foreword by P. Vidal-Naquet. (updated bibliography from the 1990 translation of the 1967 French original). New York: Zone Books.

Detienne, M. - Vernant, J. 1978. *Cunning intelligence in Greek culture and society.* Hassocks: Harvester. (translation by J. Lloyd of the 1974 French original)

De Vaan, M. 2007. *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages.* Leiden: Brill.

Devereux, G. 1970. The Nature of Sappho's Seizure in Fr. 31 LP as Evidence of Her Inversion. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 20,1.17-31.

Devoto, G. 1968. *La lingua omerica.* Firenze: Sansoni.

De Vries, J. *The problem of Loki.* Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

De Vries, J. 1962. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Zweite verbesserte Auflage. Leiden: Brill.

Dobson, N. 2003. *Iambic elements in archaic Greek epic.* Ph.D. thesis from University of Texas at Austin. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Dodds, E. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Doherty, L. 1995. *Siren Songs: gender, audience and narrators in the Odyssey*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Doherty, L. 1995(2007). Internal narrators, female and male. Bloom 2007a. 57-86.

Doherty, L. 1996. Review Papadopoulou-Belmehdi 1994. *Classical Philology* 91,3.274-276.

Doherty, L. 2008. Nausikaa and Tyro:Idylls of courtship in the Phaiakian Episode of the *Odyssey* and the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*. *Phoenix* 62,1-2.63-76

Donlan, W. 1979. The structure of authority in the Iliad. *Arethusa* 12,2.51-70.

Dumézil, G. 1948. *Loki*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

Dunbar, H. - Marzullo, B. 1971. *A complete concordance to the Odyssey of Homer*. New edition, completely revised and enlarged by B. Marzullo. Hildesheim: Olms Verlag.

Dunkle, R. 1987. Nestor, Odysseus, and the MÊTIS: BIÊ Antithesis: The Funeral Games, Iliad 23. *The Classical World* 81, 1. 1-17.

Ebeling, H. 1885. *Lexicon Homericum*. 2 volumes.

Edwards, E. 1966. Some features of Homeric craftsmanship. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 97.115-179.

Edwards, M. 1969. On some "answering" expressions in Homer. *Classical Philology* 64,2.81-87.

Edwards, M. 1970. Homeric speech introductions. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 74.1-36.

Edwards, M. 1980. Convention and individuality in Iliad 1. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 84.1-28.

Edwards, M. 1991. *The Iliad: a commentary.* Volume V: books 17-20. General editor G.S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, M. 1997. Homeric style and oral poetics. Morris-Powell 1997. 261-283.

Elgersma Helleman, W. 1995. Penelope as lady Philosophy. *Phoenix* 49,4.283-302.

Emlyn-Jones, C. 1986. True and lying tales in the 'Odyssey'. *Greece & Rome* S2 33,1.1-10.

Ernout, J. - Meillet, A. 1967. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latin.* Paris: Klincksieck.

Euler, W. 1979. *Indoiranisch-griechische Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung und deren indogermanische Grundlagen.* Innsbruck.

Euler, W. 1980. Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen. Mayrhofer 1980.173-179.

Ferguson, P. - Young, T. 1995. From Anansi to Zomo: Trickster Tales in the Classroom. *The Reading Teacher.* 48,6. 490-503.

Feit Diehl, J. 1978. Come slowly -Eden. *Signs* 3.572-587.

Felson-Rubin, N. 1994. *Regarding Penelope. From character to poetics.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Felson-Rubin, N. 1996. Penelope's perspective: character from plot. Schein 1996a.163-183 (enlarged chapter from Felson Rubin 1994).

Felson-Rubin, N. 1996(2007). Penelope's perspective: character from plot. Bloom 2007a. 127-150.

Felson-Rubin, N. 1997. Artful manipulation: Od. 10.203-260. Létoublon 1997.283-291.

Fenik, B. 1978a. *Homer. Tradition and invention*. Leiden: Brill.

Fenik, B. 1978b. Stylization and variety. Four monologues on the Iliad. Fenik 1978a. 68-90.

Fenno, J. 2008. The wrath and vengeance of swift-footed Aeneas in *Iliad* 13. *Phoenix* 62,1-2.145-161.

Ferguson, P. - Young, T. 1995. From Anansi to Zomo: Trickster Tales in the Classroom. *The Reading Teacher* 48,6. 490-503.

Fernández-Galiano, M. Books XXI-XXII. Russo-Fernández-Galiano-Heubeck 1992. 131-312.

Fick, A. 1877. Zum s-Suffix im Griechischen. *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 1.231-248.

Fick, A. 1883. *Die homerische Odyssee in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen: Peppmüller.

Fick, A. 1886. *Die Homerische Ilias nach ihrer entstehung betrachtet und in den ursprünglichen sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Fick, A. 1887. *Hesiods Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen fassung und sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Finkelberg, M. 1986. Is κλέος ἄφθιτον a Homeric formula? *The Classical Quarterly* 36,1. 1-5.

Finkelberg, M. 1995 (2007). Odysseus and the genus "hero". Bloom 2007a. 23-36.

Finkelberg, M. 2005. *Greek and pre Greeks. Aegean prehistory and Greek heroic tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fletcher, J. 2008. Women's space and wingless words in the *Odyssey*. *Phoenix* 62,1-2.77-91.

Foley, J. 1997. Oral tradition and its implication. Morris-Powell 1997. 146-173.

Foley, H. 1995(2007). Penelope as moral agent. Bloom 2007a.87-108

Ford, A. 1997. Epic as a genre. Morris-Powell 1997. 396-414.

Forsyth, N. 1979. The allurement scene: a typical pattern in Greek oral epic. *California Studies in Classical Philology* 12.107-120.

Frazer, R. 1983. *The poems of Hesiod*. Translated with introduction and comments by R. Frazer. Tulsa: University of Oklahoma Press.

Frisk, H. 1936. *Wahrheit und Lüge in den indogermanischen Sprachen*. Einige morphologische Beobachtungen. Göteborg: Elanders Bocktryckeri.

Frisk, H. 1960-1972. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag.

Fulkerson, L. 2002. Epic ways of killing a woman: gender and transgression in *Odyssey* 22.465-72. *The Classical Journal* 97,4.335-350.

Gaertner, J. 2001. The Homeric Catalogues and their functon in epic narrative. *Hermes* 129,3.298-305.

Gamkrelidze, T. - Ivanov, V. 1995. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*. Berlin: Mouton De Guyter. (translated by Johanna Nichols).

Gantz, T. 1996. *Early Greek myth. A guide to literary and artistic sources*. 2 Volumes. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Garvie, A. 1994. . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gentili, B. 1981. Preistoria e formazione dell'esametro. Brillante-Cantilena-Pavese 1981.75-104. (followed by discussion)

Georgiev, V. 1960. Die griechischen Nomina auf *eus* und die baltisch-slavischen Verba auf *auju*. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 8.17-29.

Giangrande, G. 1970. Der stilistische Gebrauch der Dorismen im Epos. *Hermes* 98,3. 257-277.

Giangrande, G. 1973. Dorische Genitive bei Homer. *Glotta* 51.1-6.

Giangrande, L. 1972. Pseudo-, "international", Olympian and personal peace in Homeric Epic. *The Classical Journal* 68,1.1-10.

Goebel, A. 1878-1880. *Lexilogus zu Homer und den Homeriden: mit zahlreichen Beiträgen zur griechischen Wortforschung*. Berlin. 2 volumes.

Golden, M. - Toohey, P. 2003. *Sex and difference in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Goldhill, S. 1988. Reading differences. The *Odyssey* and juxtaposition. *Ramus* 17. 1-31.

Goodwin, W. 1894. *Greek moods and tenses*. Boston: Ginn.

Gordon, E. 1957. *An introduction to Old Norse*. (Revision of the 1927 edition in 1957 by A. Taylor). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Graver, M. 1995. Dog-Helen and Homeric insult. *Classical Antiquity* 14,1.41-61.

Gray, D. 1961. Review of W. Schadewaldt *Neue Kriterien zur Odyssee Analyse: die Wiedererkennung des Odysseus und Penelope.The Classical Review* NS 11,3. 286-287.

Graziosi, B. - Haubold, J. 2003. Homeric masculinity: HNOPEH and AΓHNOPIH. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 123.60-76.

Griffin, J. 1976. Homeric pathos and objectivity. *The Classical Quarterly* 26,2.161-187.

Griffin, J. 1977. The Epic Cyle and the uniqueness of Homer. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 97.39-53.

Griffin, J. 1978. The divine audience and the religion of the *Iliad*. *The Classical Quarterly* 28,1.1-22.

Griffin, J. 1980. Homer on life and death. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Griffin, J. - Hammond, M. 1982. Critical appreciations VI. *Greece & Rome* 29,2. 126-142.

Gunn, D. 1971. Thematic composition and Homeric authorship. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 75.1-31.

Hackstein, O. 2003. Eine weitere griechisch-tocharische Gleichung: Griechisch πτῆξαι und tocharisch B *pyāktsi*. *Glotta* 70. 136-165.

Haig Gaisser, J. 1969. A structural analysis of the digressions in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 73.1-43.

Hainsworth, B. 1964. Structure and content in epic formulae: the question of the unique expression. *The Classical Quarterly* 14,2. 155-164.

Hainsworth, J. B. 1978. Good and bad formulae. Fenik 1978a.41-50.

Hainsworth, J. B. 1981. Criteri d'oralità nella poesia arcaica non omerica. Brillante-Cantilena-Pavese 1981.3-18. (followed by discussion)

Hainsworth, J. B. 1988a. The epic dialect. Heubeck-West-Hainsworth 1988.24-32.

Hainsworth, J. B. 1988b. Books v-viii. Heubeck-West-Hainsworth 1988.249-385.

Hainsworth, J. B. 1993. *The Iliad: a commentary*. Volume III: books 9-12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hajnal, I. 1993. Neue Aspekte zur Rekonstruktion des frühgriechischen Phonemsystem. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 98.108-129.

Hajnal, I. 2003. Methodische Vorbemerkungen zu einer Palaeolinguistik des Balkanraums. Bammesberger, A. - Vennemann, T. *Languages in Prehistoric Europe*. Heidelberg:Winter. 117-145.

Hallett, J. 1979. Sappho and Her Social Context: Sense and Sensuality. *Signs* 4. 447-464.

Hamp, E. 1995. κερδώ κέρδος. *Glotta* 72.18-19.

Harris, S. - Platzner, G. 2004. *Classical mythology. Images & insights*. Boston:McGraw Hill.

Harrison, A. 1989. *The Irish trickster*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Harrison, E. 1960. Notes on Homeric psychology. *Phoenix* 14,2.63-80.

Harsh, P. 1950. Penelope and Odysseus in *Odyssey* XIX. *The American Journal of Philology* 71,1.1-21.

Harvey, A. 1957. Homeric epithets in Greek lyric poetry. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 7,3-4. 206-223.

Haslam, M. 1997. Homeric papyri and transmission of the text. Morris-Powell 1997. 55-100.

Haug, D. 2002. *Les phases de l'évolution de la langue épique. Trois études de linguistique homérique*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht.

Heider, B. 1997a. The *Iliad* and its context: introduction. *Arethusa* 30,2.145-150.

Heider, B. 1997b. The ordeals of Homeric song. *Arethusa* 30,2.221-240.

Heirbaut, E. 2006. De geboorte van de mythologie volgens Max Müller. *Tetradio (Tijdschrift van het Griekenlandcentrum)* 15. 155-184.

Heitman, R. 2005(2007). The stakes of the plot. Bloom 2007a. 223-244.

Henley, N. - Kramer, C. - Thorne, B. 1978. Perspectives in language and communication. *Signs* 3.638-651.

Herter, H. 1981. L'inno omerico a Hermes alla luce dell problematica della poesia orale. Brillante-Cantilena-Pavese 1981.183-200. (followed by discussion)

Heubeck, A. 1978. Homeric studies today: results and prospects. Fenik 1978a.1-17.

Heubeck, A. 1988. General introduction. Heubeck-West-Hainsworth 1988. 3-23.

Heubeck, A. 1989. Books ix-xii. Heubeck-Hoekstra 1989.3-146.

Heubeck, A. 1992. Books XXXIII-XXIV. Russo-Fernández Galiano-Heubeck 1992.313-418.

Heubeck, A. - Hoekstra, A. 1989. *A commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Volume II. Books ix-xvi. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Heubeck, A. - West, S. - Hainsworth, B. 1988. *A commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Volume I. Introduction and books i-viii. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hill, W. - Hill, D. 1945. Navaho Coyote Tales and Their Position in the Southern Athabaskan Group. *The Journal of American Folklore* 58,230. 317-343.

Hoekstra, A. 1954. Une formule para-homérique. *Mnemosyne* IV 7,4.297-299.

Hoekstra, A. 1957. Hésiode et la tradition orale. *Mnemosyne* IV. 10,3.193-225.

Hoekstra, A. 1981. *Epic verse before Homer. Three studies*. Amsterdam: North Holland.

Hoekstra, A. 1989. Books xiii-xvi. Heubeck-Hoekstra 1989.147-288.

Holmberg, I. 1990. *Gender and deceit in early Greek hexameter poetry*, Ph.D. thesis from Yale University. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Holmberg, I. 1995. Euripides' Helen: most noble and most chaste. *The American Journal of Philology* 116,1.19-42.

Holmberg, I. 1997. The sign of MHTIΣ. *Arethusa* 30,1.1-33.

Holmberg, I. 1998. Metis and gender in Apollonius Rhodius' Argonautica. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 128.135-146.

Holmberg, I. 2003. Hephaistos and spiders' webs. *Phoenix* 57,1/2.1-17.

Hölscher, U. 1967(1996). Penelope and the suitors. Schein 1996a .133-140.

Hölscher, U. 1978. The transformation from folk-tale to epic. Fenik 1978a.51-67.

Holst, J. 1998. Ein bisher untentdecktes Lautgesetz im Albanischen und damit im Zusammenhang stehenden Betrachtungen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 111,1.83-98.

Holtsmark, E. 1966. Spirital rebirth of the hero: "Odyssey" 5. *The Classical Journal* 61,5. 206-210.

Horrocks, G. 1997. Homer's Dialect. Morris – Powell 1997. 193-217.

Horrocks, G. 2007. The language of Homer. Christidis 2007. 475-481.

IJsseling, S. 1994. *Apollo, Dionysos, Aphrodite en de anderen. Griekse goden in de hedendaagse filosofie*. Amsterdam: Boon.

Ingalls, W. 1970. The structure of the Homeric hexameter: a review. *Phoenix* 24,1. 1-12.

Ingalls, W. 1972. Another dimension of the Homeric formula. *Phoenix* 26,2. 111-122.

Ingalls, W. 1982. Linguistic and formular innovation in the mythological digressions in the "Iliad". *Phoenix* 36,3.201-208.

Ingalls, W. 2000. Ritual performance as training for daughters in Archaic Greece. *Phoenix* 54,1-2.1-20.

Janko, R. 1981a. Equivalent formulae in the Greek Epos. *Mnemosyne* IV 34,3-4.251-264.

Janko, R. 1981b.

Janko, R. 1982. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns. Diachronic development in epic diction*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Janko, R. 1986. The Shield of Heracles and the Legend of Cycnus. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 36,1.38-59.

Janko, R. 1990. The *Iliad* and its editors: dictation and redaction. *Classical Antiquity* 9,2.326-334.

Janko, R. 1992. *The Iliad: a commentary*. Volume IV: books 13-16. General editor G.S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Janko, R. 1998. The Homeric poems as oral dictated texts. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 48,1.1-13.

Janko, R. 2000. Review West 1999. *The Classical Review* NS 50,1.1-4.

Jenkins, I. 1985. The ambiguity of Greek textiles. *Arethusa* 18,2.109-132.

Jones, P. 1992. The past in Homer's *Odyssey*. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 112.74-90.

Jones, R. 2008. The Bronze Age in Homer. MA Thesis University of Calgary.

Jung, C. - Kerényi, K. - Radin, P. 1959. *Der göttliche Schelm. Ein indianischer Mythenzyklus* . Zürich: Rhein Verlag.

Kahane, A. 1997. The semantics of performance: a case study of proper name vocatives in Homer. Létoublon 1997. 251-262.

Kakridis, J. 1949. *Homeric Researches*. Lund:Gleerup.

Kakridis, J. 1956. The role of the women in the *Iliad*. *Eranos* 54.21-27.

Karali, M. 2007. The use of dialects in literature. Christidis 2007. 974-998.

Katz, M. 1992(2003). Ideology and the "status of women" in Ancient Greece. Golden-Toohey 2003.30-41.

Katz-Anhalt, E. 2001/2. A matter of perspective: Penelope and the nightingale in *Odyssey* 19.512-534. *The Classical Journal* 97,2.145-159.

Kazazis, J. 2007. Ancient Greek metre. Christidis 2007. 1033-1044.

Kennedy, G. 1986. Helen's web unravelled. *Arethusa* 19,1.5-14.

Kerényi, C. 1959a. *The Heroes of the Greeks*. London: Thames and Hudson (translated from German into English by H. Rose).

Kerényi, C. 1959b. Mythologische Epilegomena. Jung-Kerényi-Radin 1959. 155-181.

Kirk, G. 1970. *Myth. Its meaning & functions in ancient and other cultures*. Berkeley:University of California Press.

Kirk, G. 1974. *The nature of Greek Myths*. London: Penguin.

Kirk, G. 1978. The formal duels in Books 3 and 7 of the *Iliad*. Fenk 1978a.18-40.

Kirk, G. 1981. Orality and structure in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo. Brillante-Cantilena-Pavese 1981.163-180. (followed by discussion)

Kirk, G. 1985. *The Iliad: a commentary*. Volume I: books 1-4. General editor G.S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kitto, H. 1966(1988). The *Odyssey*: the exclusion of surprise. Bloom 1988b.5-34.

Klingenschmitt, G. 1975. Tocharisch und Urindogermanisch. Rix 1975. 148-163.

Klingenschmitt, G. 1978. Zum Ablaut des indogermanischen Kausativs. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 92.1-13.

Klingenschmitt, G. 1982. *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden:Reichert.

Klingenschmitt, G. 1993. Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen. Rasmussen, J. *In honorem Holger Pedersen*. Kolloquium der indogermanischen Sprachen. Wiesbaden: Reichert. 235-251.

Kloekhorst, A. 2009. *Plene spelling in Hittite*. Evening Lecture held on August 4th in Leiden.

Knös, O. 1869. *Prolegomena ad quaestiones de digammo Homerico instituendas*. Uppsala:Schulze.

Koepping, K. 1985. Absurdity and hidden truth: cunning intelligence and grotesque body images as manifestations of the trickster. *History of Religions* 24,3.191-214.

Köhnken, A. 1981. Der Endspurt des Odysseus: Wettkampfdarstellung bei Homer und Vergil. *Hermes* 109,2.129-148.

Köhnken, A. 2003. Perspektives Erzählen im homerischen Epos: die Wiedererkennung Odysseus: Argos. *Hermes* 131.385-396.

Koniaras, G. 1973. Alexander, Palamedes, Troades, Sisyphus- A connected tetralogy? A connected trilogy? *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 77.85-124.

Krarup, P. 1956. Homer and the art of writing. *Eranos* 54.28-33.

Kretschmer, P. 1896 *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen.

Kretschmer, P. 1932. χθών. *Glotta* 20.65-67.

Krischer, T. 1993. Die Webelist der Penelope. *Hermes* 121,1. 3-11.

Kühner, R. – Blass, F. 1898. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Teil 1: Formenlehre*. 2 Bände. Hannover: Hahn.

Kühner, R. – Gerth, B. 1898. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Teil 2: Satzlehre*. 2 Bände. Hannover: Hahn.

Kullmann, W. 1985. Gods and men in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 89.1-23.

Kuryłowicz, J. 1973. Grec ΚΤ, ΧΘ, ΦΘ = V. Ind. Kṣ, etc. *Bulletin de la Société linguistique de Paris* 68.93-103.

Lamberton, R. 1997. Homer in Antiquity. Morris-Powell 1997. 33-54.

Lang, M. 1969. Homer and oral techniques. *Hesperia* 38,2.159-168.

La Pin, D. 1980. Tale and Trickster in Yoruba Verbal Art. *Research in African Literatures* 11,3. 327-341. (Special Issue on *Genre and Classification in African Folklore*)

La Roche, J. 1869. *Homerische Untersuchungen I*. Leipzig: Teubner.

La Roche, J. 1893. *Homerische Untersuchungen II*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Laser, S. 1958. Über das Verhältnis der Dolonie zur Odyssee. *Hermes* 86,4.385-425.

Lateiner, D. 1997. Homeric prayer. *Arethusa* 30,2.241-272.

Lateiner, D. 2005. Proxemic and chronemic in Homeric Epic: tie and space in heroic social interaction. *The Classical World* 98,4.413-421.

Lateur, P. 1993. *Muze, zeg me... Bloemlezing Griekse literatuur*. Leuven: Davidsfonds.

Lattimore, R. 1959. *Hesiod. Works and Days. Theogony. The Shield of Herakles*. Translated by R. Lattimore. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Layard, J. 1957. Review Radin 1956. *Man* 57.126

Leaf, W. 1900. *The Iliad* edited, with apparatus criticus, prolegomena, notes, and appendices by Walter Leaf.

Lee, M. 2004. "Evil wealth of raiment: deadly πέπλοι in Greek tragedy. *The Classical Journal* 99,3.253-279.

Lefkowitz, M. 1972. Cultural Conventions and the Persistence of Mistranslation. *The Classical Journal* 68,1. 31-38.

Lefkowitz, M. 1973. Critical Stereotypes and the Poetry of Sappho. *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 14,2. 113-122.

Lefkowitz, M. 1983a. Wives and husbands. *Greece and Rome* 2nd Series. 30,1.31-47.

Lefkowitz, M. 1983b. Influential women. Cameron-Kuhrt 1983.49-64.

Lejeune, M. 1972. *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien.* Paris: Klincksieck.

Leskien, A. 1866. *Rationem quam I. Bekker in restituendo digammo secutus est, examinavit Dr. A. Leskien.* Leipzig: Brock.

Lesky, A. 1971. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur.* Bern: Francke.

Létoublon, F. 1997. *Hommage à Milman Parry: le style formulaire de l'épopée homérique et la théorie de l'oralité poétique.* Amsterdam: Gieben.

Leumann, M. 1950. *Homerische Wörter.* Basel: Verlag Friedrich Reinhardt AG.

Levaniouk, O. 2008. Penelope and the Pandareids. *Phoenix* 62,1-2.5-38.

Levet, J. 1976. *Le vrai et le faux dans la pensée grecque archaïque. Étude de vocabulaire.* Tome I: présentation générale. Le vrai et le faux dans les épopées homériques. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Levine, D. 2002/3. Poetic justice: Homer's death in the ancient biographical tradition. *The Classical Journal* 98,2.141-160.

Lévi-Strauss, C. 1982. Tricksters and Clam Siphons. *American Ethnologist* 9,1. 193.

Lindow, J. 1992. Loki and Skaði. *Snorrastefna.* Edited by Ú. Bragason. Reykjavík 1992.130-141.

Lloyd-Jones, H. 1971. *The justice of Zeus.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Longard, L. 1837. *Symbolae ad doctrinam de digammo Aeolica.* Bonn: Georg Verlag.

Loraux, N. 1995. *The experiences of Tiresias. The feminine and the Greek man*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lord, A. 1968. Homer as oral poet. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 72.1-46.

Louden, B. 1997. Eumaios and Alkinoos: the audience and the *Odyssey*. *Phoenix* 51,2.95-114.

Louden, B. 1999(2007). Kalypso and the function of book five. Bloom 2007a. 169-196.

Lubotsky, A. 1988. The Old Phrygian Areyastis inscription. *Kadmos* 27.9-26.

Lubotsky, A. 1989. Against a Proto-Indo-European phoneme *a. Vennemann 1989a.53-66.

Lubotsky, A. forthcoming (ftc). Proto-Indo-Iranian Phonology. (should appear in an overview work edited by Jared Klein)

Lucas, D. 1962. Pity, terror, and Peripateia. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 12,1.52-60.

Luther, M. 1935. *"Wahrheit" und "Lüge" im ältesten Griechentum*. Borna: Noske Verlag.

Lynn-George, K. 1996. Structures of care in the *Iliad*. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 46,1.1-26.

Lynn-George, M. 1978. The relationship of Σ 535-540 and Scutum 156-160 re-examined. *Hermes* 106,3.396-405.

Lynn-George, M. 1994. The stem of the full-blown flower: Homeric Studies and literary theory. *Phoenix* 48,3.226-253.

Lyons, D. 2003. Dangerous gifts: ideologies o marriage and exchange in Ancient Greece. *Classical Antiquity* 22,1.93-134.

MacLeod, C. 1982. *Homer. Iliad Book XXIV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mallory, J. – Adams, D. (eds) 1997. *Encyclopedia of Indo European Culture*. London-Chicago: Dearborn Publishers.

Mallory, J. - Adams, D. 2006. *The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European world.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marcovich, M. 1972. Sappho Fr. 31: Anxiety Attack or Love Declaration? Alexandro Turyn Septuagenario. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 22,1. 19-32.

Marquardt, P. 1985. Penelope "polutropos". *The American Journal of Philology* 106,1.32-48.

Martin R. 1997. Formulas and speeches: the usefulness of Parry's method. Létoublon 1997.263-274.

Marzullo, B. 1952. *Il problema omerico.* Firenze: La Nuova Italia.

Matzinger, J. 2000. Albanisches *gra* "Frauen". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 60.75-87.

Matzinger, J. 2005. Phrygisch und Armenisch. Meiser, G. - Hackstein, O. *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel.* Akten der XI. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Wiesbaden: Reichert. 375-394.

McKinley, R. 1982. Tricksters and Clam Siphons. *American Ethnologist* 9,1. 193.

McClure, L. 1996/7. Clytemnestra's binding spell. *The Classical Journal* 92,2.123-140.

McIntosh Snyder, J. 1981. The web of song: weaving imagery in Homer and the lyric poets. *The Classical Journal* 76,3.193-196.

McIntosh Snyder, J. 1991. Public Occasion and Private Passion in the Lyrics of Sappho of Lesbos. Pomeroy 1991a.1-19.

Meid, W. 1975. Probleme der räumlichen und zeitlichen Gliederung des Indogermanischen. Rix 1975.204-219.

Meier-Brügger, M. 1992. *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft.* Zwei Bände. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Meier-Brügger, M. 2003. *Indo-European Linguistics.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Meister, K. 1921. *Die homerische Kunstsprache.* Leipzig: Preisschrift der fürstlichen Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft 48.

Merry, W. 1876a. *Homer: Odyssey I-XII.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Merry, W. 1876b. *Homer: Odyssey XIII-XXIV.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Miller, G. 1982. *Homer and the Ionic epic tradition. Some phonic and phonological evidence against an Aeolic phase.* Innsbruck.

Minton, W. 1960. Homer's invocations of the Muses: traditional patterns. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 91. 292-309.

Minton, W. 1962. Invocation and catalogue in Hesiod and Homer. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 93. 188-212.

Minton, W. 1965. The fallacy of the structural formula. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 96.241-253.

Minton, W. 1970. The proem-hymn of Hesiod's *Theogony. Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 101.357-377.

Monro, D. 1891. *A grammar of the Homeric dialect.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Morrell, K. 1997. The fabric of persuasion: Clytaemnestra, Agamemnon and the sea of garments. *The Classical Journal* 92,2.141-165.

Morris, I. – Powell, B. 1997. *A New Companion to Homer.* Leiden: Brill.

Morris, I. 1999 (2003). Archaeology and gender ideologies in early Archaic Greece. Golden Toohey 2003. 264-275.

Morrison, J. 1992. *Homeric Misdirections. False Predictions in the Iliad*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Morrison, J. 1997. Kerostasia: the dictates of fate and the will of Zeus in the *Iliad*. Arethusa 30,2.273-296.

Morrison, J. 2003. A companion to Homer's *Odyssey*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Most, G. 2006. *Hesiod. Theogony. Works and Days. Testimonia*. Edited and translated by Glenn W. Most. Cambridge: Loeb Classical Library.

Most, G. 2007. *Hesiod. The Shield. Catalogue of Women. Other fragments*. Edited and translated by Glenn W. Most. Cambridge: Loeb Classical Library.

Moulton, C. 1977. *Siniles in the Homeric Poems*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Moulton, C. 1979. Homeric metaphor. *Classical Philology* 74,4.279-293.

Muller, F. - Thiel, J. 1991. *Beknopt Grieks – Nederlands Woordenboek*. Elfde druk bewerkt door W. Den Boer. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.

Munding, H. 1955. Eine Anspielung auf Hesiods Erga in der Odyssee. *Hermes* 83,1.51-68.

Murnaghan, S. 1986. Review Cameron-Kuhrt 1983. *The Classical World* 79,4.276-277.

Murray, G. 1936. *The rise of the Greek epic*. Third edition, revised and enlarged. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Murray, G. 1938. The "question" again. Review of W. Schadewaldt *Homer und die homerische Frage. The Classical Review* 52,6.217-218.

Myres, J. 1932. The last book of the *Iliad*: its place in the structure of the poem. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 52,2.264-296.

Myres, J. 1952. The pattern of the *Odyssey. Journal of Hellenic Studies* 72.1-19.

Nachman, S. 1982. Anti-Humor: Why the Grand Sorcerer Wags His Penis. *Ethos* 10,2. 117-135.

Nagler, M. 1967. Towards a generative view of the oral formula. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 98.269-311.

Nagler, M. 1996. Dread goddess revisited. Schein 1996a .141-161.

Nagy, G. 1973. Phaethon, Sappho's Phaon, and the white rock of Leukas. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 77.137-177.

Nagy, G. 1974. *Comparative studies in Greek and Indic Meter*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Nagy, G. 1979. *The best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Nagy, G. 1983. Sema and noesis: the hero's tomb and the "reading" of symbols in Homer and Hesiod. *Arethusa* 16,1.35-55.

Nagy, G. 1990. *Greek mythology and poetics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Nagy, G. 1997a. L'épopée homérique et la fixation du texte. Létoublon 1997. 57-78.

Nagy, G. 1997b. Homeric scholia. Morris-Powell 1997.100-122.

Nash, D. 1977. Review Pomeroy 1975. *Social History* 2,6. 808-810.

Nieto Hernández, P. 2008. Penelope's absent song. *Phoenix* 62,1-2.39-62.

Nilsson, M. 1932(1972). *The Mycenaean origin of Greek mythology*. (with an introduction and bibliography by Emily Vermeule). Los Angeles-Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nordheider, H. 1984. Words δόλιος, δολόεις, δολόμητις, δόλος, δολοφρονέω, δολοφροσύνη. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, edited by B. Snell. 329-330.

Notopoulos, J. 1949. Parataxis in Homer: a new approach to Homeric literary criticism. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 80.1-23.

Notopoulos, J. 1950. The generic and oral composition in Homer. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 81.28-36.

Notopoulos, J. 1951. Continuity and interconnexion in Homeric oral composition. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 82.81-101.

Nussbaum, A. 1977. On the formation and derivational history of Greek κέρας and related words for "head" and "horn in Greek and Indo-European. *Indo-European Studies* III, edited by Calvert Watkins. Cambridge: Harvard Department of Linguistics.328-404.

Nussbaum, A. 1986. *Head and Horn in Indo European.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Nussbaum, A. 1998. *Two Studies in Greek and Homeric Linguistics.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck Ruprecht.

Nye, I. 1937. When Homer smiles. *The Classical Journal* 33,1.25-37.

Olson, D. 1990. The stories of Agamemnon in Homer's *Odyssey. Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 120.57-71.

Olson, D. 1992. Servants' suggestions in Homer's *Odyssey. The Classical Journal* 87,3.219-227.

Olson, D. 1995(2007). The wanderings. Bloom 2007a. 37-56.

Olson, S. 1989. *Odyssey* 8. Guile, force and subversive poetics of desire. *Arethusa* 22,2.135-145.

O'Nolan, K. 1960. The Proteus legend. *Hermes* 88,2.129-138.

O'Nolan, K. 1978. Doublets in the *Odyssey. The Classical Quarterly* NS 28,1.23-37.

Otto, W. 1954. *The Greek gods.* London: Thames Hudson.

Owen, W.-Goodspeed, E. 1975. *Homeric Vocabularies*. Norman:University of Oklahoma Press.

Padel, R. 1983. Women: model for possession by Greek daemons. Cameron-Kuhrt 1983.3-19.

Page, D. 1973. *Folktales in Homer's Odyssey*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pantelia, M. 1993. Spinning and weaving: ideas of domestic order in Homer. *The American Journal of Philology* 114,4.493-501.

Papadopoulou-Belmehdi, I. 1994. *Le chant de Pénélope*. Paris: Belin.

Papanikolaou. A. 1986. Ein Versuch zur Etymologie des Namens Απόλλων. *Glotta* 64.184-192.

Parker, L. 1966. Porson's Law extended. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 16,1.1-26.

Parry, H. 1994. The apologos of Odysseus: lies, all lies? *Phoenix* 48,1.1-20.

Parry, M. 1929. The distinctive character of enjambement in Homeric verse. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 60.200-220.

Parry, A. 1971. *The making of Homeric verse: the collected papers of Milman Parry*. Papers collected by A. Parry. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Parry, A. 1972. Language and characterization in Homer. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 76.1-22.

Paulme, D. 1975. Typologie des contes africains du Décepteur (A Typology of African Trickster Tales). *Cahiers d'Études Africaines* 15,60. 569-600.

Pavese, C. 1974. *Studi sulla tradizione epica rapsodica*. Roma: Edizioni dell' Ateneo.

Pavese, C. 1981. Poesia ellenica e cultura orale. Brillante-Cantilena-Pavese 1981.231-260. (followed by discussion)

Pavese, C. 1998. The rhapsodic epic poems as oral and independent poems. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 98.63-90.

Pedersen, H. 1925. *Le groupement des dialects indo-européens*. Copenhague: Bianco Lunos Bogtrykkeri.

Pederson, L. 1985. Language in the Uncle Remus Tales. *Modern Philology* 82,3. 292-298.

Pedrick, V. 1982. Supplication in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 112.125-140.

Pedrick, V. 1983. The paradigmatic nature of Nestor's speech in *Iliad* 11. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 113.55-68.

Pemberton, J. 1975. Eshu-Elegba: The Yoruba Trickster God. *African Arts* 9,1. 20-27+66-70+90-92.

Peradotto, J. 1990. *Man in the middle voice. Name and narration in the Odyssey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Perrin, B. 1909. Recognition scenes in Greek literature. *The American Journal of Philology* 30,4.371-404.

Peters, M. 1980. *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. Wien: Verlag der österreichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Phillips, E. 1959. The comic Odysseus. *Greece & Rome* Second Series 6,1.58-67.

Pisani, V. 1959/60. Indogermanisch und Sanskrit. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 76.43-51.

Pisani, V. 1969. Zum Wandel *s>h* im Iranischen und im Griechischen. *Die Sprache* 13.206-207.

Pisani, V. 1975. Zum armenischen Pluralzeichen -*k'*. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 89.94-99.

Plass, P. 1969. Menelaus and Proteus. *The Classical Journal* 65,3.104-108.

Polkas, L. 2007. Homer: epic poetry and its characteristics. Christidis 2007. 999-1009.

Polomé, E. 1989. A few notes on Indo-Aryan-Hellenic isoglosses. *Indogermanica Europaea. Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid.* Innsbruck. 209-224.

Pomeroy, S. 1975. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity.* New York: Schocken.

Pomeroy, S. 1991a. *Women's History and Ancient History.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Pomeroy, S. 1991b. *Preface.* Pomeroy 1991a. xi-vvi.

Pomeroy, S. 1991c. The Study of Women in Antiquity: Past, Present, and Future. *The American Journal of Philology* 112,2. 263-268.

Powell, B. 1997. Homer and writing. Morris-Powell 1997.3-32.

Powell, B. 2001. *Classical Myth.* Upper Saddle River: Pearson.

Pralon, D. 1997. Ce que dit Démodocos. Létoublon 1997.303-315.

Pratt, L. 1988. *Lying and poetry from Homer to Pindar.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Preller, L. 1894. *Griechische Mythologie.* (3 volumes). Berlin: Weidmann.

Prellwitz, W. 1892. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht.

Prendergast, G. - Marzullo, B. 1962. *A complete concordance to the Iliad of Homer.* New edition, completely revised and enlarged by B. Marzullo. Hildesheim: Olms Verlag.

Pucci, P. 1979. The song of the Sirens. *Arethusa* 12,2. 121-132.

Pucci, P. 1987. *Odysseus Polutropos. Intertextual readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Pucci, P. 1998. *The song of the Sirens. Essays on Homer.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Puhvel, J. 1987. *Comparative mythology.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Rabel, R. 1997. Sophocles' Philoctetes and the interpretation of *Iliad* 9. *Arethusa* 30,2.297-307.

Race, W. 1993. First appearances in the *Odyssey. Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123.79-107.

Radin, P. 1959a. *Vorwort.* Jung-Kerényi-Radin 1959.5-9.

Radin, P. 1959b. Die Winnibago und ihr Schelmenzyklus. Jung-Kerényi-Radin 1959. 91-154.

Ramsey, J. 1978. Crow: or the trickster transformed. *The Massachusetts Review* 19,1.111-127.

Rauber, D. 1969. Some "metaphysical" aspects of the Homeric simile. *The Classical Journal* 65,3.97-103.

Redfield, J. 1979. The proem of the *Iliad*: Homer's art. *Classical Philology* 74,2.95-110.

Reeve, M. 1972. Two Notes on *Iliad* 9. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 22,1. 1-4.

Reinhardt, K. 1921(1996). The adventures in the *Odyssey.* Schein 1996a .63-131

Renehan, R. 1987. The Heldentod in Homer: one heroic ideal. *Classical Philology* 82,2.99-116.

Rhyan Kardulias, D. 2001. Odysseus in Ino's veil: feminine headdress and the hero in "Odyssey" 5. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 131. 23-51.

Richardson, N. 1980. Literary criticism in the exegetical Scholia to the *Iliad*: a sketch. *The Classical Quarterly* 30,2.265-287.

Richardson, N. 1993. *The Iliad: a commentary*. Volume VI: books 21-24. General editor G.S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riess E. 1925. Studies in superstition and folklore. VII: Homer. *The American Journal of Philology* 46,3. 222-242.

Ringe, D. 1985. On the prehistory of the Tocharian B accent. *Studies in honour of Warren Cowgill*. 254-269.

Ringe, D. 1988-1990. Evidence for the position of Tocharian in the Indo-European Family. *Die Sprache* 34.59-123.

Ringe, D. 2004. Reconstructed ancient languages. Woodard, R. 2004. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the world's ancient languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1112-1128.

Ritter, R. - Sowa, W. 2004. Greek-Armenian isoglosses and ancient Greek dialects. *Studies in Greek Linguistics*. Proceedings of the 24th annual meeting of the Department of Linguistics in Thessaloniki 645-656.

Rix, H. 1970. Anlautender Laryngal vor Liquida oder Nasalis sonans im Griechischen. *Museum Helveticum* 27.79-110.

Rix, H. 1975. (editor). *Flexion und Wortbildung*. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Rix, H. 1976. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre.* Herausgegeben von Helmut Rix. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Rohde, E. 1921(1966). *Psyche. The cult of souls & belief in immortality among the Greeks.* Translated by W. Hillis with an introduction by W. Guthrie. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Roisman, H. 1987. Penelope's indignation. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 117.59-68.

Roisman, H. 1990. Kerdion in the *Iliad*: profit and trickiness. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 120.23-35.

Roisman, H. 2006. Helen in the *Iliad*; *causa belli* and victim of war: from silent weaver to public speaker. *American Journal of Philology* 127.1-36.

Roller, D.- Roller, L. Penelope's thick hand ("Odyssey" 21.6). *The Classical Journal* 90,1.9-19.

Rose, G. 1969. Unfriendly Phaeacians. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 100. 387-406.

Rose, P. 1997. Ideology in the *Iliad*: Polis, Basileus, Theoi. *Arethusa* 30,2. 151-199.

Rosén, R. 1997. Homer and Hesiod. Morris-Powell 1997. 463-488.

Rossner, J. 1976. The speech of Phoenix: "Iliad" 9.434-605. *Phoenix* 30,4.314-327.

Rowe, C. 1978. *Essential Hesiod. Theogony 1-232, 453-733. Works and Days 1-307*, with introduction and notes by C.J. Rowe. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.

Ruijgh, C. 1957. *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique.* Assen: Van Gorcum.

Ruijgh, C. 1967. *Études du grec mycénien.* Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Ruijgh, C. 1969a. *Het Myceense Dialect: een nieuw beginpunt voor de historische grammatica van het Grieks*, openbare les bij het aanvaarden van het ambt als hoogleraar. Leiden: Brill.

Ruijgh, C. 1969b. *Liever dagloner op aarde: gedachten over de diachronische en synchronische analyse van het Homerische taalgebruik.* Leiden: Brill.

Ruijgh, C. 1995. D'Homère aux origins proto-mycéniennes de la tradition épique. Analyse dialectologique du lange homérique, avec un excursus sur la creation de l'alphabet grec. Crielaard 1995. 1-96.

Ruijgh, C. 1997. Les origines proto-mycéniennes de la tradition épique. Létoublon 1997. 33-46.

Ruijgh, C. 1998. Sur la date de la création de l'alphabet grec. *Mnemosyne* IV 51,6.658-687.

Russo, J. 1971. The meaning of oral poetry: the collected papers of Milman Parry: a critical reassessment. *Quaderni Urbinati della Cultura Classica* 12.27-39.

Russo, J. 1982. Interview and aftermath: dream, fantasy, and intuition in *Odyssey* 19 and 20. *The American Journal of Philology* 103,1.4-18.

Russo, J. -Fernández Galiano, M.-Heubeck, A. 1992. *A commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Volume III:Books XVII-XXIV. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Russo, J. 1992. Books XVII-XX. Russo-Fernández Galiano-Heubeck 1992. 3-130.

Russo, J. 1997. The formula. Morris-Powell 1997. 238-260.

Russo, J. - Simon, B. 1971. Psicologia omerica e tradizione epica orale. *Quaderni Urbinati della Cultura Classica* 12.40-61.

Rutherford, R. 1982. Tragic form and feeling in the *Iliad. The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 102.145-160.

Rutherford, R. 1992. . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ryan, G. 1965. Helen in Homer. *The Classical Journal* 61,3.115-117.

Sacks, R. 1975. Old Norse *móðsefa, tjǫld* and Greek δέλτοις φρενῶν. *Indo-European Studies II*, edited by C. Watkins. Cambridge: Harvard Department of Linguistics. 454-486.

Sale, W. 1987. The formularity of the place phrases of the *Iliad*. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 117.21-50.

Sarischoulis, E. 2008. *Schicksal, Götter und Handlungsfreiheit in den Epen Homers*. Palingenesia – Band 92. Berlin: Steiner Verlag.

Savoy, E. 1995. The Signifying Rabbit. *Narrative* 3,2. 188-209.

Schadewaldt, W. 1958. Der Prolog der Odyssee. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 63.15-32.

Schadewaldt, W. 1959a. Neue Kriterien zur Odyssee-Analyse: die Wiedererkennung des Odysseus und der Penelope. *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse 1959, 2 Band.* 7-28.

Schadewaldt, W. 1959b. Kleiderdinge: zur Analyse der Odyssee. *Hermes* 87,1.13-26.

Schein, S. 1980a. *The mortal hero. An introduction to Homer's Iliad.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Schein, S. 1980b. On Achilles' speech to Odysseus. *Eranos* 78.125-131.

Schein, S. 1991. Review: naratology and Homeric Studies. *Poetics Today* 12,3.577-590.

Schein, S. 1996a. *Reading the Odyssey.* Selected interpretive essays. Edited with an introduction by Seth L. Schein. Princeton: Priceton University Press.

Schein, S. 1996b. Introduction. Schein 1996a .3-31.

Schein, S. 1997. Milman Parry and the literary interpretation of Homeric poetry. Létoublon 1997. 275-281.

Schindler, J. 1967. Das idg. Wort für "Erde" und die dentalen Spiranten. *Die Sprache* 13.191-20.

Schindler, J. 1975a. Armenisch *erkn*, griechisch ὀδύνη, irisch *idu*. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 89.53-65.

Schindler, J. 1975b. On the Greek type ἱππεύς. *Indo-European Studies* II, edited by Calvert Watkins. Cambridge: Harvard Department of Linguistics.199-209.

Schleicher, A. 1876. *Compendium der vergleichenden grammatik der indogermanischen sprachen.*

Schmiel, R. 1972. Telemachus in Sparta. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 103.463-472.

Schmiel, R. 1987. Achilles in Hades. *Classical Philology* 82,1.35-37.

Schmitt, R. 1967. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit.* Wiesbaden: Harassowitz.

Scodel, R. 1982a. The Achaean wall and the myth of destruction. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 86.33-50.

Scodel, R. 1982b. The autobiography of Phoenix: *Iliad* 9.444-95. *The American Journal of Philology* 103,2.128-136.

Scodel, R. 1984. Epic doublets and Polynices' two burials. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 114. 49-58.

Scodel, R. 1989. The word of Achilles. *Classical Philology* 84,2.91-99.

Scodel, R. 1994a. The wits of Glaucus. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 122.73-84.

Scodel, R. 1994b. Odysseus and the stag. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 44,2.530-534.

Scodel, R. 1996. Δόμων ἄγαλμα: virgin sacrifice and aesthetic object. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 126.111-128.

Scodel, R. 1997. Pseudo intimacy and the prior knowledge of the Homeric audience. *Arethusa* 30,2.201-219.

Scodel, R. 1998a. Bardic performance and oral-tradition in Homer. *The American Journal of Philology* 119,2.171-194.

Scodel, R. 1998b. The removal of the arms, the recognition with Laertes, and narrative tension in the *Odyssey*. *Classical Philology* 93,1.1-17.

Scodel, R. 1998c. The captive's dilemma: sexual acquiescence in Euripides Hecuba and Troades. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 98.137-154.

Scodel, R. 2001. The suitors' games. *The American Journal of Philology* 122,3.307-327.

Scodel, R. 2002. *Listening to Homer. Tradition, narrative and audience*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Scodel, R. 2003. "Iliad" 9.372-73 and αὐτὸς ἀπούρας. *The Classical Journal* 98,3.275-279.

Scott, J. 1915. The ethos of dactylic and spondaic verses in Homer. *The Classical Journal* 10,7.326-30.

Scott, J. 1917. The close of the "Odyssey". *The Classical Journal* 12,6.397-405.

Scully, S. 1981. The bard as custodian of Homeric society: *Odyssey* 3,263-272. *Quaderni Urbinati della Cultura Classica* 37.67-83.

Scully, S. 1986. Studies of narrative and speech in the *Iliad*. *Arethusa* 19,2.135-153.

Scully, S. 1987. Doubling in the table of Odysseus. *The Classical World* 80,6.401-417.

Seaford, R. 1984. The last bath of Agamemnon. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 34,2.247-254.

Segal, S. 1968. Circean temptations: Homer, Vergil, Ovid. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 99.419-442.

Segal, C. 1981. Orality, repetition, and formulaic artistry in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter. Brillante-Cantilena-Pavese 1981.107-159. (followed by discussion)

Segal, C. 1983(1988). Kleos and its ironies in the *Odyssey*. Bloom 1988a. 127-150.

Segal, C. 1990. Violence and the other: Greek, female, and barbarian in Euripides' Hecuba. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 120.109-131.

Segal, C. 1992. Divine justice in the *Odyssey*: Poseidon, Cyclops and Helios. *The American Journal of Philology* 113,4.489-518.

Segal, C. 1994 (2007). Transition and ritual in Odysseus' return. Bloom 2007a. 5-22.

Setatos, M. 2007. Language and literature. Christidis 2007. 964-973.

Shipp, G. 1972. *Studies in the language of Homer*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shorey, P. 1922. The logic of the Homeric simile. *Classical Philology* 17,3.240-259.

Sinclair, T. 1966. *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Sjölund, R. 1938. *Metrische Kürzung im Griechischen*. Uppsala: Almqvist.

Skinner, M. 1991. *Nossis Thelyglossos*: the private text and the public book. Pomeroy 1991a.20-47.

Slater, P. 1968. *The glory of Hera. Greek mythology and the Greek family*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Slatkin, L. 1991. *The power of Thetis. Allusion and interpretation in the Iliad.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Slatkin, L. 1996. Composition by theme and the *metis* of the *Odyssey*. Schein 1996a.223-237.

Solmsen, F. 1954. The "gift" of speech in Homer and Hesiod. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 85.1-15.

Solmsen, F. 1965. Ilias Σ 535-560. *Hermes* 93,1.1-6.

Solmsen, F. 1982. Achilles on the Islands of the Blessed: Pindar vs Homer and Hesiod. *The American Journal of Philology* 103,1.19-24.

Solta, G. 1960. *Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen.* Vienna: Mechitharisten-Buchdruckerei.

Solta, G. 1990. Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen: ein Überblick. E. Ruprechtsberger. *Armenien: Frühzeit bis 1 Jahrtausend. Sprache, Kunst und Geschichte.* Linz. 7-18.

Stanford, W. 1958. *The Odyssey of Homer.* Books XIII-XXIV Edited with general and grammatcial introductions, commentary and indexes. London:MacMillan.

Stanford, W. 1959. *The Odyssey of Homer.* Books I-XII Edited with general and grammatcial introductions, commentary and indexes. London:MacMillan.

Stevens, P. 1986. Ajax in the Trugrede. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 36,2.327-336.

Stewart, D. 1976. *The disguised guest. Rank, role, and identity in the Odyssey.* London: Associated University Press.

Strauss-Clay, J. 1983. *The wrath of Athena.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Strauss-Clay, J. 1983 (1988). Odysseus: name and helmet. Bloom 1988a. .103-126.

Strauss-Clay, J 1992. Review Peradotto 1990. *Classical Philology* 87,2.161-164.

Strauss-Clay, J. 1997. The Homeric Hymns. Morris-Powell 1997. 489-507.

Thomas, C. 1988. Penelope's worth: looming large in early Greece. *Hermes* 116,3.257-264.

Thornton, A. 1970(1988). The homecoming of the Achaeans. Bloom 1988b.35-48.

Tidwell, P. 1997. Imagination, Conversation, and Trickster Discourse: Negotiating an Approach to Native American Literary Culture. *American Indian Quarterly* 21,4. 621-631.

Tracy, S. 1997(2007). The structures of the *Odyssey*. Bloom 2007a. 151-168.

Trahman, . 1952. Odysseus' lies. *Phoenix* .

Tsitsibakou-Vasalos, E. 1986. Two Homeric formulae in the P. Lille Poem: θεοὶ θέσαν and ἄναξ ἑκάεργος ʼΑπόλλων. *Glotta* 64.165-184.

Tsopanakis, A. 1966. Problems in the Greek Hexameter. Thessaloniki.

Tsopanakis, A. 1983. Homeric researches: from the prosodic irregularity to the construction of the verse. Thessaloniki.

Turner, F. 1997. The Homeric question. Morris-Powell 1997. 123-145.

Untermann J. 1987. *Einführung in die Sprache Homers. Der Tod des Patroklos Π 684-867*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Van Assendelft, M. - Derix, H. - Van Gessel, H. - Schaafsma, A. - Surber, J. 1993. *Duurzamer dan brons. Romeinse literatuur en cultuur voor de bovenbouw*. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff Educatief.

Van der Mije, S. 1987. Achilles' god-given strength. *Iliad* A 178 and gifts from the gods in Homer. *Mnemosyne* IV 40,3-4.241-267.

Van Leeuwen, J. 1892. *Enchiridion dictionis epicae*. Leiden: Sijthoff.

Van Nortwick, T. 1980. "Apollonos Apate": associative imagery in the Homeric "Hymn to Hermes" 227-292. *The Classical World* 74,1.1-5.

Van Nortwick, T. 1983. Penelope as a double agent: "Odyssey" 21.1-60. *The Classical World* 77,1.24-25.

Van Raalte, M. 1988. Greek elegiac verse rhythm. *Glotta* 86.145-178.

Vecsey, C. 1981. The Exception Who Proves the Rules: Ananse the Akan Trickster. *Journal of Religion in Africa* 12,3. 161-177.

Velie, A. 1984. Indians in Indian Fiction: The Shadow of the Trickster. *American Indian Quarterly* 8,4. 315-329.

Verdenius, W. 1944. ΑΙΔΩΣ bei Homer. *Mnemosyne* III 12,1.47-60.

Verdenius, W. 1956. *Odyssey* 2,103-4. *Mnemosyne* IV 9,1.49.

Verdenius, W. 1958.*Odyssey* XIV 338. *Mnemosyne* IV 11,1.24.

Verdenius, W. 1969. Nostos. *Mnemosyne* IV 22,2.195.

Verdenius, W. 1975. *Odyssey* 10,398. *Mnemosyne* IV 28,4.418.

Verdenius, W. 1983. The principles of Greek literary criticism. *Mnemosyne* IV 36,1-2.14-59.

Vernant, J.-P. 1982(1996). The refusal of Odysseus. Schein 1996a.185-190.

Vest, J. 2000. From Bobtail to Brer Rabbit: Native American Influences on Uncle Remus. *American Indian Quarterly* 24,1. 19-43.

Vidal-Naquet, P. 1970(1996). Land and sacrifice. Schein 1996a.33-53.

Vielle, C. 1996. *Le mytho-cycle héroïque dans l'aire indo-européenne. Correspondances et transformations helléno-aryennes.* Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut orientaliste UCL.

Vivante, P. 1970. *The Homeric imagination: a study of Homer's poetic perception of reality*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.

Vivante, P. 1982. *The epithets in Homer. A study in poetic values*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Vizenor, G. 1990. Trickster Discourse. *American Indian Quarterly* 14,3. 277-287.

Von Doederlein, L. 1850. *Homerisches Glossarium*. 3 volumes.

Von Hartel, W. 1874. *Homerische Studien*. 3 volumes. Vienna: K. Gerald's Sohn.

Von Stehle, M. - Zimmermann, H. 1958. *Griechische Wortkunde*. Stuttgart: Klett.

Von Thiersch, F. 1826-1828. *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialektes*. Leipzig: Fleischer.

Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. 1921. *Griechische Verskunst*. Darmstadt: wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Wace, A. 1948. Weaving or embroidery? *American Journal of Archaeology* 52,1.51-55.

Walcot, P. 1984. Greek attitudes towards women: the mythological evidence. *Greece & Rome* 31,1.37-47.

Walde, A. - Pokorny, J. 1959. *Etymologisches indogermanisches Wörterbuch*. Bern.

Wallace, R. 2004. Sabellian languages. Woodard, R. 2004. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the world's ancient languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 96-123.

Wathelet, P. 1973. Études de linguistique homérique. *Antiquité Classique* 42. 380-405.

Wathelet, P. 1981. La langue homérique et le rayonnement littéraire de l'Eubée. *Antiquité Classique* 50.819-833.

Watkins, C. 1975a. Observations on the "Nestor's Cup" inscription. *Indo-European Studies* II, edited by Calvert Watkins. Cambridge: Harvard Department of Linguistics.401-432.

Watkins, C. 1975b. Syntax and metrics in the Dipylon Vase inscription. *Indo-European Studies* II, edited by Calvert Watkins. Cambridge: Harvard Department of Linguistics.433-453.

Watkins, C. 1977. À propos de MHNIΣ. *Bulletin de la Société linguistique de Paris* 72.187-209.

Watkins, C. 1981. Aspects of Indo-European poetics. *Indo-European Studies IV*, edited by Calvert Watkins. Cambridge: Harvard Department of Linguistics. 764-799.

Watkins, C. 1985a. *Studies in memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985)*. Edited by Calvert Watkins.

Watkins, C. 1985b. How to kill a dragon in Indo-European. Watkins 1985a.270-299.

Webster, T. 1956. Early and late in Homeric diction. *Eranos* 54.34-48.

Weiss, M. ftc. *Historical Grammar of Latin*.

West, M. 1966. *Hesiod. Theogony*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

West, M. 1973. Indo-European metre. *Glotta* 51. 161-187.

West, M. 1981. Is the "Works and Days" an oral poem? Brillante-Cantilena-Pavese 1981.53-66. (followed by discussion)

West, M. 1987. Introduction to Greek metre.

West, M. 1988. The Rise of the Greek Epic. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108.151-172.

West, M. 1997. Homer's meter. Morris-Powell 1997. 218-237.

West, S. 1988a. The transmission of the text. Heubeck-West-Hainsworth 1988.33-48

West, S. 1988b. Books i-iv. Heubeck-West-Hainsworth 1988.50-245.

Whallon, W. 2000. How the shroud for Laertes became the robe of Odysseus. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 50,2.331-337.

Whitman, C. 1970. Hera's anvils. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 74.37-42.

Whitman, C. - Scodel, R. 1981. Sequence and simultaneity in *Iliad* N, ξ, and O. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 85,1-15.

Willcock, M. 1964. Mythological paradeigma in the *Iliad*. *The Classical Quarterly* NS 14,2.141-154.

Willcock, M. 1977. Ad hoc invention in the *Iliad*. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 81.41-53.

Willcock, M. 1997. Neoanalysis. Morris-Powell 1997. 174-189.

Willett, S. 1998. Review Fagles, R. - Knox, B. *Homer: The Odyssey*. *The Classical Journal* 93,2.203-206.

Willi, A. 2008. Demeter, Gê and the Indo-European word(s) for "Earth". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 120.169-194.

Winter, W. 1950. *Studien zum "prothetischen Vokal" im Griechischen*. Hamburg: Heitmann & Co.

Witte, K. 1907. *Singular und Plural. Forschungen über Form und Geschichte der griechischen Poesie*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Wyatt, W. 1966. Short accusative plurals in Greek. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 97.617-643.

Wyatt, W. 1969. *Metrical lengthening in Homer*. Roma: Edizione dell'Ateneo.

Wyatt, W. 1971. *Iliad* XXI:342-360. *Živa Antika* 21.55-64.

Wyatt, W. 1975. Homer's linguistic ancestors. *Epistimoniki epetiridatis filosofikis scholis tou Thessalonikis* 14. 133-147.

Wyatt, W. 1982. Homeric *ate*. *The American Journal of Philology* 103,3.247-276.

Wyatt, W. 1992. Homer's linguistic forebears. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 112.167-173.

Wyatt, W. 1995. Homeric loss of /w/ and vowels in contact. *Glotta* 72.119-150.

Wyatt, W. 2002. Agamemnon's deception. *Syllecta Classica* 13. 1-18.

Young, A. 1951. Of the nightingale's song. *The Classical Journal* 46,4.181-184.

Zoëga, G. 1926. *A concise dictionary of Old Icelandic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Appendix A. The etymology of δόλος.

Determining the etymology of a word is always a conjecture. Unless a word is attested in all cognate languages there can never be absolute certainty that the parent language possessed the specific word. In addition, there is the possibility of borrowing, contact, or genetic relationship between the different daughter languages. Nevertheless, I would concur with Mallory-Adams that a word can only safely be considered of PIE origin, if it has cognates in Hittite and one other language, or if it has cognates in a Western and an Eastern (not adjacent) language, and if the languages are not just Greek and Sanskrit.[296]

The etymology of δόλος poses several problems. There are several words in the different Indo-European languages that are (tentatively) explained by one up to four roots *del.[297] Examples include Greek δόλος "trick", δαιδάλλω "mould, work (intensively)",[298] Latin dēlēre "destroy", Sanskrit dalayati "split, divide", Old Norse tal "language", Old Norse tál "deceit", German Zahl "number", Old Irish delb "figure", and Latin dolāre "hew into a form".[299]

These words are based on different vocalisms and nominal or verbal formations, and usually they are not considered to belong to one root. Scholars have looked at these different words and tried to distinguish between them. Some words have been considered borrowings rather than indications of genetic relationship. Examples of this assumption are δαιδάλλω[300] and dolus (cf. infra). The agreements between the Germanic words and the

---

296 Mallory-Adams 2006:107-111
297 Walde-Pokorny 1959:808-814
298 Leumann 1950:133
299 Leumann 1950:133
300 Gamkrelidze-Ivanov 1995:800 who see Greek δαιδάλλω as proof for the Greek migration to Greece from the East and assume contacts with Kartvelian.

Greek have been either denied, or explained as the result of secondary evolutions within the Germanic family.[301]

Two attempts have been made to link (several of) the words that have been quoted above. Walde-Pokorny[302] linked Greek δόλος to *del₁ "es worauf abgesehen haben, auch feindlich: listig schäden, auch ziele, berechnen". The suggested meaning for the root *del₁ is broad, and included on the one hand the meaning of "deceit" and on the other hand the meaning of "relate, tell, count". This explained the different meanings of Old Norse tal "language" and tál "deceit".[303] The second attempt was made by Sacks. He argued that the original meaning of the root *del was "something made by a skilful person". He subsequently argued that from "skilful" the meaning became "skilful and cunning", and that the different meanings were divided on the root vocalism.[304] In Greek and Germanic the root survived in two vocalisms: the o and the e grade. Δόλος and tál "deceit" were built on the o grade and received the meaning with a negative connotation, whereas words such as δέλτον "writing tablet" and tjáld "tent" were built on the e grade and did not receive that undertone. His argumentation would allow us to link different words such as Old Irish delb, Latin dolare and Sanskrit dálati and would avoid positing different roots *del.[305]

---

301 One can refer to Boisacq 1937:195 and Buck 1949:1181. De Vries 1962:580-581 accepts the link with tál but is doubtful about tal.
302 Although the value of Walde-Pokorny's etymological dictionary can hardly be overstated, it still has some shortcomings. Most importanty, it did not take into account the possibility of subdialectal divisions and contacts between certain groups outside the entire family. Walde-Pokorny assumed that any root attested in at least two languages could be transferred back into the mother language. Their dictionary is nevertheless a very important source for many roots. Current attempts to replace it are under way in Leiden (www.indo-european.nl). One of the main differences between WP and current Indo-European linguistics is obviously the treatment of laryngeals. WP did not accept the laryngeal theory as it is now generally done. In spite of the shortcomings, I am not convinced that their Etymologisches Indogermanisches Wörterbuch will be soon replaced.
303 For those words see Zoëga 1910:432-433; Gordon 1957:389 (this book does not mention of tál); Faulkes-Barnes 2007c:239-240; Cleasby-Vígfusson-Craigie 1957:624-626
304 Sacks 1975:472
305 Sacks 1975:476-477

These two attempts did not take into account the similar semantic evolution that the Greek and Germanic words shared. The German and Greek cognates both evolved from a concrete meaning into a more abstract version, and both had the notion of language in it as well. The Germanic words started from the meaning "number" (as can be seen in German *Zahl* and Dutch *getal*), then evolved into "relating" (as can be seen in German *erzählen*, Dutch *vertellen*) and "language" (as can be seen in Dutch *taal* and Old Norse *tal*) and finally into "deceit" (as can be seen in Old Norse *tál*). As such, we have a clear evolution from concrete into abstract. Greek shows a similar semantic evolution. The initial meaning of δόλος was concrete, as can be seen in the meaning "bait". Then gradually δόλος also became more abstract. The best illustration are the examples from Hephaistos' ruse, where the word means both "net" and "trap". Then δόλος was more used for abstract contexts, where it meant "guile". It is remarkable that δόλος was used in the *Iliad* in the context of an old mythical story of Bellerophon, with Mycenaean roots,[306] but that it referred nevertheless to the use of writing and language. A similar use of δόλος is seen in Odysseus' use of to outsmart the Kyklops. The word μῆτις is the δόλος. The oldest Greek texts therefore indicate a link between the concrete, abstract and linguistic usage of the word δόλος. This semantic evolution, and especially the relation to the use of language, is proved by another Graeco-Germanic isogloss: the combination of the verb "to weave" with the word "words".[307] Old English has *wordcræft wæb* "I weave poetry,[308] and Greek has μύθους καὶ μήδεα πᾶσιν ὕφαινον "when he wove words and plans to all".[309] Greek

---

306 Nilsson 1932(1972):120
307 Schmitt 1967:300
308 Cynewulf. This example is mentioned in Schmitt 1967:300.
309 *Iliad* 3,212

ὑφαίνω "weave" and English *web* and *weave* are related and come from the root *(H)ubʰ* "weave".[310] A third common element is the link between "deceit" and "fishing". As we stated before, in Old Icelandic mythology, Loki, the prototypical god of trickery, was credited with the invention of the net to catch fish. As such, it seems that Greek and Germanic share the conceptual enlargement of the root *dol*.

Latin *dolus* and Oscan *dolud, dolom* are also often connected with the Greek and Germanic words.[311] There is less agreement on the issue if the Italic words are related or borrowed. The Oscan word is probably a borrowing from Latin, as it mostly appeared in legal phraseology based on Latin examples, such as *perum dolum malum* "without any bad guile" which is calqued on *sine malo dolo*.[312] When Rome's influence became more outspoken in Italy, so did the influence of its language on the other languages of the Italic peninsula.[313] Several scholars suspected that the Italic words might have been borrowings, because Latin and also Oscan borrowed many words from Greek, especially in the field of culture and religion.[314]

Two elements make it difficult to determine whether the word *dolos* can be traced back to common PIE. The first one reason is that the word had only cognates in a Western language and in Greek (which has a central position[315] between the *Westindogermania* and

310For the root in the form of *h₂ubʰ* see Peters 1980:124, for the form *h₁ubʰ* see Lubotsky ftc.
311Boisacq 1937:195
312 Many of the examples can be found in the *Tabula Bantina* (dates from II³); see Buck 1904:231-235, especially 235.
313Wallace 2004:122
314 Ernout-Meillet 1956:182; Chantraine 1933:10 and 1968:292; Nordheider 1984:329; Wallace 2004:121 for the Sabellian borrowings of Greek.
315 Greek is often considered to be Western Indo European, but the facts seem to indicate that Greek belonged more to the East than to the West, because of the many isoglosses Greek shared with several Eastern languages such as Indo-Iranian (Dehò, Meid and Euler), Tocharian (Hackstein, Adams), Phrygian (Haas, Brixhe, Lubotsky), Albanian (Schleicher, Matzinger, Holst) and Armenian (Solta, Hamp, De Lamberterie, Ringe *et alii*), and also with several of these languages together (the so-called Balkan-Indo-European theory, as can be found in Klingenschmitt, Hajnal, Sowa, Matzinger, Ritter-Sowa). The relatively meagre number of isoglosses between Greek and Latin seems to confirm this. For the few, if any, contacts between Greek and

Ostindogermania)[316] and it is therefore not certain that the Eastern languages knew this word as well.[317] This problem remains even if we assume that the Italic words were original instead of borrowings. The second complicating factor is that the exact position of Germanic within the *Indogermania* is debated.[318] Consequently, it is very difficult to make any certain assumptions about the origin of this specific word.

Latin see Scherer 1954:206; Pisani 1976:121; Ringe 1988-1990:78 who even states that there was no contact.
316 The terms have been coined by Meid 1975.
317 Mallory-Adams 2006:106-113, especially 109.
318 Determining the relationships of the Germanic family within the *Indogermania* is no sinecure. Many different suggesions have been made. Kortlandt and the Leiden School, and Gamkrelidze-Ivanov 1995 link it with Balto-Slavic. Ringe (in an email on May 28th 2009) linked it with no other language family, and told me that that was the *communis opinio* nowadays. He wrote *no*one* outside of Leiden except Eugen Hill believes the Leiden alternative, so far as I can see, for the simple reason that it doesn't fit the Germanic facts well*. Adams (in an email on May 27th 2009) considered the relationships between Germanic and Tocharian to be the most outspoken. See also Adams 1984 and 1994. Polomé tried throughout his entire career to analyse and enumerate the isoglosses that Germanic had with other languages, more specifically with Balto-Slavic, but also with Celtic, Italic and even Indo-Iranian (he used the links between Germanic and Indo-Iranian in his attempt to destroy the "Graeco-Aryan" hypothesis"). Murray and Vennemann assume that Germanic and Hittite were closest to PIE, and assumed that the earliest PIE was much more analytical as might be assumed on the basis of Latin, Greek and Sanskrit.

Appendix B. Is there a *Trickster motif* in the Homeric poems?

1. The trickster in general mythology.

The following traits have been ascribed to a trickster: he is a cunning,[319] often mischievous[320] but also semi-comic[321] individual who operates independently of all social order[322] and uses his capacities to outsmart other people, either in order to obtain personal gain or for the sake of outwitting others. He often does not restrain himself and is reckless,[323] gluttonous[324] and sexually promiscuous.[325] Sometimes he is a weak character who has to confront stronger opponents, and acts as an underdog. Some scholars state that he was initially a ritual figure.[326] He is sometimes linked to a culture hero, and, as such, a benefactor for humanity.[327] In other stories, however, he is held responsible for the presence of evil on earth.[328] The ethical aspects of this creature are therefore not always clear.[329] As such, we seem to have four different trickster creatures: buffoon, culture hero, underdog and evil creature. His comic and underdog behaviour creates an attraction to everybody. His actions, and this includes his bad traits, are related to real life and are often recognisable.[330]

---

319 Koepping 1985:194
320 Ramsey 1978:114
321 Miller in Mallory-Adams 1997:601
322 Koepping 1985:194; Basso 1988:292 and 303
323 La Pin 1980:338
324 Ballinger 1989:25
325 La Pin 1980:335-338 for the African aspects (the Yoruba trickster has three penises); Blowsnake 1959:35-37, Ballinger 1989:26 for the Native examples.
326 Raglan 1957:941
327 Carroll 1981:306
328 Paulme 1975:597
329 Paulme 1975:570 (for the African trickster) *son emploi n'appelle pas de jugement moral*; Harris-Platzner 2004:106-108
330 Radin 1959b:154 *was ihm geschieht, geschieht auch uns.*

We will now try to determine if some of those general assumptions can be illustrated by the mythologies where a trickster can be observed with certainty, namely in Native[331] and African mythology.[332] Both mythological *corpora* agree on the comical aspects of the creature and its link to animal appearances.[333] In Native myths the link was made between the trickster character and the animal appearances Raven, Coyote and Hare,[334] in spite of Lévi-Strauss' objections that the trickster was restricted to the Coyote and the Raven.[335] In African mythology tortoises, spiders, jackals and monkeys appeared.[336]

The different mythical stories point, however, also to different aspects of the trickster. It is not certain that one trickster can be assumed for all African myths.[337] Neither is there a set of standard versions of the stories, because they are never finished and can always be expanded.[338] Some stories have a didactic function because they indicate that bad behaviour is punished or show what should not be done,[339] but there are also examples where gratuitous violence is used,[340] or where the trickster is responsible for introducing evil into the world.[341] As such, the African trickster cannot be considered a culture hero.

---

331 In order to avoid ambiguity I use Indic and Indian as adjective of India, and Native for the oboriginal peoples in North America.

332 I am aware of the fact that treating the Native myths as one and treating the African myths as another whole is an oversimplification.

333 Radin 1959a:8 *Gelächter, Humor und Ironie durchpulsen alles, was der Schelm tut.*; Blowsnake 1959; Paulme 1975:569 for the African myths.

334 Radin 1959b:107-115. I was not able to read any other work of Radin except the German translation of part of his "Trickster" book. See also later scholars such as Carrol 1981 and also 1982:193 (in reaction to a remark of Lévi-Strauss 1982 on the same page) and Vest 2000:32-33.

335 Lévi-Strauss argued this in 1964, but I did not read that book. He reiterated his opinion in 1982:193.

336 An overview of different trickster stories and motifs can be found in Paulme 1975. For the animal appearances see also Vecsey 1981:162.

337 Paulme 1975:596: *Mais parler pour l'Afrique d'un Décepteur et d'un seul, quel que soit l'acteur - Lièvre, Araignée, Tortue - auquel la société assigne ce role, est insuffisant.*

338 Paulme 1975:596: *Un conte du Décepteur n'est jamais fini, le conteur peut toujours enchaîner, imaginer une péripétie nouvelle selon le principe simple qui fait alterner amélioration et détérioration.*

339 Paulme 1975:575; La Pin 1980:338; Vecsey 1981:161

340 Paulme 1975:571-572

341 Paulme 1975:597

Besides his evil traits, the negative actions of the trickster sometimes confirm the societal

norms.[342] The "trickster forms" that can be found in African myths are therefore underdog,

evil creature and buffoon.

An important difference between Native and African trickster is the very old nature

of the Native trickster, as he is considered to have lived a long time ago, whereas the

African one is considered to be a living character among the tribal population.[343] The focus

is not always on humour alone, because the trickster also functions as a culture hero.[344] As

such, the trickster character is considered in Native mythology to be a merger of both a

buffoon and a culture hero.[345] There are also examples of an evil trickster in Native

myths.[346] The trickster figure in Native myths incorporates the roles of a buffoon, evil

character and culture hero.

It is interesting to note that the trickster figures of the African and Native cultures

merged into a new trickster, Brer Rabbit. This character originated in the stories brought to

the US by African slaves and in America the character obtained features from the Native

myths.[347] Brer Rabbit showed that a small but clever creature could outwit more powerful

opponents and, as such, the stories were very popular among the enslaved population. The

stories of this character were popularised by Joel Chandler Harris, a journalist who

---

342 Vecsey 1981:171-174
343 Radin 1959b:108-109 for the Native trickster; Paulme 1975:597 for the African one.
344 Radin 1959b:107-108
345 Carroll 1981:306
346 Hill-Hill 1945:330-334; see also the story of the Winnebago trickster (quoted in Blowsnake 1959) who was given the care of several children. The children were allowed to eat only once a day, otherwise they would die. When the trickster was hungry, he decided to eat more than once anyway. As a result, the children died. This could be seen as an indication that the trickster was not concerned with anybody's well being other than his own. See also Kerényi 1959b:159.
347 *Encyclopaedia Brittannica* on "Brer Rabbit". There is no agreement as to the exact relationships of the Native and African traits. Generally it is assumed that Brer Rabbit originated in the African aspects, but Vest 2000 has tried to prove a Native origin. Savoy 1985 linked it also to the cartoon Bugs Bunny, and the language of the stories has been analysed by Pederson 1985. A rehabiliation of the figure of Harris can be found in Cochran 2004.

collected the stories from slaves from the plantations, and called them "Tales of Uncle Remus".[348] The underdog aspect is a very important aspect in this story, and this contributed to the popularity of this specific trickster character.

2. The trickster in Indo-European mythology.

We now turn to the Indo-European stories. Whereas the Indo-European language family is the best known or, at least studied most extensively of all language families, its mythology and religion are much less studied. A scholar who is interested in Indo-European mythology and in the trickster more in particular, is faced with very few sources. For the comparison between the languages all texts can be used, but for the reconstruction of a common mythology only those cultures and peoples that had a mythology are useful. In addition, many Indo-European peoples only have sources from after the rise of Christianity, and therefore their stories could be influenced or cleansed by Christian influences. The stories that are attested in cultures from pre-Christian times are unfortunately not free of problems either.

There are three questions that need to be answered. The first one is which cultures provide substantial evidence for a mythological reconstruction, the second one is which cultures are needed to posit an Indo-European origin and the third one is if a trickster character can be reconstructed for the Proto-Indo-European culture. The first two ones are not restricted to the mythological reconstruction, but they are even more problematic for the research into the myths than they are for the language reconstruction.

---

348 Ferguson-Young 1995:492;Cochran 2004; *Encyclopaedia Brittannica* on "Brer Rabbit". I owe the reference to Brer Rabbit to Professor Janis Svilpis.

Generally, it is assumed that Greek and Sanskrit are sufficient for any Indo-European reconstruction, because of their old and extensive material. This assumption is debatable for the linguistic reconstruction, especially in light of the Hittite evidence which is older than both languages but less abundant. For mythology the situation is even more problematic because there is much less available material. Greek and Sanskrit are the only two cultures with a relatively well known religion and pantheon. As such, they provide, together with the much less extensively attested Italic and Hittite, the only pre-christian material. Müller assumed that originally the Greeks and Indo-Iranian peoples had the same myths, but that the Greeks forgot them and invented new ones.[349] Baldick assumes that the Indo-Iranian epic was the source for the Greek one, and that many of the stories of the Greek gods were based on oriental influence.[350] Oriental influences cannot be denied for Hesiod,[351] but it is more difficult to prove them for Homer. The main problem with Baldick's book is that it starts from the presumption that Indic mythology was the basis of everything, but we cannot be entirely sure that every aspect of Indic mythology is necessarily Indo-European.[352]

This brings us to the second problem (related to the first one), namely which peoples' myths are sufficient and convincing enough to be posited back to PIE. Puhvel argued that only Indo-Iranian, Italic and Germanic could be considered reliable, because Greek, Anatolian and Indo-Iranian showed Eastern influences. The stories form those three

---

349 He is quoted in Baldick 1994:18. For a reassessment of his opinions on the origin of myths, see Heirbaut 2006.
350 Baldick 1994:56,75 (with reference to W. Burkert *The Orientalising Revolution*-non vidi). Also important is Burkert 1981.
351 West 1966:20-31, see 106-107 for a bibliography of the scholarship until 1966 on Oriental influences in Hesiod; Kirk 1974:45-49, 117; Frazer 1983:8-9. One can also refer to M.West, *The East Face of the Helicon* (non vidi).
352 Kirk 1974:255 *Semitic tribes absorbed concepts from Indo-Iranian ones and vice versa.*

cultures therefore needed to be used with caution if their versions could not not confirmed by other myths.[353] As such, he posited his *triangulated Indo-European reconstruction*.[354] Although I do not really see any faults in his arguments except maybe his reliance on Indo-Iranian for Indo-European in spite of his own warning that there are non-Indo-European elements in it, the statement is still remarkable because generally in Indo-European linguistic reconstructions, the presence of a feature in an Anatolian language and another language is enough to accept the PIE nature of it.[355]

This brings us to the third problem of this chapter: because of the meagre evidence, there is no certainty that a trickster character can even be reconstructed for the PIE period. Several different pantheons seem to have stories and even gods who act in this way but it is unclear if these creatures have only trickster or also messianic functions.[356] Unfortunately no substantial research has been done into the Indo-European nature of the trickster.[357] We now give an overview of the different suggestions that have been made for Indo-European tricksters.

De Vries argued that Loki was the creature in all Indo-European myths who came the closest to the Native trickster figures.[358] Kirk agreed but argued that Prometheus was a close second.[359] Dumézil thought that there were only two cultures with a character that could be considered a trickster, although he did not use that term. For the Nordic mythology, he considered Loki to be a clear example of an evil character, because he

---

353 Puhvel 1987:22, 31
354 Puhvel 1987:191
355 Mallory-Adams 2006:107-111
356 Koepping 1985:202
357 Koepping 1985:201; Miller in Mallory-Adams 1997:601; in a personal communication Professor Michael Janda informed me that he was not sure whether or not a *Trickster Gestalt* could be found in PIE society, but he added that he had not yet looked for it either.
358 De Vries 1933:254-257.
359 Kirk 1970:207

willingly inflicted pain, had no moral standing, caused problems by his actions, and belonged only partially to the world of the gods.[360] The other creature fitting Dumézil's description[361] was Syrdon from the Nartic mythology.[362] These two creatures were characterised by their superior intelligence, lower birth, *la pensée lente* combined with a lack of considering the consequences and indications of bisexuality.[363] Dumézil thought that it could not be determined whether or not this pointed at an Indo-European origin for the trickster. He assumed that it was not likely, in spite of the fact that the myths provided an attestation in both Indo-Iranian and Germanic.[364] Dumézil specifically ruled out a link with Hephaistos, Hermes, Prometheus and Typhon, and even any other character in any other mythological story.[365] Puhvel, who followed the work of his master closely, nevertheless linked Loki with Prometheus and thought that Syrdon and Loki proved that the myth was of Indo-European origin, because the Narts belonged to the Indo-Iranians and the Old Icelandic myth belonged to the Germanic family.[366] In addition, he listed other Germano-Indo-Iranian correspondences.[367] He did, however, not speak about the concept "trickster", just as Dumézil had not done that.

The next category is made up of the characters who possibly displayed trickster-like traits, but were not necessarily tricksters. The Indic heroes Indra (*Ṛg Veda*) and

360 Dumézil 1948:164-168
361 As I do not speak or read any Indo-Iranian language, I had to rely on Dumézil's translations. I will mostly leave Syrdon out of the discussion because I have not been able to read the texts in the original language myself, in contrast to the Icelandic texts, which I read under the guidance of Professor MacGillivray. Unfortunately, I had to rely on translations as well for the Sanskrit and Celtic texts.
362 The Narts were an Indo-Iranian people living in Ossetia and were called the "European Iranians", see Dumézil 1948:184.
363 The bisexuality was remarked upon by De Vries 1933:215-233, who was also quoted in Dumézil 1948:268; for the description of their *modus operandi* see Dumézil 1948:242-243.
364 Dumézil 1948:247-248
365 Dumézil 1948:257-258
366 Puhvel 1987:88-89,114. One can also refer to his chapter on Germanic myths and Epic Iran.
367 One can also refer to the work of Polomé who used Germano-Indo-Iranian isoglosses to argue against a "Graeco-Aryan" unity. See Polomé 1989 with reference to his earlier works.

Duryodhana (*Mahābhārata*) acted in a way that cannot be called heroic and fair,[368] but that unheroic behaviour is often considered to be "sins of the hero", and these sins have not necessarily been ascribed to trickster-like behaviour. Duryodhana did not have the same lineage as the other heroes.[369] He was described as an evil soul and he sewed dissension through stratagems.[370] One of his outrageous actions was his attempt to drown and poison Bhīma.[371] On the other hand, he had an important function, was often tricked himself and sometimes felt remorse for what he has done.[372] As such, he seems less trickster-like. Indra is even explicitly said to have defeated tricksters.[373]

The next category involves buffoon characters. In Irish mythology we find the character Bricriu in Old Irish stories and many other buffoon like creatures in Middle Irish stories. They engage in trickster behaviour (ridicule, deceit and injuring themselves and others),[374] and also display a societal-critical function, by challenging authorities and the church. This links them at the same time with the Medieval buffoons and Goliardic poetry,[375] and tales such as the Ysengrimus, who could actually be a very good illustration of the trickster and also has a very outspoken societal-critical function.[376] Harrison explicitly relates Bricriu with Loki, but also points out that Bricriu brings stability in the

---

368 For Duryodhana's tricks see (among others) McGrath 2004:112; for Indra see (also among others) Puhvel 1987:76 and 250
369 McGrath 2004:114
370 McGrath 2004:116-118
371 Puhvel 1987:77; *Mahābhārata* book 1.
372 McGrath 2004:116-132
373 Puhvel 1978:51; *Ŗg Veda* 1
374 Harrison 1989:22-24, 71
375 Harrison 1989:71-85
376 This is of course not an Irish myth. The story is also known under the name *Van den Vos Reinaerde* (the tale of Reinhard the fox), and is situated in the area around the Flemish city of Sint-Niklaas. Surprisingly enough. it is not known among many North American scholars that the story is of Flemish origin, as can be seen in Ferguson-Young 1995:493.

end and confirms the societal norms.[377] This is something that Loki, Hermes and Autolykos did not do, but which can be seen in several African myths (as we stated before).

Puhvel linked Indra with Herakles,[378] and Loki with the Greek Prometheus, the Irish Bricriu and the Indic Duryodhana.[379] I am not arguing that they are tricksters, but that they show trickster traits, just as Odysseus did. If these links are accepted, an Indo-European *Trickster Gestalt* could be tentatively posited based on the common traits of all the mentioned characters. I would state that Loki could be an almost perfect illustration of it, but the issue deserves much more research. I have to point out that this conclusion is based on Dumézil and Puhvel, but that they did not state the idea of a trickster themselves. We will now determine how the Greek evidence fits into this discussion.

3. The Greek trickster.

In Greek mythology the trickster is described as anthropomorphic[380] and usually male. His actions either benefit mankind or cause complete chaos and lead to punishment for humanity.[381] Prometheus, Hermes,[382] Autolykos,[383] Odysseus and maybe Hephaistos could be seen as personifications of the Greek trickster.[384] As can be seen from the characters, both gods and mortals can act as tricksters. According to Harris-Platzner, Greek gods seldom led humans into traps but rather warned them not to overstep their boundaries.[385] This is a remarkable statement, because there are stories in which gods trick humans into

---

377 Harrison 1989:23-25
378 Puhvel 1987:250
379 Puhvel 1987:215-217
380 Kirk 1974:50
381 Harris-Platzner 2004:106
382 Strauss-Clay 1983(1988):113
383 Kirk 1974:50
384 Kirk 1974:50 who did not mention Hephaistos; Koepping 1985:206-207
385 Harris-Platzner 2004:108

destruction. Semele was "advised" by Hera to ask her secret lover to reveal himself. Hera sent a fury to Herakles, and as a consequence, he slaughtered his entire family. The deceitful dream that Zeus sent to Agamemnon is another revealing example of how gods could induce mortals into erring. The Greeks even had a goddess whom they held responsible for the blinding of gods and mortals, Ate. I will now briefly discuss the characters and their trickster aspects.

Prometheus is generally accepted as the best illustration of the Greek trickster, although Kirk thought that he was more than just a trickster.[386] His actions often do not benefit his own person, but mankind in general, although the descriptions differ slightly according to the ancient writer, as one can see in the different versions of Hesiod and Aiskhylos. He was not only an opponent of Zeus, but also helped him maintain his reign.[387] His most famous actions were the misleading sacrifice and the theft of fire.[388] Consequently, he was severely punished by having his liver eaten out for eternity, until Herakles freed him.[389] Prometheus seemed[390] unusually benevolent towards humans, because he pleaded with Zeus not to exterminate them after his theft of the fire,[391] and as a consequence they suffered because of his deeds.[392] His benivolence towards mankind and his beneficial actions indicate that Prometheus acted as a culture hero-trickster and not as an evil minded trickster.

---

386 Kirk 1974:104
387 Aiskhylos, *Prometheus Desmotes*, 219-221; see for the analysis and quote Gantz 1996:158-159
388 Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 42-105; Sinclair 1966:7
389 Hesiod, *Theogony*, 526-534, although the exact nature of the liberation is debated because in line 616 he was still bound, see Sinclair 1966; Rowe 1978:78; Frazer 1983:63-64
390 For the uncertainty of the Hesiodic Prometheus see Rowe 1978:83
391 Gantz 1996:159 with reference to Aiskhylos, *Prometheus Desmotes*, 232-236.
392 Rowe 1978:83

The next possible trickster is Hermes. He is described as the *patron saint of burglars and sheep-stealers*.[393] Famous is his raid on Apollon's cattle,[394] where he made the cattle run backwards to make it look as if they went the other way,[395] and the accusation of theft by Apollon. Hermes was very resourceful, clever and deceitful.[396] In addition, he was not concerned about shame, pride and dignity, and did not hesitate to perjure himself if that led to more gain.[397] Words that are used to describe him are "crafty", "ingenious", "deceiving". All these elements confirm to a large extent his trickster-nature, because his own interests are the only thing that matters, he is somewhat an outsider and he has no real shame. As such, the link between Loki and Hermes could be defended.[398]

Hephaistos is another possible trickster character. He has a good nature, as could be seen by his reluctance to nail Prometheus to the rock as punishment.[399] In addition, his lame physical condition made him the laughing stock of the other gods (also in Homer).[400] He dispalyed his trickster traits by the "revenge" on his mother. Initially Hera refused to recognise him as her child. Only when Hephaistos became a skilled craftsman, she decided to accept him.[401] He therefore wanted revenge. When he came to Olympos, he had a surprise in mind for his mother. He offered her a throne which was actually a trap. She sat down in it and could no longer move. He made her swear an oath that she would reveal his true lineage.[402] In other versions, Hephaistos wanted to have a reward for untying his

---

393 Rowe 1987:114
394 For his outsmarting of Apollon see Van Nortwick 1980.
395 Slatkin 1996:236
396 Otto 1954:104-108; Kerényi 1959b:169-170
397 Otto 1954:108-109; see especially his perjury in *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes*.
398 Mallory-Adams 1997:601-602
399 Puhvel 1989:133. His reluctance is described in the *prologos* of Aiskhylos' *Prometheus Desmotes*. See also Gantz 1996:77-78. Harris-Platzner 2004:117
400 *Iliad* 1,599-600
401 Slater 1968:198; Gantz 1996:76-77
402 Slater 1968:199-200; Gantz 1996:74-76, with reference to the ancient sources Alkaios and Pindar.

mother. According to some sources, he wanted Aphrodite, and others mention that he wanted Athena. Athena did not relish the thought of being Hephaistos' wife and fled. Hephaistos pursued her and out of their *coitus interruptus* Erikhthonios was born.[403] As discussed above, Aphrodite was not very amused about the marriage either, and had children by many handsome mortals and gods, but not with Hephaistos. If Hephaistos bound Hera to be accepted as a god, he was acting out of self preservation, and that would agree with the underdog aspect of the trickster; if he wanted a beautiful goddess, then he would be a self-serving trickster.

Probably the closest in character to Loki and the best illustration of an evil trickster is Autolykos. He was Odysseus' maternal grandfather and was renowned for his bad tricks, perjury and theft: *whatever Autolycus touched, passed from sight*.[404] He stole cattle from his neighbours (an Indo-European theme) and hid them. Autolykos was credited with giving Odysseus his name because everybody hated him.[405]

As such, we have the following trickster characters: Hephaistos was the underdog, Hermes and Autolykos could be considered as evil or extremly self serving tricksters, and Prometheus was a culture hero.

I think that there are several correspondences between at least Loki and the Greek myths.[406] On the other hand, there are also some differences. The fact that he was punished several times occurred in Greek mythology as well. Loki was linked to Hermes,[407] but

---

403 Gantz 1996:74-75
404 Marzullo 1952:75; for the quote see Otto 1954:108
405 Homer often made a pun on the name Odysseus and the Greek verb "to hate". I refer to the comments by Murray-Wyatt and especially Murray-Dimock on the respective passages. See also (the list is not exhaustive) Marzullo 1952:74-81; Strauss-Clay 1983:59.
406 I leave the other myths out of the comparison, because I could not read them in the original language yet.
407 De Vries 1933:270-275; Harris-Platzner 2004:202

Loki's ambiguous attitude towards the gods can very well be equated to Prometheus,[408] who cheated the gods during the sacrifice and stole the fire, but who also helped Zeus against the Titans.[409] Also his punishment can be compared to Prometheus'. Prometheus had to lie in the Underworld to have his liver eaten every day by an eagle and to have the liver grown back every night. Loki had to lie with open mouth in a cave with a poisonous snake dripping venom onto his face, but his wife, Sigyn, collected the venom to prevent Loki's face from burning.[410] Loki was, however, freed during the final battle of the doom of the gods and fought against them.

The lower birth can be positively identified with Hephaistos' origin as a lame god. Hephaistos is often depicted in (self) humiliation. He had to endure laughter when he limped on the Olympos after he warned his mother not to challenge Zeus again, and his limping is also mocked after the adulterers have been caught. This can be compared to Loki's self humiliation when he has to make Skaði, the daughter of the giant Þjázi whom he murdered, laugh to avoid his own death. He made her laugh by binding his testicles with a cord and the beard of a goat. When he pulled the cord, both he and the goat shrieked and that noise made her laugh.[411]

Loki displayed some aspects of bisexuality.[412] The most important illustration comes from the story about the construction of the gods' fortification in Àsgarðr against the giants. An anonymous builder with a very strong horse suggested building it for the gods, in exchange for Freyja, the moon and the sun if he were able to complete the building in

408 Kirk 1970:207
409 Aiskhylos, *Prometheus Desmotes*, 219-221; see for the analysis and quote Gantz 1996:158-159
410 Lokasenna 50; the French translation can be found in Dumézil 1948:60-66
411 *Skaldskaparmál* 2-4; Dumézil 1948:24-26
412 See the *Encyclopaedia Brittannica* article on Loki.

one winter's time.[413] He progressed so well that the gods forced Loki under the threat of

death to stop the builder. The builder was to a very large extent dependent on his strong

horse. Loki therefore changed himself into a mare, mated with the horse and bore Sleipnir.

The bisexual nature could be compared to Hephaistos who was portrayed in the *Odyssey* as

weaving a web like a spider (a female animal, according to the Greeks). It could be

compared to the ambiguous sexual nature of Herakles, who served queen Omphale dressed

as a woman,[414] and Teiresias who lived seven years as a man and seven years as a woman to

see which gender enjoyed sexual intercourse the most.[415] Teiresias and Herakles are

however not tricksters and Hephaistos is still a male god. As such, Loki has the same

ambiguous sexual role and is often humiliated as well.[416]

4. The Homeric passages.

Turning to Odysseus, many scholars see an evolution from a folktale trickster into an epic

hero.[417] Strauss-Clay talks about a *pre Homeric Odysseus* as illustration for the trickster.[418]

Hölscher stated that the main difference between the *Odyssey* and the other folktales was

that the *Odyssey* did not just relate the stories, but also provided insights into the motives,

psychology and feelings of the characters.[419] The *Odyssey*, however, has a special position

---

413 See the *Encyclopaedia Brittannica* article on Svaðilfari.
414 For the story see Kirk 1974:62 and Walcot 1984:41-42.
415 This story is relatyed in a work *Melampodia* which is asribed to Hesiod (Walcot 1984:46 with reference to the collection of Hesiodic fragments by Merkelbach and West, which I have not been able to consult). See also Cixous 1981:41-42; Walcot 1984:40 and 46. The *Encyclopaedia Brittannica* refers to G. Apollinaire and T.S. Elliott for the modern *Nachleben* of Teiresias. The most extensive treatment is still the book from 1976 by L. Brisson, *Le mythe de Tirésias, essai d'analyse structuraliste*. Leiden: Brill, but I have not been able to read that book.
416 For an analysis of this episode see Lindow 1992 with special focus on the trickster aspects.
417 Hölscher 1978:60-61; Strauss-Clay 1992:163
418 Griffin 1976; Strauss-Clay 1983(1988):112 for the quote and also 1992:163
419 Hölscher 1978:66-67; see already a similar opinion in Kirk 1974:168

because the hero has only one goal,[420] and all his efforts are subordinated to that objective.[421] As a consequence, the key question is which definition to use for the concept trickster. If it is posited that the trickster is someone who tricks for the sake of tricking with no functional use involved, there are maybe five passages involved in the *Odyssey*. If on the other hand, we assume that the trickster also tricks when his/her own survival is involved, we have more candidates and episodes to discuss.

In this analysis I follow the assumption that a trickster tricks for his/her own profit or for the sake of tricking. As a consequence, the stories about Penelope's weaving and her bed trick are left out, because they are a clear self defence mechanism (to keep the suitors away and to make sure that the person in front of her was indeed her returned husband), and were not performed for the sake of showing how clever she was. One could argue against this assumption that outsmarting the trickster king[422] is in itself already proof of some trickster-like capacity, but I will nevertheless not include Penelope because she did not trick for the sake of tricking. As stated before, her intellectual strength was of the outmost importance in maintaining Odysseus' kingdom but that has no bearing in our discussion here. I also leave out Odysseus' reactions to both Kalypso's announcement that he could go home and to Leukothea's advice that he had to swim to the shore, in spite of Stanford's assumptions that such a distrust was the indication of his trickster nature.[423]

---

420 Barnouw 2004:32
421 Arieti 1986:27: *despite his normal desire for glory, he is always willing to subordinate himself for the cause of victory.* Barnouw 2004:32
422 This is the opinion of Winkler, who is quoted in Doherty 1995:43; Morrison 2003:172-173
423 Stanford 1959: 305

There are three certain and four debatable stories that can be used as illustration for the trickster motif in the Homeric poems. Two debatable stories can be found in the *Iliad*, and all the others come from the *Odyssey*. We will now take a look at those instances.

The first story from the *Iliad* is the *Doloneia*. During this expedition Odysseus and Diomedes went disguised into the Trojan territory and even into the city to spy on them. On their way they met Dolon whom they questioned and to whom promised safety, but killed anyway after he had given them the information they needed. This story shows that Odysseus did not honour his promises. The question is, however, if this is enough for a trickster story, because one could also argue that letting Dolon leave might have put them and the entire Greek army at risk. The story nevertheless proved that one could only use tricks if one had the skills to do so. Dolon decided to embark on his exploration because he wanted to obtain Akhilleus' horses as a reward once he would have killed him.[424]

The next instance is the funerary games after Patroklos' death. The content has been discussed before. Odysseus' goal was to win at any cost, but he did not only use his own tricks, but also requested Athena's help, which she gave willingly. I would not argue that Odysseus was a trickster during the running contest, but I am more inclined to consider his tricks during the wrestling contest as some kind of trickster behaviour, especially because he is not the only one who tried to win by less than honest means. Antilokhos (Nestor's son) did the same, but he was no skilled trick-user, so he had to admit his fault. In addition, "cheating" during contests was something that Loki did as well.[425] Aias' reaction when he tripped proves that Strauss-Clays' and Baldick's assumption that Odysseus is smarter and

---

424 *Iliad* 10,319-332.
425 As can be seen in his contest with Þorr.

better in cunning than Athena[426] is not entirely true because she made sure he won. As such, I agree with Pucci's assumption that Odysseus as trickster could only survive with the support of a god(dess) behind him.[427] This would make him much less of a trickster character, because a trickster is usually acting alone and even against the gods.

In the *Odyssey*, the first story involves Helen. This might be surprising because it had been assumed that the Greek trickster was male, but some of her actions clearly indicate trickster behaviour. She was almost a surrogate of Aphrodite,[428] who generally used deceit as one of her tools.[429] As such, Helen was a dangerous person, because she was able to disarm everybody by her beauty and nothing remained unseen for her, as the recognition of both Odysseus and Telemakhos proved. First of all, her use of drugs needs to be discussed. It was not so benevolent as certain scholars have thought it was.[430] She used her drugs not to outsmart Menelaos but to prevent him from second-guessing what happened in Troy. As such, it was a clear defence mechanism, and cannot be used in this discussion. There are two episodes in which she displayed her cunning and deceitful nature, both come from the same episode when she and Menelaos each related a story from the Trojan War. The first instance happened during the *Doloneia*, although it was only related in the *Odyssey*, contrary to the "real" *Doloneia* which could be found in the *Iliad*. She outsmarted Odysseus by recognising him during his secret raid in Troy. She did not betray him, but welcomed him, and bathed (and slept with?) him. She mentioned that he revealed what his intentions were and that she rejoiced when she saw him kill Trojans and when she

---

426 Strauss Clay 1983; Baldick 1994:44
427 Pucci 1987:183
428 Austin 1994:82-83
429 Hesiod, *Theogony*, 200-206. See also Pomeroy 1975:6; Detienne-Vernant 1978:66; Frazer 1983:39-40; Pratt 1993:73-76; Austin 1994:82-83; Detienne 1996:78-79.
430 Austin 1994:77

heard the crying of relatives of the people Odysseus had killed.[431] Menelaos, on the other hand, recalled what happened when the Trojan Horse was brought into Troy. Helen walked around the Horse, impersonating the voices of the warriors' wives. This is the closest the Greeks came to being betrayed and thwarted in their attempt to take the city. The story of Laokoon is not told in Homer.[432] Helen's Horse challenging makes her almost the perfect trickster because for her own amusement she attacked a Greek tool. The question is how we can explain Helen's contradictory and untrustworthy nature. There is no functional need for her to act the way she did. The episodes confronted the two most cunning characters of the Trojan War, and it is unclear who was the strongest. In both stories, Helen came very close to Loki, who on several occasions went against the best interests of the gods although he was a god himself.[433] In the first story, she acted against the interests of the people with whom she was living and might have been influenced by some kind of pleasure and love for Odysseus (although that is debated), and in the second story, she decided to put her original husband, to whom she claimed she wanted to return, and his army into an almost fatal trap. As such, I am inclined to say that Helen only served herself, was only interested in her own gain and safety,[434] which would make her a good trickster.

The story about Ares and Aphrodite is another possible trickster illustration. The details have been discussed earlier. If one argues that Hephaistos reacted out of damaged honour or had became a defender of marriage, the story should technically not be included in our analysis. If on the other hand, we assume that he wanted to take revenge on Ares and

---

431 *Odyssey* 4,257-261
432 Famous is of course the Vergilian phrase, that was pronounced by Laokoon upon seeing the horse *timeo Danaos et dona ferentes* "I fear the Greeks, even when they bring gifts", and that has become proverbial. One could also refer to the sculptures of the Laokoon group.
433 The most infamous example is the murder of Baldr for which he received a Prometheus-like punishment.
434 Ryan 1967 described her very well, especially on page 117.

hoped for a monetary recompense, the story would be suited for the trickster character. The passage is therefore debated, but I included it anyway, because this passage is the only one where Hephaistos is actually described as Aphrodite's husband. In Hesiod[435] and the *Iliad*[436] he was married to a Grace. Some stories also related that Hephaistos trapped his mother in order to obtain a beautiful wife, and that Ares was not able to convince Hephaistos to release their mother. On the other hand, the story ends on an ambiguous note, because the gods laughed and would have willingly switched places with Ares. The comic and self-humiliating effects of this story for Hephaistos seem to correspond to the comic nature of the trickster. In addition, it is also a clear indication of the underdog nature of the trickster. Hephaistos was not even close to Ares in strength, beauty and stature, but nevertheless succeeded in outsmarting him.

The next episode involved Odysseus' attempt to get a cloak for the night from the swine herd Eumaios when they were going to sleep. Odysseus invented a story in which he related how Odysseus once gave him a cloak when he was shivering from the cold. It seems surprising that a hero who had been travelling under the hardest and most hostile circumstances would suddenly want a cloak for what was likely his last night as a beggar. Other motives must therefore have played a role. The goal of this story is debated. Does it mean that Odysseus wanted to test Eumaios' loyalty or is Odysseus again only looking out for himself and his own comfort? On the one hand one can argue that the story could hardly have a functional purpose, because Eumaios did not know that the beggar was Odysseus, and therefore he could not prove his allegiance to his hidden master.[437] In this reasoning

---

435 Hesiod, *Theogony*, 945-946
436 *Iliad* 18, 382
437 Block 1985:6

Odysseus wanted a cloak to have a better sleep, or wanted something that somebody else had. If that were the case, we would have another example of Odysseus' unnecessary tricks. Chaston, however, sees in these episodes proof of Eumaios' loyalty and talks about the ὁμοφροσύνη "equalmindedness" between them.[438] Barnouw suggests that Odysseus used that trick to see if references to Odysseus were still pleasing to Eumaios,[439] and hence some kind of test for his loyalty after all. Nagy thought that praise of Odysseus was used to get a cloak from a loyal Odysseus follower.[440] According to that reasoning, one could say that Odysseus is trying to see if the mention of his name and his supposed behaviour will make other people act accordingly. If it does, is would prove that the persons involved are still loyal to Odysseus. As such, the passage can be an illustration of his trickster behaviour, but other motives cannot be excluded either.

The next passage that I would like to mention in this discussion is the conversation between Odysseus and Penelope before he killed the suitors. The passage has been dealt with earlier, but I would like to go a bit deeper into Odysseus' behaviour. Although he saw Penelope's tears and had trouble hiding his own, he still succeeded in hiding them from Penelope and continued nevertheless with his false stories. They caused even more pain for Penelope, and there is no functional need for Odysseus to do so at this point in the story. It would have been more useful for Odysseus to reveal himself to her because she had already shown by her shroud story that she was still faithful and wanted Odysseus to return. Testing her was no longer necessary and the fact that the sight of Penelope's suffering caused Odysseus' tears should have been enough for him to stop, but Odysseus chose to continue

---

438 Chaston 2002:12
439 Barnouw 2004:260
440 Nagy 1979:234-235

tormenting his wife. He made her cry, felt pity for her when he saw her tears, hid his own tears, but did not stop. He continued and gave the impression that he actually enjoyed what he was doing. There was no real use for disguise or refusal to reveal himself (as Telemakhos was already aware of his identity), and yet he continued to inflict sorrow on Penelope, who had been faithful to him and had kept his kingdom from collapsing under the weight of the outrageous suitors. One could, however, also argue that the fact that Penelope was a female made Odysseus refuse to tell her who he was, but even in that case, there was no real reason for him to torment her like that. The wanton infliction of pain with no regard of the consequences fits well in the amoral nature of the trickster.

The last passage that needs to be discussed in the trickster episodes, is undoubtedly the most blatant case of unnecesary and painful trickery. In the last Song of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus decided to try his father, Laertes, who had not yet been informed about the return of his son and was not aware that the suitors had been killed already. Odysseus went to the orchard where Laertes could be found, saw his wretched figure and started crying.[441] Nevertheless, he still decided to mock his own father as he had done with Penelope. When he saw her suffering and grief for him, he also started crying, but that did not keep him from tormenting her nor he did not reveal himself. He approached Laertes, congratulated him for the well preserved orchard, but scoffed at him for his own looks and asked him whose slave he was. The scolding of one's own father as a slave and ridicule of the grief-stricken father are in my opinion undefensable actions. Harsh stated that this was an example of cautious behaviour,[442] but it is difficult to see how that could be the case, because the likelhood of Laertes betraying his own son is very low and Odysseus was told

---

441 *Odyssey* 24,234
442 Harsh 1950:4

by his mother Antikleia during his Underworld visit that his father was slowly fading away out of grief for his lost son. When Odysseus started his story, he came up with a fake genealogy, and upon mentioning Odysseus he saw his father smearing his face with ashes.[443] Then he decided to reveal himself after all. Laertes asked for a token of recognition which Odysseus provided. The testing and tormenting of Laertes is the test of someone whose loyalty can actually not be doubted.[444] This story is an indication that Odysseus has indeed a dark trait, although he eventually dropped his story and told his father who he was. A similar excessive reaction could be seen when he threatened his nurse Eurykleia not to betray him by her screams unless she wanted to be killed.[445] The story becomes even darker when we consider that Odysseus' mother told him in the Underworld that she had died of grief for her absent son. That Odysseus decided to taunt his father after all and in full knowledge of both his mother's death and his father's pitiful appearance is very revealing about Odysseus' character.

Lastly, we might ask the question: is Odysseus the perfect trickster? I am inclined to answer negatively. He is not perfect, and if it were not for the support of the gods, he would have died much earlier. But even if we disregard the divine elements, it has to be said that he is not a trickster supreme. First of all, both Helen and Penelope succeeded in outsmarting him. Secondly, his desire for personal gain and his overconfidence put him in contact with the Kyklops, who killed many of his men. Once that creature was defeated, Odysseus' ego allowed him to tauntingly reveal his name with the baneful and known consequences.

---

443 *Odyssey* 24,315-323
444 Chaston 2002:17
445 *Odyssey* 19,488-490