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CANONICITY, SETTING, WISDOM IN THE DEUTEROCANONICALS

PAPERS OF THE JUBILEE MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE DEUTEROCANONICAL BOOKS
Please Note: I claim on p. 226 that the dog is never mentioned in Medieval Jewish versions of Tobit, but actually it is present in 5:17 in the Hebrew Constantinople 1519 (see Weeks, Stuckenbruck, Gathercole, The Book of Tobit). I thank Lucas Brum for drawing my attention to this oversight.

"What About the Dog?"
Tobit's Mysterious Canine Revisited

NAOMI S.S. JACOBS

When I mention that I work with the Book of Tobit, the most common question I receive does not concern date and place of composition, redaction, or even magic, demons and angels. Instead I am asked, "Why is the dog there? What is its meaning?" This is a question that has been deliberated upon for some time. Scholars have found the presence of the dog problematic on two counts. First of all, with a few exceptions, the dog is spoken of disparagingly by Israelites in the Hebrew Bible and in documents such as the Lachish Letters. It is considered an insult to be a dog. A dog’s head or even worse a dead dog. Dogs moreover were both considered unclean and consumed that which was unclean, including human flesh. It appears that packs of feral dogs

---

1 This paper is dedicated to the amazing Zoey, part Australian Shepherd, all heart. Zoey lives in Saint Louis with her human companion, my friend Sherry Komer. I would also like to express my great gratitude to my friend and teacher, Homer scholar Leonard Maenhendriks for insight both into the Odyssey the and into general issues of methodology. While this article was nearing completion, our home was subject to Colorado flooding, thus cancelling a planned final visit to the library; I was thus not able to consult a small number of sources.

2 See TORCZYNER, Lachish Letters, II 3f., V. 3f., VI. 2f., as cited in THOMAS, Keleb, 414, n.7.

3 1 Sam 17:43 (spoken by Goliath), 2 Kings 8:13 (spoken by Hazael).

4 2 Sam 3:8 (spoken by Absalom). THOMAS, Keleb, 419-425. argues that this refers to the dog-faced baboon.

5 1 Sam 24:15 (spoken by David to Saul and compared with a flea, the implication is that David is not so lowly); 2 Sam 9:8 (spoken by Mephibosheth); 2 Sam 16:9 (spoken by Abishai regarding Shimei); Ecc 9:4 draws on the theme by preferring even a live dog to a dead lion.

6 Is 66:3 (the immolation of which is forbidden and in parallel with the blood of pigs); Exod 22:30 (tom wild beasts).

7 Royalty and others threatened to be eaten and/or eaten include: 1) those belonging to Jeroboam (1 Kings 14:1), 2) those belonging to Baasha (1 Kings 16:4; birds of the air also mentioned as eaters) 3) Naboth (1 Kings 21:19), 4) Ahaz (1 Kings 21:19, 24; 1 Kings 22:18), 5) Jezebel (1 Kings 21:23, 2 Kings 9:10, 35-36) and 6) Israelite enemies (Ps 68:24).
roamed around in urban areas. Even dogs that appear to be part of a wider household (Isa 56:10-11; Job 30:1) are spoken of disparagingly either as part of a negative metaphor (dumb or greedy) or with disdain. Furthermore, the word dog is presented in the text negatively in parallel with the term for female prostitute, suggesting that it may refer to a male prostitute. If the dog is viewed so negatively, it is reasoned, how could it appear as a positive figure in Tobit?

Secondly, the dog is poorly integrated into the narrative. It appears twice in the story. First in 6:2 (5:17 in the GI version) just as Tobiah and the angel Raphael depart Nineveh and approach the river Tigris and second in 11:4 (GI and GIIII) just before the two are about to return to Nineveh to heal Tobit of his blindness. The passages are as follows:

Tob 6:1-4: The young man went out and the angel went with him; and the dog came out with him (καὶ ὁ κύων ἐξῆλθεν μετ’ αὐτοῦ) and went along with them. So they both journeyed along, and when the first night overtook them they camped by the Tigris river.

Tob 11:1-4: When they came near to Kaserin, which is opposite Nineveh, Raphael said, "You are aware of how we left your father. Let us run ahead of your wife and prepare the house while they are still on the way." As they went on together Raphael said to him, "Have the gall ready." And the dog went along behind him (καὶ συνῆλθεν ὁ κύων διπολὺν σπέρματος). 12

One might think that the dog would help Tobiah with the large dangerous fish that attacks him in the Tigris river, but it does not. It would appear that aside for these two instance, the story proceeds as if the dog were not in fact present.

Neither of these apparent problems need loom so large. It is entirely possible to have a large amount of negative language about something and still be able to have a positive relationship with it. Even

---

8 Ps 59:7,15; in a related sense Ps 22:17 speaks of being surrounded by mauling dogs and in verse 21 the psalmist fears being killed by them.
9 Deut 23:19
10 As will be discussed below, the dog has a larger presence in the Vulgate.
11 In addition to five fragmentary Dead Sea Scroll manuscripts, study of the Book of Tobit also includes three distinct Greek text types (GI, GII, GIII) and Old Latin manuscripts. See further, WEEKS/GATHERCOLE/STUCKENBRUCK, Book of Tobit, 10-15, 21-26.
12 So reads GI, GIII has the dog run before in front of them, instead of behind. Sinaic (the main exemplar of GII), however, uses the same verb as GI abut also speaks instead of the Lord as coming from behind (ἐκ τῶν δύσων αἰχμῶν), as will be discussed below.
Even dogs that appear to be part of a Job 30:1) are spoken of disparagingly as a (dumb or greedy) or with disdain, presented in the text negatively in parallelism, suggesting that it may refer to a dog so negatively, it is reasoned, how so in Tobit?

Integrated into the narrative, it appears 6:2 (5:17 in the GI version) just as apart Nineveh and approach the river of Gill just before the two are about to leave his blindness. The passages are as follows:

I and the angel went with him; and the stars spake and went along with him, and the first night overtook river.

As to Kaserin, which is opposite Nineveh, we let your father. Let us run ahead, while they are still on the way. And said to him, "Have the gall ready."

And the dog took a (in the name of Astarte)."

and it could help Tobit with the large dance of Tigris river, but it does not. It would be helpful if the problems need less dogs.

It is an amount of negative language about a positive relationship with it. Even spoken of being surrounded by mauling dogs being killed by them.)

But a larger presence in the Vulgate:

Sea Scroll manuscripts, study of the Book of Ely, text types (GI, GII, GIII) and Old Latin scholars, Book of Tobit, 10-15.


Furthermore, a major Babylonian goddess, Gula, is accompanied by a dog, as will be discussed further below. Indeed, as Thomas notes, the dog could also be considered a positive symbol of loyalty in which the worshipper sees him or herself as a “dog of [deity].” This is seen not only in a hymn to Marduk but possibly in 1 Chron 17:19’s parallel of 2 Sam 7:21, where it has been proposed that David speaks of himself as YHWH’s dog. It is in the sense of being devoted to a deity that Thomas understands the male prostitute reference in Deuteronomy, not as a negative label but in keeping with terms for cultic personnel attested elsewhere.

---

10. THOMAS, Kelebb, 415.
11. THOMAS, Kelebb, 417.
12. LEACH, God Had a Dog, 75.
13. THOMAS, Kelebb, 424. The proposed reading vocalizes (narrative instead of a (tiger) for the second letter of lurch.
One need not go so far as Geoffrey David Miller who attempted to emphasize a positive relationship with dogs in Ancient Israel as the author unfortunately uses Tobit as his main counterexample as well as Job, a writing whose original cultural context has been much debated. As noted above, there does seem to be evidence from Isaiah 56:10-11 that Israelites at some point had watch dogs. Moreover, in the tragic story of Jephthah’s daughter, Jephthah states that whatever comes out to greet him when he returns to battle will be sacrificed. Assuming that Jephthah is not contemplating human sacrifice, just what exactly is he expecting? could it be a dog? Note further that in Ps 68:24 God promises “that the tongue of your dogs (יִבְרֹא) may have its portion of your enemies,” directly referring to dog ownership and that Prov 26:24 (admittedly a document that includes among its sources non-Israelite material, such as Egyptian) speaks of seizing a dog by its ears, something that suggests close physical encounters with dogs. One must also not forget the name Caleb, linked with a popular leader. Whether the numerous dog burials found at Ashkelon (and outside the land of Israel) however indicate emotional attachment to dogs cannot at this time be determined and has indeed been challenged.

Much later, in 4QMMT, it clearly states that dogs do not belong in the Temple because of their habit of chewing bones and/or the meat attached thereof (a situation also lamented in 4Q306). Are these wild dogs or dogs that belong to worshippers? In fragment 8 col. IV line 8 of 4Q306, one of the MMT manuscripts, the text appears to be stating that it is not permitted to the dogs. The hiphil infinitive מָאָס, which here has mostly damaged letters, has been translated both as “bring” and “allow to enter,” although the first meaning is by far the predominant one in the Hebrew Bible and in Mishnaic Hebrew. The first option could conceivably but not necessarily imply that people might bring in dogs themselves, perhaps with the intent to feed them.

Even more striking evidence comes from the Book of Jubilees. Already in the Exodus story in the Torah, the dogs of Egypt do not bark, thus saving the Israelites. But in Jubilees’ account in 49:4, the Israelites themselves have dogs.

---

24 Miller, Attitudes Towards Dogs, 487-500.
25 Caleb for instance is singled among the spies for being confident of being able to conquer Canaan (e.g. Num 13:30, 14:38).
26 See WAPNISH/HESSE, Pampered Pooches, 55-80. The authors also do not find it possible to attribute the burials to a particular culture.
27 E.g. WISE/ABBIG/COOK, Dead Sea Scroll, 459.
28 E.g. GARCIA MARTINEZ/TICHELAAR, Dead Sea Scrolls, 793
29 HALOT 111; JASTROW, Dictionary, 144.

---

And the powers of the Lord demanded them, and they came not upon them to destroy tile, or man, or dog.

The verse in Jubilees has several parallels to the presence of a dog as part of the human: it also might show a sense of loss. And note, turnip, which mentions dogs both as eaters and as a desired animal:

Noble horses we seek, and steers and oxen; and other beasts of the earth, and the oxen of the field.

The case that the Jews in the Second Temple era with canines is also attested by the ancient writers:

Let not then our appetites rush after the flesh, for the flesh is weak and alien to a Jew, and animals are to us food and companions.

Philo has clearly known a dog in their homes and it makes clear that one could not have a dog in a house or a householder owning a dog. That anyone who raises a dog is not allowed by Psalm 21:4, Rabban Gamliel refers up as relevant for a case regarding a dog, which from this evidence outside of it, it is clear that at the time and valued, even as part of the household.

25 In the Testament of Judith 2.6 (admitting of having a dog that is attacked by a dog in tearing apart a wild animal, 2) this term is often refers to young dogs.
27 Note further that Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (יָבָר) to Exodus 22:30’s command to select a dog that seems as a midrash a barking during the Exodus as attesh 965, it definitely highlights a possible relationship between human and dog, as something...
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And the powers of the Lord did everything according as the Lord commanded them, and they passed by all the children of Israel, and the plague came not upon them to destroy from amongst them any soul either of cattle, or man, or dog.

The verse in Jubilees has several implications. It shows that for Jubilees, the presence of a dog as part of a greater household unit is taken for granted. It also might show that the death of a dog would be considered a loss.25 And note, turning to the Diaspora, that Pseudo-Phocylides mentions dogs both as eaters of unclean food (148, 185) and at the same time as a desired animal:

Noble horses we seek, and strong-necked bulls, plowiers of the earth, and the very best of dogs (άχιρ σκυλάκων26 πανίριστον) (201-202).

The case that the Jews in the Diaspora could have close experiences with canines is also attested by Philo in Giants 35.

Let not then our appetites rush eagerly in pursuit of all the things that are pleasant to the flesh, for the pleasures are often untameable, when like dogs they fawn upon us (βητεν κυκών πρόστον προσόνισμον) and all of a sudden, change and bite us, inflicting incurable sounds.

Philo has clearly known a dog in an intimate setting. Later, the Mishnah makes it clear that one could own a dog; m.B.Q. 5:3 speaks explicitly of a householder owning a dog in a tort case and again in 7:7 states that anyone who raises a dog needs to keep it chained. Note also that in m.Pesah 2:3, Rabban Gamliel refers to that which the dog cannot scratch up as relevant for a case regarding leaven; this certainly assumes ready access to a dog.27 Thus from evidence both within the land of Israel and outside of it, it is clear that at the very least, dogs could be seen as positive and valued, even as part of the greater household.

---

25 In the Testament of Judah 2:6 (admittedly Christian in its current form) Judah speaks of having a dog that is attacked by a leopard and just before compares himself with a dog in tearing apart a wild animal, 2:4.

26 This term often refers to young dogs, but can also refer to dogs in general. LSJ,1616.

27 Note further that Targum Pseudo-Jonathan adds the words “as its wages/reward” (=pesa) to Exod 22:30’s command to give meat torn from a living beast to a dog. Although it may seem as a midrashic allusion to the reward for the Egyptian dogs not barking during the Exodus as attested in Exodus Rabbin 31 (so JASTROW, Dictionary, 963), it definitely highlights a positive perspective and presents the relationship between human and dog as something ongoing.
Now we come to the second alleged problem, the brief mention of the dogs in Tobit and the absence of integration. This is a more serious concern. The fact that Sinaiticus mistakenly replaces the dog (κύων) with the Lord (κύριος) in 11:4 may attest that an ancient scribe did not find the dog well integrated either. Similarly, the absence of the dog in all known Jewish Medieval versions of Tobit could indeed reflect Jewish-canine relations of that time but it could also reflect the dog’s minimal function in the story and these versions do cut out much of the story to varying degrees. Likewise the expanded presence of the dog in the Vulgate could either reflect a different cultural context or that Jerome too saw the dog as occupying too minimal a role and chose the opposite approach; the Vulgate of Tobit is known for its expansionist tendencies.28

Although my own individual reading also found the presentation of the dog as strange, I am not entirely convinced that the narrative of Tobit does. This narrative, aside from issues of redaction, has some other loose ends. It states that Sarah was beating the household maidservants yet this is never followed up once Sarah, is cured nor fully integrated into the positive portrait of Sarah especially as she is described in Tob. 6:12 as wise and of a good character. The question remains, would it be possible in an ancient narrative to briefly mention something without further development? I believe the answer is yes. Although I will shortly be critiquing attempts to explain the dog’s presence as an influence of the Odyssey, it is instructive that the dogs associated with Telemachus also appear here and there without complete integration in the narrative.29 Furthermore, although it is extremely illuminating to go deeper into the folkloric, magical and spiritual aspects of the dog to better appreciate its presence in Tobit, it is not true that it can only be explained by recourse to an external text or an external culture. At the very minimum, the dog in Tobit, as noted by others, is linked with the transition between home and travel and between travel and home.30 It may or may not also be no accident that it appears right before an act of healing.31 Tobit will be discussed below.

This paper aims not merely to trace a narrative, it also has the aim of investigating the problem of the dog when thought to be problematic by using the dog as a key. Though the dog’s presence is not necessarily the reason for its presence, its kinds of questionable assumptions can tell when a narrative incorporates various sources or cultural influences show that even explanations about to be more carefully explicated. A tige of a “secular” folk tale, as Carey Moore, it is more productively presented far less poetically than Moore.32

Carey Moore has helpfully connected the presence of the dog and found any fundamentally new elements have been reordered and recombined and is present in Tobit because: 1) the dog is the hero;33 2) the dog is derived from A Odyssey;34 3) the use of the dog a ristic culture;35 5) the dog is a people’s hero important in Zoroastrianism. He has associations with the Babylonian 2; the dog was originally a helper because Asmodeus is now a spirit of maintained.36

28 The Vulgate 11:9 corresponding with Tob 11:4 elsewhere, “Then the dog, which had also been on the journey, ran ahead and as a messenger that arrives, showed his joy with his tail” (tunc praecucurni canis qui simul fuerat in via et quasi nuntius adventes blandimento suae caudae gaudet). The translation is my own; in consultation with Skene: Vulgate of Tobit, 329. ZIMMERMANN, Book of Tobit, 132 also sees the Vulgate as an expansion.

29 Telemachus in particular is said to be accompanied by two swift dogs (Od. 2.11, 17.62, 20.144) yet the dogs of Eumaeus do not bark at him (15.4, 6.9) as they surely would in the presence of other dogs, had Telemachus’ two dogs been present.

30 Cf. ZIMMERMANN, Tobit, 78.
right before an act of healing. Other possible dimensions to the dog in Tobit will be discussed below.

This paper aims not merely to address the problem of the dog, per se, it also has the aim of investigating the very process that scholars undergo when they think there is an element in the narrative that is problematic by using the dog in Tobit as an example. Thus, even though the dog’s presence is not nearly as problematic as it appears, the reasons given for its presence are worth analyzing to highlight the kinds of questionable assumptions made by scholars about how one can tell when a narrative incorporates external elements, be they literary sources or cultural influences. At the same time, this paper will also show that even explanations about the dog possessing some merit need to be more carefully explicated. Rather than state that the dog is a vestige of a “secular” folklore, as do Frank Zimmermann followed by Carey Moore, it is more productive to focus on how the dog in Tobit is presented far less potently than folklore and world culture would suggest.11

Carey Moore has helpfully collected a full range of explanations for the presence of the dog and further research into the issue has not found any fundamentally new explanations. The explanations, which have been reordered and recombined, now follow, stating that the dog is present in Tobit because: 1) the mention of the dog is a copyist error;20 2) the dog is derived from Ahiqar;21 3) the dog is derived from the Odyssey;24 4) the use of the dog as a companion in Tobit reflects Hellenistic culture;25 5) the dog is a product of Iranian culture, where the dog is important in Zoroastrianism and is used in exorcism;26 6) the dog has associations with the Babylonian healing deity Gula;27 and finally 7) the dog was originally a helper against dragon-slaying in folklore, but because Asmodeus is now a spirit, the dog is no longer needed yet is maintained.28
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11 MOORE, Tobit, 197; ZIMMERMANN, Tobit, 198.
12 ABRAHAMS, Tobit’s Dog, 288.
13 SMEND, Altor und Herkunft, 153, cited in MOORE, Tobit, 197.
14 GLASSON, Main Sources, 277 (here following ROSENMAANN, Studien); PAUTREL/ LEBESBRE, Trois texts, cited in MOORE, Tobit, 197 and recently MACDONALD, Tobit and the Odyssey, 1-40; and NICKELSBRUG, Tobit, Genesis, and the Odyssey, 41-55.
15 ROSENMAANN, Studien: GROSS, Tobit, Judit, 1930.
16 MOWLTON, Iranian Background, 258; HAUPIT, Asmodeus, 176; GOOSPEED, Story of the Apocrypha, 17; BRUNNER, Fable of the Babylonian Tree, 196, cited in MOORE, Tobit, 197; WINSTON, Iranian Component, 194 and recently RUSSLLE, God is Good, 3.
17 DESALAERS, Buch Tobit, 114, n. 135.
18 ZIMMERMANN, Tobit, 198.
Explanation number 1, which assumes that the presence of the dog is impossible in a Jewish text can be dismissed easily. The argument made is that the word for heart (פז) was misread as dog (שז). Even were the text underlying the Greek in fact Hebrew, which cannot be ruled out, the heart has no role in the two places where the dog is mentioned. In the first instance, 6:2, Tobiah has yet to encounter the fish let alone any of its organs, although they are mentioned a few verses later. Even more critically, by the second instance, 11:4, the heart has already been dispensed with three chapters earlier to remove the demon. Exactly what would it mean for Raphael and Tobiah to be accompanied by a heart may be best left to Edgar Allen Poe.

Explanations 2 and 3 share the common assumption that the dog cannot be positive for Jews and that this problem must be solved from an external text (either in written form or by oral transmission). There certainly is strong evidence elsewhere in Tobit that the Ahiqar story influenced the narrative. Ahiqar himself as well as his nephew Nadab are in the story several times and the court tale elements of Tobit’s story with his exile and return to the court mirror Ahiqar’s fall and rise in his career. Dogs are mentioned several times both in the Aramaic Ahiqar and in other versions. None of the examples in Aramaic Ahiqar refer to animals as companions; at most is a reference to a hunting dog (8:17). An ongoing relationship between a dog and a human master is only evident in other versions. There are two sayings related to this theme. The first is that the speaker is addressed to smite (Syriac A 2:35) or pursue (Armenian 2:85) the dog that follows him, having abandoned his master. The second saying reads as follows in Syriac A 2:38 and Syriac B 2:5 with parallels in Armenian Ahiqar 8:26, Ethiopian Ahiqar 2 and Greek Ahiqar 26:11.

There is one Hebrew DSS manuscript, 4Q200 and there have been no unambiguous mistakes in the Greek that definitively point to a Hebrew or Aramaic base text, although Zimmermann’s explanation of “pouring bread” in Tob. 4:17, which assumes a possible Aramaic Vorlage (ZIMMERMANN, Tobit, 70), is a strong contender.

The larger questions of how to define the concept of intertextuality and how it operates is a complicated one beyond the scope of this study but well explicated by MÁRTEZ ALFARO, Intertextuality, 268-285.

Ahiqar and/or his nephew “Nadab” (elsewhere Nadin) are mentioned in Tob 1:11, 1:22, 2:10, 11:18; and 14:10.

See Ahiqar 2:51, 8:8, 8:14, 8:17, 8:28. Many of these sayings have parallels among Syriac and Armenian Ahiqar.

Both passages certainly refer to a human. At the same time Tobit and neither says is a comment on dog. The dog as a metaphor in Ahiqar should a single line: Was the narrative of

It may be helpful to consider the passage's grave, which (Syriac, Arabic, with) assumed that that principle in Ahiqar as explained above is enough to show that, although it appears that dog in Tobit corresponds with dog in Ahiqar is clearly beyond the scope of this study. In many cases, the value of Ahiqar is clearly the same contradiction of Israels, to the be the case where the source.

The claim that both stronger and weaker are dogs in the Ody story, the claim that Tobit is much more difficult
at the presence of the dog used easily. The argument misread as dog (5·3). Even Hebrew, which cannot be no places where the dog is has yet to encounter they are mentioned a few and instance, 11:4, the heart pliers earlier to remove the Raphael and Tobit to be Ahiqar, Allen Poe.

in assumption that the dog oblem must be solved from oral transmission. There Tobit that the Ahiqar story well as his nephew Nadaburt tale elements of Tobit’s mirror Ahiqar’s fall and rise at times both in the Aramaic examples in Aramaic Ahiqar a reference to a hunting dog and a human master is two sayings related to this used to smile (Syriac A 2:35) shows him, having abandoned laws in Syriac A 2:38 and Ahiqar 8:26, Ethiopian Ahiqar 2

there have been no unambiguous Hebrew or Aramaic base text. “In” in Tob. 4:17, which assumes is a strong contender.

intersexuality and how it operates study but well explicated by

sayings have parallels among

My son, sweeten your tongue and make savory the opening of your mouth; for the tail of a dog gives him bread, and his mouth gets him blows.

Both passages certainly reflect the situation of a dog owned by a human. At the same time, the dog does not appear as part of saying in Tobit and neither saying above presents the dog as a character. The first is a comment on dealing with another’s property; the second uses the dog as a metaphor for human behavior. The larger question remains: either the dog is or is not a problem for the Jewish narrative; why should a single line in Ahiqar overturn supposed negative views of dog? Was the narrative of Tobit that much in the thrill of a particular source?

It may be helpful to this discussion to consider here briefly the famous problem of placing consumable substances upon a righteous person’s grave, which can also be traced to multiple versions of Ahiqar (Syriac, Arabic with an Armenian parallel). For years many scholars assumed that that practice could not be Israelite or Jewish and brought in Ahiqar as explanation. The language is indeed close and specific enough to show that passage is in all likelihood derived from Ahiqar, although it appears in a different form. For here is a real case of a saying in Tobit corresponding with a saying in Ahiqar. At the same time, further research has shown that there is evidence for that placing food and/or drink on graves was an actual Israelite and Jewish practice and that the very passage in Deuteronomy (26:14) evoked as evidence against such practices, is in fact evidence for the practice. Indeed, the concepts of righteousness, food, and honoring the dead fit squarely with the values of the narrative. If it can be shown that even when Ahiqar is clearly being used as a source, it is not necessarily done so in contradiction of Israelite or Jewish practice, one can hardly expect this to be the case where there is no clear evidence of Ahiqar being used as a source.

The claim that the dog is based on influence from the Odyssey is both stronger and weaker than the Ahiqar claim, stronger because there are dogs in the Odyssey that are actual characters and weaker because the claim that Tobit is in any way directly influenced by the Odyssey is much more difficult to establish. Aside from abundant metaphorical

---

40 Syriac Ahiqar 2:28.
41 Syriac 2:10 and Armenian 2:7; Arabic no. 1 in Cooperate/Rendel Harris/Lewis. Story of Ahiqar, 6, 90, 26.)
42 See further discussion Jacobs, And 1 Sam. 135-146. The thesis is available online at http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/2443/ and see also MacDonald, Bread on the Grave, 98-103.
usage, dogs occur at certain points in the story. Most significant for our purposes are the two swift dogs accompanying Telemachus and Odysseus' own dog Argus, who since the departure of his master, has aged greatly and been in most unhappy state, but perks up upon seeing him and wags his tail, yet is too weak to reach Odysseus and is to die soon thereafter. Other noteworthy dog scenes include the occasion dogs do not bark at Telemachus because they recognize him. Although a parallel with Argus has been suggested for the Book of Tobit, Argus' behavior concerns a dog at home greeting a master, whereas in Tobit it is a dog that leaves on a journey and returns from the journey. At best, Argus' tail wagging resembles the dog in the Vulgate, but not the dog of any other version of Tobit.

The two swift dogs that accompany Telemachus are a slightly better parallel. They are described three times: 1) Telemachus comes out with his spear and with his two swift dogs to hold a meeting with the Achaeans (2.11); Telemachus then sits in his father's seat; 2) Telemachus goes into his family hall with his spear and with his two swift dogs and sits down near Mentor (Athene) and his father's friends (17.248); and 3) Telemachus goes through the hall with his spear and his two swift dogs on the way to the place of assembly where the Achaeans are (20.145). Although Telemachus does go on a journey, the accompanying dogs are only mentioned in places in or close to home, not as part of a journey as in Tobit. The dog of Tobit is one, not two, and it is not described asswift. At no point does Tobiah ever carry a spear.

With the wrong number of dogs (which Leonard Muellner informs me are parallel to the two maidservants accompanying Penelope) and with the wrong context, it is difficult to see this as a robust explanation. Furthermore, the evidence regarding the so-called parallels between Odyssey and Tobit is mixed at best. My doctoral thesis examined all four purported parallels related to food and eating between the two texts and found none consistent. and Haman weaves sound weaving is a female stereotyped Jewish world to the point work.

Arguments made about the Odyssey as a source, is difficult to establish. A recent order only establishes narrative patterns and makes Campbell describes as "The strike me while reading the disguised divine helper be a male family friend an Athenian posing as Mentor is (1.169-177) and indirectly being asked one's family is in these scenes, and the per Tobit, is Tobit, who would critically, there is a major diachronicus suspects that Mentor no such suspicion is evident it interesting that both Hans refuse to eat thinking they had by far, common folklore direct dependence to explain the Odyssey, although one or haps unconscious, as Georg notable is that even were the

---

46 Passages include: Od. 2.11, 5.259, 14.29, 133, 164, 6.9, 17.62, 200, 300, 306, 309, 312, 18.87, 105, 19.429, 438, 44, 20.145, 340, 21.340. See further FAUST, Künstlerische Verwendung, 8-31. I thank Leonard Muellner for this reference. Relevant to our discussion above about language, note that even in the Odyssey, where dogs are valued the word 'dog' can be used also as an insult, for example in Od. 12.248 and 22.35. This is also discussed in BECK, Dogs, Dwellings, and Masters, 164-165. 167.
47 To review, Telemachus' dogs are mentioned in Od. 2.11, 17.62, 20.145; Argos is described in Od. 17.290-297.
48 Od. 164, 6, 9.
49 So PAUWELS/LIEBVEN, Troy texts.
Most significant for the Odysseus of our discussion is the title of his master, has erks up upon seeing Odysseus and is to die unknown the occasion as he recognizes him. 48 Also the Book of Tobit, a master, whereas in the Vulgate, but not

Tobit's Mysterious Canine Revised

texts and found none convincing. 51 Furthermore, that both Penelope and Hannah weave sounds impressive until one observes that women weaving is a female stereotype throughout the classical world and the Jewish world to the point that in Tobit it is said to be “women's work.” 52

Arguments made about the density of parallel examples in support of the Odyssey as a source, moreover, flat if each individual parallel is difficult to establish. 53 Arguments made about patterns appearing in a certain order only establish that they are based on common folklore narrative patterns and motifs, such as the famous pattern Joseph Campbell describes as “The Hero's Journey.” 54 One similarity that did strike me while reading the Odyssey at first was the interchange with the disguised divine helper. In both cases the divine being pretends to be a male family friend and in both cases is asked about his family: Athene posing as Mentor is in fact asked about directly by Telemachus (1.169-177) and indirectly by Eumachus (1.405). At the same time, being asked one’s family is typical of Greek Epic as a whole, 55 not just in these scenes, and the person who asks about family in the Book of Tobit is Tobit, who would better parallel Odysseus. But even more critically, there is a major difference in that very early on, “wise” Telemachus suspects that Mentor is really a goddess (1.323, 420), whereas no such suspicion is evident by the less than clever Tobiah. I also found it interesting that both Hannah (10:7 GL, 101, Old Latin) and Penelope refuse to eat thinking they had lost their sons, but this seems more like a common motif or stereotype than a dependency. 56

By far, common folklore motifs are a more likely explanation than direct dependence to explain possible similarities between Tobit and the Odyssey, although one cannot rule out some level of influence, perhaps unconscious, as George W. E. Nickelsburg suggests. 57 What is notable is that even the purported parallels demonstrable, they do
not do much for the reader of Tobit beyond being noted as a clever allusion. So much more opens up to the reader who examines how Genesis can be used in the story. For example, note the parallels between Tob 8:19 and Genesis 18:6-7.

Tob 8:19 And he told [his] wife to make many loaves and having walked to the herd he brought two oxen and four rams and he told [them] to kill them and they began to prepare.

Gen. 18:6 Abraham hastened into the tent to Sarah, and said, 'Quick three seahs of choice flour! Knead and make cakes!' Then Abraham ran to the herd, took a calf, tender and choice, and gave it to a servant-boy, who hastened to prepare it.

The parallels are very tight. In both cases, a husband asks a wife to make bread products, and the husband selects animal(s) for eating and asks servants to prepare it. There is no other passage in the Torah that is quite similar. But the parallel details themselves are only part of the fun. The reader of Tobit who detects the similarities may recall that this is also a passage in the Torah in which angels, like Raphael, are guests in disguise as humans. The parallel thus works both at the micro and macro levels. Moreover, the angels of this scene in Genesis are here to deliver the good news of the couple having a child. In Tobit the fear that Sarah will never have children (Tob 3:9) parallels the infertiltiy of the biblical Sarah, yet like her namesake she too will bear children (Tob 14:3,8,12). Adding to the mix is that the word נחם (sexual delight) in this very chapter in verse 12, its only appearance in the Hebrew Bible, is the same as the name of Sarah’s mother.

Reading Tobit with its Genesis parallels leads the reader into a world of midrashic delight. Reading Tobit with a strict insistence upon Homeric parallels flattens the text. The larger project of linking the characters of Tobit to matriarchs and patriarchs goes beyond mere typology; it suggests numerous ideas including that the characters are a part of or a continuation of the world of Genesis, in which God’s help is always forthcoming with the help of angels. In contrast, the parallels with the Odyssey do not add this level of richness to the reading. (Tobit’s use of Ahigar, in contrast, also does work on micro and macro levels both in details relating to him and Nadab and in invoking the wider arc of Ahigar’s story of ups and downs.)

There is however a great work of literature that follows a journey of sorts of a Diaspora Jew who is also a husband and father. Without knowing the story and details about the Odyssey, one misses the point of the work entirely. This work is not The Book of Tobit; it is James Joyce’s Ulysses. For the student of literature studying this massive volume, there are numerous books on Joyce’s allusions and references, standing of the text. In contrast for understanding the story of Tobit.

Nonetheless, every Tobit scholar with the Hellenistic novels and one can find, because it allows a web of ancient narration with a oral and folktale, the great mysteries are very clear that the Odyssey cannot be for the presence of the dog in Tobit.

Instead of relying upon a shelf of 5, and 6 refer to cultural influence assume that the dog does not other assumption that is not for certain. I that an influence of Hellenistic culture negative. Explanation 5 makes the absence of Persian culture in which the story in exorcism is why the dog is present and contains that the dog’s link to a Messianic presence.

Explanation 4 may be correct if one cultural context like Philo and close to dogs. Even Jubilees could show by Hellenistic culture, even frequently to such an extent that it forbade Jews. One must continue to won view of dogs is a new development in cultural contact. Whether this is the significant explanatory power. It is tolerated but does not explain why.

Explanation 5 referencing Persia definitely true, whether one looks at Zoroastrian inhabitants of India) especially important in Persian culture. The substantial amount of space to dog...
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ume, there are numerous books that explain not only each and every of Joyce's allusions and references, but open up and enhance one's understanding of the text. In contrast, a reading of Odyssey is not necessary for understanding the story of Tobit.

Nonetheless, every Tobit scholar should read the Odyssey, along with the Hellenistic novels and as much of Greek and Latin literature one can find, because it allows one to perceive Tobit as part of a wider web of ancient narration with a certain amount of kinship between epic and folklore, the great mysteries and the novel. All the same, it remains very clear that the Odyssey cannot be sustained as the defining reason for the presence of the dog in Tobit.

Instead of relying upon on a specific literary source, explanations 4, 5, and 6 refer to cultural influence. All three explanations continue to assume that the dog does not otherwise belong in a Jewish text, an assumption that is not for certain. Explanation 4 makes the simple claim that an influence of Hellenistic culture is why the dog is not seen as negative. Explanation 5 makes the more complex claim that an influence of Persian culture in which the dog was highly valued and an aid in exorcism is why the dog is presented in the text. Explanation 6 maintains that the dog's link to a Mesopotamian healing deity accounts for its presence.

Explanation 4 may be correct. Certainly Jews living in a Hellenistic cultural context like Philo and the author of Psuedo-Phocylides were close to dogs. Even Jubilees could conceivably be influenced in some way by Hellenistic culture, even though it is wary of non-Jewish culture to such an extent that it forbids Jews to share a table with non-Jews.

One must continue to wonder, however, if a less than negative view of dogs is a new development or can be traced to pre-Hellenistic cultural contact. Whether this is the case or not, the explanation lacks significant explanatory power. It accounts for why the dog's presence is tolerated but does not explain why the dog is present in the first place.

Explanation 5 referencing Persian culture is most interesting. It is definitely true, whether one looks at Zoroastrian literature or at Parsi (Zoroastrian inhabitants of India) funeral customs, that dogs are markedly important in Persian culture. The Zoroastrian Vendidad59 devotes a substantial amount of space to dogs, stressing severe punishments for

---

58 Jub 22:16.
59 This Avestan text, possibly dating to before the 8th century C.E. yet preserving older materials, may be found online at http://www.avesta.org/cenlidad/pdf132be.htm [accessed September 16, 2013.]
those who misfeed them. 60 Book thirteen opens with the following lines,

Which is the good creature among creatures of the Good Spirit that from midnight till the sun is up goes and kills thousands of the creatures of the Evil Spirit?
Ahura Mazda answered: “The dog with the prickly back, with the long and thin muzzle.” (1-2)

The idea that dogs drive out evil spirits is notable in the Parsi custom of a dog being placed in the room with the newly deceased so that the dog can exorcise the corpse spirit. 61 Dogs also accompany Persian deities such as Mithra and Sraoche. 62

At the outset, this sounds promising, especially since the notion of driving away evil spirits is important in the story of Tobit, even though there is no explicit connection between the dog and exorcism made in the story. Arguments however that simply state that the dog is present because dogs were revered in Persia suffer the same difficulties as the Hellenistic explanation. 63

There are two other factors to consider when exploring the question of Persian influence. The first is the issue of whether one can in fact demonstrate a Persian influence in Tobit and the second is whether Persian culture exclusively held dogs in high esteem and involved in activities such as exorcism. There has been a long debate on the extent to which Iranian culture, especially Zoroastrianism, has impacted upon Judaism. To be sure, living under Persian rule for centuries is unlikely to be without impact. But the question is complicated by the fact that Zoroastrian literature is not attested until a much later period. 64

Certainly, the sudden strong interest in angels and demons and the increased power of Satan/Mastema/Beliar is notable and any evidence pointing to ancient Iranian religious beliefs would seem worthy of exploration. One would however, expect in the course of cultural interchange something more dynamic and complex than the simple mapping of one culture upon another, a process of adaption and adaptation as much as adoption. One may also one wonder whether the circum-

stances that led to the dualism of by Israelite/Judahite culture.

To be sure the Zoroastric understanding the four kingdom s is a common. 65 In discussing the Collins favors a possibly Persian Daniel yet also cautious that specificity nor certainty. What and widespread tradition. 66 than propose direct influence that when studied, helps one cultural world streams? This fine influence and how to establish the as the means of cultural integration.

The specific question of Persia's interesting one. After all, the s and Rages. The question as to mon, derives from Asma Daeas-relating to the Persian beyond it seems a likely explanation. mem, dalet is the source of the expected for wholesale authenticity incorporated into Tobit—it is quite watered down. 67 Yet ultimately difficult to demonstrate Persian influence name Asmodeus were Persian in names of deities and demons have the initial cultural context. Ereshkigal Netherworld is still famously in Pazuzu, a Mesopotamian demon. A Jewish example might include name of a giant in the Book of the Mesopotamian Epic. This seems that Asmodeus there in no way behavior of cosmic import; he behaves like

60 Misfeeding a sheep-dog, for instance, is said to be as serious a crime as serving bad food to a master of house of first rank (13:1.20) and warrants a punishment of 200 stripes (13:4.24)
61 LURKER, Dogs, 397.
62 WINSTON, Iranian Component, 194, n. 28.
63 See for instance, most recently, RUSSELL, God is Good, 3.
64 This problem is discussed by WINSTON, Iranian Component, 186.
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To be sure the Zoroastrian text Bahrani Yasht is relevant to under-
standing the four kingdom scenario of Daniel 2 as they share much in
common.65 In discussing the relationship between the two texts, John J.
Collins favors a possibly Persian or at least eastern background to
Daniel yet also cautions that “the evidence, however, permits neither
specificity nor certainty. What is clear is that the imagery had a long
and widespread tradition.”66 Might it not be better, therefore, rather
than propose direct influence, to view Persian religion as something
that when studied, helps one place Tobit within a wider context of cul-
tural world streams? This finesse the problems of how to prove direct
influence and how to establish the means of cultural dispersal as well
as the means of cultural integration.

The specific question of Persian influence with respect to Tobit is
an interesting one. After all, the story does include the regions of Ecbatana
and Rages. The question as to whether Asmodeus, the name of the de-
mon, derives from Asma Daeva is a complex one and involves issues
relating to the Persian beyond this author’s competence; nonetheless, it
seems a more likely explanation than stating that the Semitic root shin,
mem, dalet is the source of the name.67 It is also not necessary or even
expected for wholesale authentically certified Iranian culture to be in-
corporated into Tobit—it is quite possible that it could be vague and
watered down.68 Yet ultimately, as James Barr argues, it is truly diffi-
cult to demonstrate Persian influence in Tobit as a whole. Even if the
name Asmodeus were Persian in origin, one must bear in mind that the
names of deities and demons have a long life, extending way beyond
the initial cultural context. Ereshkigal, the Mesopotamian queen of the
Netherworld is still famously invoked in Greek magical papyri and
Pazuzu, a Mesopotamian demon is featured in the movie The Exorcist.
A Jewish example might include the use of semi-divine Gilgamesh as a
name of a giant in the The Book of Giants, a far cry from his character in
Mesopotamian Epic. This seems to be what is happening in Tobit as the
Asmodeus there in no way behaves like his namesake; he is not a figure
of cosmic import; he behaves like the generic evil spirit or demon men-

65 Collins, Daniel, 163-164.
66 Collins, Daniel, 164-165. Winston, Iranian Component, less cautiously speaks
outright of Persian influence, 189-191.
67 Barr, Question of Religious Influence, 216. Barr refers to a demon named Shimadon
that occurs but once in Genesis Rabbah.
68 Barr’s article focuses upon religious influence, thus for him influence is demon-
strated when it accurately reflects the religion of the source culture.
tioned in Tobit’s recipes, with parallels more to Mesopotamia than to Zoroastrian theology. 69

We come now to the question of the dog in Persian culture. Is it unique? It is true that the extremely positive attitude towards the dog is notable in Persian culture. But it is anything but unique. The link between dog and human is one of the deepest and most complex of interspecies relationships. Dogs are thought to have been domesticated as far back as the late Paleolithic period, very likely the first animal in fact to be domesticated. 70 Whether the dog derives from the wolf or from a common ancestor, has been debated. 71 To some extent dogs may have only been partially tamed 72 and the dog thus occupied a complex place as ambassador between wildness and culture, between visible reality and the realm of spirits. Hence its association with the netherworld and its power against evil spirits or demons. The healing lick of the dog also may have led to the attribution of healing powers. 73 I have personally spoken with people with conditions such as epilepsy whose dogs are able to know when a seizure is about to take place before the person does. Anecdotally there are many stories of the healing and even psychic nature of dogs. 74

Throughout the world in past and present, dogs accompany gods (including at least two famous healing gods) and assist with exorcisms. In Maria Leach’s extensive treatment of the dog in world culture, she identifies no less than 76 deities all over the world that are in one way or another connected to dogs. 75 Gods and goddesses that are accompanied by dogs include not only the gods of the Ancient Near East, Egypt, Greece and Rome such as Isis and Osiris, 76 Gula, 77 Artemis, 78 Pan, 79 Hermes, 80 Hephaestus, 81 Asclepius, S (the Shawnee creator god, Nagaicho Central Alaska), Mesomamerica (fictitious), South America (Ai Apaec of Peru), and the Celtic Lugh, 82 the Irish Lugh, 83 and the Celtic Hina (Hawaii), Marvunoger, daklan (Philippines). 84

Dogs can also serve as symbols of deities. The clearest cases of this include the goddess Lakshmi (Armenian mother goddess Lare), Asclepius, 85 as well as To’ahiti of Tahiti, 86 as well as Arouitepia of particular interest as healers.
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(the Shawnee creator god, Nagaicho of the Kato Indians, Sedna of Central Alaska), Mesomameria (the Aztec Xolotl, twin of Quezalcoatl), South America (Ai Apaec of Peru), Asia (Varuna of India, Yamantaka of Buddhist Nepal, Da of Tibet), Europe (the Germanic Hel, the Irish Lugh, and the Celtic Nodens and Nehalennia), Africa (Nyamurairi of the Belgian Congo and the Yoruba Odudua), not to mention Hina (Hawaii), Marvunogero (Papua New Guinea) and Kadakar (Philippines).

Dogs can also serve as symbols of deities or are the manifestation of deities. The clearest cases of this include Anubis, Gula, Marduk, the goddess Lakevann (Armenian mountains), Hecate, the Roman god Lares, Asclepius, as well as Siva, Salveo of Samoa and To’ahiti of Tahiti, as well as Arou of the Yoruba. Gula and Asclepius are of particular interest as healing gods. Gula, the divine doctor,
protected the family and home, including against demons. She is represented by a hound. This hound may be beside her on her throne or may in fact carry her and her throne on its back.\textsuperscript{105} Asclepius was said to have been nursed by a dog as an infant and the dog is also pictured by his throne. Along with the serpent, the dog served as his symbol. Live dogs were placed in temples to Asclepius and were sometimes credited for cures obtained through incubation.\textsuperscript{106} There was also a Celtic healing goddess, Sirona, who was linked with a dog, although all evidence dates from the Roman period.\textsuperscript{107}

Furthermore, extensive studies have been made of Roman/Gaulish culture and Latin literature, where it is quite clear that dogs were of deep religious importance being linked with healing\textsuperscript{108} and also recognized for their ability to protect against evil spirits.\textsuperscript{109} The use of dogs as protection against evil spirits and/or sorcery is also attested in China,\textsuperscript{110} among the Mandan people of North America,\textsuperscript{111} in Dahomey,\textsuperscript{112} and in Europe during the Middle Ages\textsuperscript{113} (299). There is even a folklore motif F405.5.1 of dogs protecting the house against spirits.\textsuperscript{114} In addition to these, dogs are also linked to death and the netherworld (e.g. Cerberus) or venerated in their own right (throughout northern and western India, for example).\textsuperscript{115} Given that the importance of the dog and its powers against evil is both a worldwide phenomenon and attested in a wide range of cultures encountered by Judaism, it would be best not to solely attribute the presence of the dog in Tobit to Persian influence, especially since it is so difficult to demonstrate said influence.\textsuperscript{116}

From the above discussion, one sees that Explanation 7 that links the dog to Gula is relevant information yet not a definitive explanation.

\textsuperscript{105} LEACH, God Had a Dog, 20-21; see also Fuhr Hund als Begleiter, 135-145, which I did not have the opportunity to consult.
\textsuperscript{106} LEACH, God Had a Dog, 24, 76, 183.
\textsuperscript{107} MANAGHAN, Encyclopedia of Celtic Mythology, 132.
\textsuperscript{108} See JENKINS, Role of the Dog.
\textsuperscript{109} See BURRESS, Place of the Dog, 32.
\textsuperscript{110} LEACH, God Had a Dog, 177.
\textsuperscript{111} LEACH, God Had a Dog, 282.
\textsuperscript{112} LEACH, God Had a Dog, 293.
\textsuperscript{113} LEACH, God Had a Dog, 299
\textsuperscript{114} THOMPSON, Motif-index, [accessed online, September 12, 2013] http://www.ruthenia.ru/folkl/omthom/index.htm; an example is given from the folklore of Greenland.
\textsuperscript{115} LEACH, God Had a Dog, 175.
\textsuperscript{116} BARR, Question of Religious Influence: "The fact that a dog goes with Tobias and the angel is hardly evidence of Zoroastrian honoring of the dog."
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This would seem to proceed out of dog helping in exorcism, or helping ag the dog does not exhibit this

\textsuperscript{117} AARNE, Types of the Folk tale.
\textsuperscript{118} Uther, Types of International Folktales.
\textsuperscript{119} Uther, Types of International Folktales, 175. Uther's work the story of Tobit also fits under A the ghost of a corpse aids the hero who has he which a son goes on a quest for father's healing (dragon's body such as the heart is used for heal which a son brings the body past to his father).
\textsuperscript{120} THOMPSON, Motif-index, [accessed online, September ru/folklomthom/index.htm. Thompson not myth, in French Canadian tales and among the B
Gula being linked to a dog is an example of the link between dogs and healing that in all likelihood goes back to Paleolithic times. But even were there some remaining influence of Gula’s cult at the time(s) of Tobit’s composition, one still cannot prove that Gula’s cult is the reason for the dog’s presence, although along with other evidence, the link between the dog and healing is important information.

All in all our examination of Explanations 4, 5, and 6 have revealed that the symbolic and religious associations with dogs are profound but they need not be attributed to a specific culture, especially when evidence of said culture is difficult to otherwise substantiate.

The final explanation is that the dog is a truncation of a more prominent element in a folktales. It is not surprising, given the dog’s significance in world culture, that it would also be prominent in folklore and fairy tale; we have already seen that the dog’s powers against evil spirits is a folklore motif. Many readers may be aware of the Aarne-Thompson Folklore Index cataloguing European tales. This system assigns a number to each type of folktales. The system has more recently been updated by Hans-Jürg Uther and now includes international tales. In the updated ATU system, a notable entry is ATU 300, which refers to tales of dragon-slaying. The theme of dragon/water creature slaying is extremely ancient, notable in Marduk’s defeat of Tiamat, Baal’s defeat of Yam and YHWH’s defeat of Leviathan not to mention all kinds of slaying of monsters and dragons in tales, such as in the story of St. George. As presented in ATU 300, the tale of the dragon slaying almost always includes having the dog as helper in defeating the monster. The particular motif associated with helping dogs is identified in the Sth Thompson Motif-Index as 8.524.1.1.

This would seem to proceed out of the wider cultural idea of the dog helping in exorcism, or helping against the devil. Zimmermann states that the dog does not exhibit this role fully because Asmodeus
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replaces the dragon and is now a spirit, but there is ample evidence that the large fish is equally standing in place of the sea monster/dragon. It would seem that Raphael is doing the job one would expect of the dog. One could almost see the dog as a kind of animal counterpart/emblem of Raphael, just as many ancient gods were associated with animals. The dog always seems to be present when Raphael is also. But there is no way to prove that the dog is tied to the archangel.

Despite the importance of the dog in folktales involving dragon-slaying, the dog in Tobit cannot be linked to a specific folktale. And although it is a strong possibility that the dog may derive from the world of folklore, even that cannot be proven definitively. Like the large fish/sea monster, the dog is an ancient symbol, a figure of many meanings; one cannot ascertain how it figured in the composition of Tobit, for the reason that we are not privy to the composition process nor can we reconstruct it.

It is however noteworthy that the dog in Tobit, although described right before the scene with the fish and although appearing right before a healing, has so little to do compared to what is otherwise described in other cultures and in many other tales. We see this as well in a Slovak-Gypsy dragon-slaying tale in which the hero has a big wise dog, yet the dog is not mentioned elsewhere in the story. For Tobit, however, the dog is not the only muted aspect; the demon is also muted. With Tobit; the reader never is given the opportunity to see where Asmodeus is actually located. Is he in Sarah’s body? How exactly does he kill the seven bridesmaids that have proceeded Tobias? Uther explicitly identifies Tobit as being a version of the Monster’s Bride (ATU 507) also called by some The Dangerous Bride and by others The Poisoned Maiden. ATU 507 typically includes serpents coming out of the princess’s mouth to kill her rescuer and in some versions requires that as part of her cure, the princess be bathed three times. Tobit has Tobiah fumigate the entire bedroom but three Jewish Medieval versions clearly see the demon as in Sarah’s body, when in 8:3 they have the fumigation take place under her clothes. One also sees a similar motif in the Talmud which has what seems to be a strange obsession with snakes climbing into one’s home as a remedy.

A far more ancient case, instead of having the woman is possessed by clear whether or not Sarah’s slaves raises many questions in Tob 6:8 merely speak maining with him or his body, stating that his dog speaks of “hindering” that entails and states that it

Tobit’s presentation is neither depicted as being tim or foe to be pre less scary. It makes Sara’s sexual purity more assuring in control of its “so... can be said about the m be said is that the dog is an outside influence.

An awareness of the and folklore opens up occasion of the dog as a conving and exorcism enrich accompanying healing deity think anew about how the angel Raphael is present and with powers against the dog is present wh gathered as well as just | Such knowledge does not but does add a richer dir

There are other insta add depth to a reading. erature sea creatures we

---

121 ZIMMERMANN, Tobit, 78-79.
122 GROOME, Tobit and Jack, 243.
123 Uther, Types of International Folktales, 291-293.
124 The three versions are Constantinople 1516, Codex Gaster and the Bodleian Aramaic. For more information on these and other Jewish Medieval versions see WEISS/ GATHERCOLE/STUCKENBRUCK, Book of Tobit, 32-46.
125 See for instance, 1 Shabbat 201b, 202a.
126 PORTER, Folklore, 140.
Tobit's Mysterious Canine Revisited

Tobit's mysterious canine, which is often depicted as a big, fierce dog, plays a significant role in the narrative. The dog appears to be a companion and helper, often involved in the healing process. This canine is not only a helper but also a figure of fear, as it is often associated with evil and danger. The presence of the dog in various tales and stories highlights its importance in the narrative, serving as a link between the ancient and the modern.

123 See for instance, J. Shukait, 110a.

124 PORTER, Folklore, 140.
fish is presented, not to mention its association with Jonah. The presence of the salt on the fish similarly is enhanced when one knows of the widely attested magical quality of salt even though the salt in Tobit is not described as having magical properties.

From this, and what we have said about the muted quality of dog, demon, and Sarah's body, one might draw some conclusions about the style of Tobit. In many ways it renders the story a lot less magical than it could have been. There is the ease with which the demon is dispatched and the fact that the medicinal fish organs are combined with prayer, not incantation. There is a matter-of-factness to much of the story and the removal of the demon is a forgone conclusion a little less than halfway through, thus limiting the suspense. A full exploration of this important quality is beyond the scope of this study, but one may suggest that the reduction of the magical was a consequence of the strong focus upon Jewish religion. In any case, the fact that the narrative is so much blander than other tales of its type is of extreme importance to the study of the story as a whole and to the wider project of understanding how Jews have taken upon worldwide motifs yet at the same time have made the stories their own. In terms of the history of Jewish ideas, one might see a similar move, even to a greater extreme, in the treatment of the demonic in priestly writings in the Torah.

Studying the problem of the dog in Tobit has not only revealed fascinating information about dogs in human culture, including Israelite and Jewish culture, it has also led to a wider discussion of the way the narrative of Tobit integrates motifs of the wider world into a Jewish narrative. It seems likely that the narrative would not include a dog in the story if it really were a problem simply because of exposure to a specific text or a specific culture. Indeed, this research has shown that despite the negative language, dogs could have an important place in the larger Israelite and Jewish worlds. Although, we cannot pinpoint a definitive reason for the dog's presence, the existence of other muted elements in the story places the presentation of the dog within a wider context.

---

127 In KTU 1.5.118, Mot's appetite is compared to that of sea monster.
129 ZIMMERMANN, Tobit, 80-81, states outright that the purpose of the salt is magical, particularly against demons. Such a view, although not supportable, shows how a well-versed reader's sensitivities would expect salt to have such powers in Tobit.
130 Cf. Barr, Question of Religious Influence, 217.
131 The boundary between prayer and incantation is not always clear, but is in this case.
Several methodological considerations have also arisen in the course of this study. First of all, it seems very important to keep in mind that an apparent problem in a narrative may be a problem only in the eyes of the interpreter, narrative and cultural conventions exhibited in a text may simply be unfamiliar to the interpreter. Secondly it would seem that any perceived problem in a text based on a claim that some element of culture is despoiled or forbidden (or the opposite) requires careful research to verify said claim.

Thirdly, where there really seems to be a problem, the assumption that an outside influence, be it a text or a culture can definitively explain the presence of the problematic element requires intense scrutiny. One may come to such a conclusion, but only after very careful analysis and research. And even if such a conclusion is made, it is important to keep in mind that the relationship between a text and something outside of it may be dynamic and complex. This is seen for instance in the ways the stories of creation and the flood in Genesis dramatically rework the Mesopotamian traditions they incorporate.

Indeed, sometimes it may not be easy to make a neat separation between internal elements and external elements. Like a living cell, a culture or narrative is constantly taking in and giving out and yesterday’s cultural “borrowing” is tomorrow’s “core culture.” Another image might be of a Möbius strip, a band that seems to have two sides, but really only has one. For example, a culture or narrative might incorporate an element from another source in part because it reminds them of something already present in their own culture.

Fourthly, it would seem that when there is a clear case of a dependence upon an external source, such as the use of Genesis 18 in Tobit, one can generate a great deal of insight through detailed analysis, with the awareness that even if the external text was not available in a fully conscious manner the associations made were nonetheless meaningful. Where there is no such clarity, however, rather than posit direct transmission, something that one may never be able to demonstrate with full confidence, it may be more productive to use the process of comparison, and contrast so as better to situate the element in the target text within the wider web of narrative possibility. For instance, both the Odyssey and Tobit interestingly present the dog as companion to major characters without magical elements, even though dogs have a rich relationship to magic in human history.

Lastly, even when there is a clear case of a relationship between the target text and other narrative, it is entirely possible a simultaneous use of ancient motifs or even other sources is also at work. Again, caution is advised before crafting an all-in-one grand explanation of why some-
thing is so. Like the dog in Tobit, great narratives tend to retain a sense of mysterious. Just when one thinks one understands what is going on, something comes up that surprises, delights, and confounds. And we wouldn’t have it any other way.
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