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MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

These are exciting times at the OI, as we continue to fill positions and hire new people into our community!

First of all, I’m delighted to announce that Matt Welton has accepted the new position of associate director of marketing, communication, and programming. Over the past years and especially during the pandemic, Matt and his team have kept the OI and our research in the public eye by focusing on communication through social media, and they have been very successful at it. With important changes underway, it is ever more important that we have a coordinated strategy for outreach and communication and that we speak with a single voice. Matt will make sure we do!

This past January, we welcomed three new hires to the OI. On January 1, Jana Matuszak came on board as our new professor of Sumerology, filling the vacancy left by Christopher Woods. Her appointment means a substantial strengthening of our cuneiform program as she joins Petra Goedegebuure, Hervé Reculeau, Susanne Paulus, Martha Roth, and myself. A little later, we welcomed Marianna Capeles, who took over from Tauresha Florence as our business administrator, and Marc Maillot, our new chief curator and associate director of the OI Museum. With Marc’s appointment, we have finally filled the gap that Jean Evans left, and I want to thank Kiersten Neumann, who for close to a year took on the busy position of interim chief curator and kept all Museum activities going. Assisted by the entire Museum staff, she (co)curated the beautiful special exhibition of Joseph Lindon Smith’s Persepolis paintings and the current show Making Sense of Marbles, and the next two exhibitions are already being planned and prepared.

Hiring for faculty and staff positions is hard work, so I also want to take this opportunity to express my deep gratitude to the various committees who identified, interviewed, and recommended all of these people as candidates: it takes a community to do this!

Finally, I am very pleased to announce that former volunteer manager Sue Geshwender (see the interview with Sue at the end of this issue) has joined the OI Advisory Council. I am confident that we will profit from her wide management experience both in the corporate world and in a range of not-for-profit organizations. A warm welcome to all!

Our previous issue of News & Notes, no. 252, was dedicated to the memory of the late Robert Ritner, specialist in ancient Egyptian magic. As announced there, we follow up here with several articles on ancient Middle Eastern magic by OI faculty and guest authors: Christopher Faraone on a Greek- and Egyptian-inspired amulet from Palestine, Korshi Dosoo and Sofia Torallas Tovar on a papyrus with a Coptic curse, Kiersten Neumann on an Assyrian offering table, Faraone and Torallas Tovar on so-called grimoires or books of spells, and Petra Goedegebuure on magic in Hittite society. The final contribution by Camille R. Banks on one of our most precious Nubian artifacts, an incense burner from Qustul, belongs here as well. In addition to these articles around the theme of magic, you will also find the second part of Emily Teeter’s article celebrating the centennial of the discovery of Tutankhamun’s tomb.

With all this, the new year is off to a good start—and there is more to come!

THEO VAN DEN HOUT
Director
Marc Maillot joined the OI as associate director and chief curator of the Oriental Institute Museum on January 17, 2023.

Marc comes to the OI from the Sudan National Museum, where he held the position of director of the French Archaeological Unit on behalf of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He received his PhD from the Sorbonne University in Paris. Since 2020, Marc has been director of excavations at the site of Damboya in Sudan. He has also been involved in the organization of several exhibitions, as well as in cultural heritage preservation efforts.

Marc considers this appointment “a motivating challenge to bring a long-term vision to one of the best collections in my discipline.” With a background in Nubian studies and archaeology, Marc looks forward to guiding the OI Museum while connecting the collections to the latest state-of-the-art research in Nubia and reinforcing OI partnerships at an international level.

“The OI Museum staff did an amazing job in renovating the galleries,” Marc says, “and I intend to rely on their expertise to bring some of the best, though not necessarily well-known, artifacts to the academic and public scene. It is necessarily a collective and long-term program, but I can say briefly that I would like to launch a series of exhibitions focused on a thematic approach that will shed light on certain parts of the collection not so often presented and allow a cross-department involvement. The idea is to make the museum a familiar, grounded, and open institution that becomes in time a cultural reflex, like a dictionary, for the constituents of the city.”

When asked about moving to Chicago from the Sudan and Paris, Marc called it “a thrilling experience, and not only for professional reasons. I am eager to dive into a cosmopolitan city, with a proud multicultural identity. I grew up in the suburbs of Paris, and Chicago was a reference for us in the fields of contemporary art, architecture, jazz, and hip-hop.”
ARTIFACTS ALSO DIE

A Special Exhibition
at the OI Museum

Opening April 5, 2023
THE TUTANKHAMUN STATUES

Perhaps the most visible connection between the Oriental Institute and Tutankhamun is the colossal statue of the king that stands at the entrance to the Joseph and Mary Grimshaw Egyptian Gallery. It is one of a pair discovered by Uvo Hölscher in December 1930 during the OI’s excavation of Medinet Habu. The statues were discovered while Howard Carter was still clearing Tutankhamun’s tomb and also during the construction of the OI building in Chicago with its museum, slated to open in December 1931. (The “new” Chicago House in Luxor was also under construction, its opening date coordinated with that of the Chicago headquarters.)

Hölscher discovered the pair of toppled quartzite statues broken into pieces to the north and south of a doorway in the ruined temple of Aye and Horemheb—a temple whose existence had been unknown before 1930. The excavation drew a rebuke from the Egyptian Antiquities Service, which claimed that the University of Chicago was working beyond the perimeters of its concession. On December 20, 1930, Epigraphic Survey director Harold Nelson, who was in charge of the overall mission, received a polite letter from the local authority:

Dear Mr. H. Nelson:

When Monsieur Lacau was at Gurna the day before yesterday, he saw your workmen digging outside the surrounding wall north of the Temple of Medinet Habu. He told me that the digging is out of your concession.

Could I know why your workmen were digging outside your concession and will you be so kind as to order them to stop work until you obtain a permit from the central office.

Chicago argued that the site was within its concession, while Pierre Lacau, the head of the Egyptian Antiquities Service (see Autumn 2022 News & Notes, p. 9), said it was in the area reserved for the French. Eventually, after a good scolding and a lot of paperwork, Chicago was able to continue the excavation.

On Lacau’s orders, the pieces of the two enormous statues were transported (with the help of French archaeologist Émile Baraïze) on carts to Chicago House for safekeeping. Even though Chicago House was not far away, the move took four days. The statues spent the summer of 1931 there. Nelson, whose team was not equipped to deal with such material, wrote: “Just how we are ever going to get them down to Cairo, I do not know.”

The statues themselves became a sensitive issue. OI director James Henry Breasted was hoping to receive a generous division of the finds from Medinet Habu for the new museum in Chicago, and what could be more impressive than a colossal statue of a pharaoh? A potential problem was that Lacau—the official who had enforced the regulation that all the materials from Tutankhamun’s tomb stay in Egypt—was also in charge of the division of finds from Medinet Habu. Breasted worried that the identification of the statues as Tutankhamun worked against Chicago receiving a statue, later summing up the situation: “The name of Tutankhamun is enough to set the river on fire” (Breasted to his son Charles, April 5, 1933).

The Chicago team recognized the Catch-22: If the statue was originally Tutankhamun, Lacau might not let it leave the country. On the other hand, in the 1930s, a colossal statue of Aye or Horemheb (who were then almost unknown to the public) would be more likely to receive an export permit but would lack star power in the new museum. As Nelson wrote to Breasted: “Isn’t this a choice bit of Horemheb, pinched, to be sure, from, possibly, Tutankhamon, though of this latter possibility we are, at present, saying nothing, for we want to get one of the statues for Chicago. Should Tut’s name be mentioned with them, there would be no opportunity of our getting anything” (March 27, 1931).

As OI members know, the statue is inscribed for Horemheb, although traces of the name of his predecessor, Aye, are visible on the back pillar, belt buckle, and base. The team was undecided about the identity of the statue’s original owner. Upon its discovery, Hölscher described it to Breasted as a “giant statue of Horemheb of reddish, hard limestone with transparent painting . . . the name of Horemheb was confirmed. It is situated over the erasure. It is still in doubt who the earlier was—if Ai or Tutankhamen” (December 16, 1930). As it turned out, in March 1933 one of the colossal statues, along with about five thousand other objects from Medinet Habu, was awarded to the Oriental Institute.

But doubts about the original identity of the statue lingered, and in August 1933, Nelson wrote Breasted: “By the way, I am not at all convinced that the statue was originally Tutankhamon. It is in the style of the time, but personally I regret hearing it referred to at the Institute as Tut’s statue.” Although subsequent correspondence refers to the statue as Tutankhamun, in the 1939 publication (Uvo Hölscher, The Excavation of Medinet Habu II, pp. 102, 105), the official word was less than clear, reporting that the two colossal statues were “apparently” commissioned by Tutankhamun but
erected by Aye and finally usurped by Horemheb. Elsewhere in the report, Hölscher comments that “we believe we recognize the youthful Tut’ankhamon” in the features of the face of the Chicago statue, largely because of differences between the faces of the standing statues and those of two seated statues of Aye found at the site in the nineteenth century. The identity of the Chicago statue continues to be debated. The question is complicated because it is essentially about who commissioned the statue (few doubt it was Tut) and who it represents—in short, how far advanced the carving was at the time of Tut’s death. This second consideration is further complicated by the lack of large-scale representations of Tutankhamun and of statues that are reliably original to Aye to which the statue can be compared. Marianne Eaton-Krauss, W. Raymond Johnson, and Marc Gabolde—all distinguished art historians—opt for Aye, while others (including the author, who is not an art historian), identify it as Tutankhamun.

There are other lingering questions about the Chicago statue. One is the possibility that the crown is not original to the statue, an assertion that was included on an OI Education Department information card for visitors some years ago. In the excavation of 1930–31, two large crowns were unearthed, one of quartzite and one of limestone. The limestone crown was assumed to belong to a seated colossal limestone statue inscribed for Aye and usurped by Horemheb, excavated from the same temple in 1845 and now in Berlin, so that crown was sent to Berlin to join it. On December 22, 1933, Breasted reported to T. G. Allen that Heinrich Schäfer of the Berlin Museum had written that the crown “looks very well and makes his statue very impressive. Nevertheless, it does not exactly fit, and it is undoubtedly not the one originally belonging to the Berlin Statue.” Breasted concluded that the wrong crown had been sent to Berlin because the Chicago crown also did not perfectly fit the Chicago statue. However, he commented, “It looks exceedingly well and the difficulty will never be discovered by the average beholder,” and he suggested that they not bother undertaking the huge project of disassembling the statues and trading crowns, “for Schäfer is very much satisfied with his crown and I am not in the least worried about ours. As a matter of scientific history, however, we shall of course have to put the facts on record.” Hölscher joined the conversation shortly afterward, on January 16, 1934, citing the archaeological context to dispel the idea that the crowns were mismatched: “Please note from the enclosed photograph that crown, head with chest as well as torso of the [Chicago] statue were found together, still in the original toppled position, the crown having rolled barely two meters toward the west! The other statue of the same reddish quartzite (which is now in Cairo) lay at a distance of about 20 meters; in it, the head and the bottom section of the crown are interconnected. And no other statues of the same material were found in the Eye Temple. The Berlin statue and crown is composed of white limestone and is even larger than the Chicago one. A mix-up of the crowns is thus impossible.”

Through 1933 and into 1934, there was discussion about whether the one surviving quartzite base excavated by Hölscher belonged to the Chicago or the Cairo statue. Rex Engelbach, then the director
of the Egyptian Museum, thought it did not join the Cairo statue and therefore never ordered its full restoration. But on January 16, 1934, Hölscher, who had already refuted this purported mix-up in several letters, suggested that Engelbach “simply hadn’t looked well enough!” and commented, “It is unfortunate for the Cairo statue that it has now ended up so out of context. Yours in Chicago will certainly make a very different impression. When it has been completely restored, I believe it will be the most imposing Tutenkhamon portrait!”

The statue was installed in the OI Museum in 1933. That April, the museum ordered casts of pieces of the face, base, and kilt of the Cairo colossus to aid in the restoration of the Chicago sculpture. Harold Nelson was in Chicago in August 1933, and he commented on the difficulty of finding an appropriate location for the enormous statue: “I looked over the Museum at the Institute with an eye to the large statue. . . . The ideal arrangement, to my seeing that the bull [the lamassu from Khorsabad] cannot be pastured elsewhere, would be to place the statue at the end of the present Assyrian room [then in the east gallery], turn that room into an Egyptian exhibit, and put the Assyrian stuff where the Egyptian material now is. The only other place possible is to the left or right of the door into the Assyrian room, the door right next to the Bull.” His first suggestion, to move the Mesopotamian collection into the north gallery (which was then Egypt) and to put the Tut statue in the museum’s southeast corner, was very much like the arrangement that was followed in the late 1990s renovation of the galleries. But in the 1930s, the museum followed his second suggestion, and the statue stood to the right of the door into the Assyrian gallery until 1998.

Other Tutankhamun objects were added to the Chicago collection. In 1923, Breasted purchased a wood astronomical instrument (OIM E12144) inscribed for Tut and his “father” (probably his great-grandfather), Thutmose IV. In 1967, the OI purchased a group of 167 pieces of pottery that were deaccessioned from the Metropolitan Museum of Art. This material, originally excavated from pit 54 in the Valley of the Kings in 1907–8, is thought to be from the embalming and funeral of Tutankhamun. The astronomical instrument and a selection of the cache are currently on view in the gallery.

**DOCUMENTING THE MONUMENTS OF TUTANKHAMUN**

The OI’s Epigraphic Survey started documenting the reliefs and inscriptions of Tutankhamun in the Colonnade Hall of Luxor Temple in 1975. The scenes of the Opet Festival in this part of the temple, depicting the great annual procession of the king and gods from Karnak to Luxor and back, are the most extensive and best-preserved documents of the reign of Tutankhamun anywhere in Egypt. Large reliefs of Tutankhamun (usurped by Horemheb) adorn the north end walls of the hall. As part of the documentation, the Survey, then led by W. Raymond Johnson, reconstructed the upper wall registers of the Opet Festival based on more than two thousand blocks and fragments that were recovered around the temple. The scenes preserved on them were reconstructed on paper, and a group in the first register on the east wall was physically restored in 2006. Volumes of *Reliefs and Inscriptions at Luxor Temple* were published in 1994 and 1998, and a third volume is planned.
EXHIBITING TUTANKHAMUN

The first exhibition of objects from the tomb of Tutankhamun in the United States, in 1961–63, was tied to the UNESCO and Center of Documentation in Egypt project to document and save the monuments of Nubia. In 1961, the United States National Committee for the Preservation of the Nubian Monuments was formed with OI Egyptologist (and former director) John Wilson as its executive secretary. Wilson and the committee were instrumental in bringing the first exhibition of objects from Tutankhamun’s tomb to America.

In 1961, Wilson worked with Sarwat Okasha, the Minister of Culture of the United Arab Republic (Egypt), to develop a traveling exhibit of Egyptian artifacts that would garner public interest and financial support for the documentation and preservation of the Nubian monuments. Okasha presented an initial list of 250 Egyptian objects, but as Wilson wrote to John Cooney of the Brooklyn Museum, “I did not see it [the list], but I understand that it was rightly condemned as mediocre and adding nothing to our collections already in this country. In Chicago we went to work on Okasha for a small collection, less than 50 pieces, emphasizing objets d’art and including duplicates from the tomb of Tut-ankh-Amen” (February 20, 1961). Following that meeting, Okasha obtained permission from President Nasser for objects from the tomb of Tutankhamun—objects that had never before left Egypt—to travel to eighteen US cities. Tutankhamun’s Treasures, ultimately composed of thirty-two objects from Tutankhamun’s tomb, three from the tomb of Sho-shenq at Tanis, and an Old Kingdom statue from the collection of the White House, was exhibited in Chicago at the Field Museum and cosponsored by the OI. In a single month (June 15 to July 15, 1962), the show attracted 123,722 visitors. Objects from the collection of the Field Museum and OI, selected and arranged by OI professors Pinhas Delougaz and Helene Kantor, were shown in conjunction with the Tut items.

The first exhibit to be a termed a “blockbuster” was the Tutankhamun show that toured the United States (and also visited Toronto) in commemoration of the US bicentennial in 1976–79. In Chicago, the show was cosponsored by the OI and Field Museum and was exhibited at the Field Museum, which had the infrastructure adequate to handle crowds; indeed, over 1.3 million people visited it between April 15 and August 15, 1977. The show was organized by the National Gallery of Art in Washington as a quasi-diplomatic effort, but Chicago again played an important role: Professor (now emeritus) Edward F. Wente wrote the historical essay that introduced the era of Tutankhamun to the many millions of people who purchased the catalog. David P. Silverman of the OI served as the project Egyptologist. Working with editor Bill Williams of the National Gallery—the first venue—Silverman selected the photos for the panels and wrote the explanatory text and labels for the exhibit that were then used by most of the other cities in the tour. OI conservator Barbara J. Hall accompanied the exhibit throughout its tour, supervising the installation and packing of the objects. The exhibit included funding for an ambitious outreach program that sent OI graduate students to schools, museums, and civic organizations throughout Chicago and the Midwest.

In a bid to bring visitors to Hyde Park, a temporary exhibit was mounted at the OI, presented in the same area as the current special exhibits gallery. The show, The Magic of Egyptian Art, ran from April 15 to August 15, 1977, and was designed by Gary Fedota and curated by Silverman with the assistance of Peter F. Dorman, Emily Teeter, and Joan Rosenberg. It featured objects from the OI’s collection, organized around the themes of writing, religion, portraiture, and the Tutankhamun cache. The show was funded by a $57,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, funds that also provided for the publication of a revised guide to the museum and the special exhibit. Silverman and OI Egyptologist James P. Allen also worked on a partial renovation of the permanent Egyptian collection at the Field Museum to ready it for the Tut crowds.

In 2006, the OI presented an exhibit titled Wonderful Things! The Discovery of the Tomb of Tutankhamun: The Harry Burton Photographs, curated by Emily Teeter. The fifty photos were borrowed from the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Because of copyright issues, the Met produced the catalog for the show with text by Chicago alumni Susan J. Allen and James P. Allen. The exhibit, shown in different forms in New York and Atlanta, sparked a resurgence in interest in the Burton photos for their historic and artistic value. A self-guided tour booklet, The Ancient Near East in the Time of Tutankhamun, was issued to alert visitors to objects in the museum that related to Tut or his times.

Throughout the past century, the OI has played many important roles in the discovery of Tutankhamun’s tomb and the interpretation of its history and treasures for scholars and the public alike.

EMILY TEETER is an Egyptologist, now retired from the Oriental Institute Museum. She thanks Anne Flannery, Oriental Institute archivist, for access to the director’s correspondence, and David P. Silverman, University of Pennsylvania, for his recollections of the Chicago exhibits.

Visitors in line to see the OI-sponsored *The Treasures of Tutankhamun* at the Field Museum, 1977.

David P. Silverman, project Egyptologist for the Chicago presentation of *The Treasures of Tutankhamun* and author of the exhibit’s didactic material.

Floor plan for *The Magic of Egyptian Art* at the Oriental Institute, 1977.


Group of Tutankhamun cache pottery photographed for *The Magic of Egyptian Art*. Photo by Paul Zimanski.
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Nearly forty years ago, the late Robert Ritner published this very worn hematite gem, said to come from Palestine, in the Moritz collection of the OI ("A Uterine Amulet in the Oriental Institute Collection," *JNES* 43 [1984]: 209–21). It is a fairly common type that combines Greek and Egyptian ideas into a single design. At the center is a Greek rendering of a womb as an inverted urn (all that remains now is the sphere in the center and the disk floating below it), with an ancient key further below in the locked position. The womb itself, however, is surmounted by three Egyptian deities—Osiris flanked by Isis and Nephthys—and the whole design is encircled by an ouroboros, a serpent biting its own tail. The serpent, as Ritner pointed out, is either keeping danger away from the womb or possibly preventing the womb from moving about, reflecting the strange Greek idea that the womb could move about the female body and cause pain or even harm. A formula was inscribed on the periphery of the gem outside the snake—it now survives only in the few letters above the snake's head. Ritner was the first to realize that this inscription, the “Sooror-formula,” appeared in another Greek recipe for opening doors to facilitate escape, and he argued convincingly that this gem was probably used to open the mouth of the womb of the woman who wore it, for three possible reasons: to allow the menses to flow freely, to facilitate copulation, or to allow a birth to proceed more easily. In the past few years, we have learned two additional facts that increase our understanding of this gem. First, analysis of the hematite used in amulets found in Caesarea has shown that all of them were made from local hematite, and given the fact that this gem is said to have come from Palestine (S. Amorai-Stark and S. Ilani, “Unpublished Magical Amulets in the Hendler Collection from Caesarea Maritima, Israel, and Reflections on the Origin of the Hematite Raw Materials of the Majority in Natural Israeli Iron Oxide Concretions,” forthcoming), we can probably conclude that it was also made from local stone. Second, until recently the squared-off shape of the originally oval OI gem was attributed to wear and tear, but microscopic examination of the edges of a number of other hematite gems has shown that they were actually carved down on purpose, presumably so that the hematite could be ingested as a popular cure for stomach and bleeding problems (S. Amorai-Stark and S. Ilani, “Magical Gem Amulets from Caesarea Maritima: ‘Intact’ and ‘Broken’ Hematite Intaglios,” in K. Endreffy, A. M. Nagy, and J. Spier, eds., *Magical Gems in Their Contexts*, Rome: L’Erma Di Bretschneider, 2019, pp. 18–27). The fact that the OI gem preserves the full magical word 

A HEMATITE AMULET FOR THE WOMB

by Christopher A. Faraone
The archives of the OI store some magical treasures, among them a tenth- or eleventh-century Coptic curse (OIM E13767), written on paper, to prevent a man named Pharaouō from having intercourse with a woman named Touaen—or indeed anyone (or anything!) else. Instructions for performing this particular ritual are found in another manuscript (P. Bad. V 137 ll. 20–48) and specify that the writing of the text should be accompanied by the burning of white myrrh and frankincense. Similar texts were usually folded and deposited in tombs, and this manuscript shows extensive signs of such folding. Toward the end, the text implies the way the curse can be undone—by finding, unfolding, and reading it again. It was acquired by the OI in 1929 from Bernhard Moritz, director of the Khedival Library in Cairo, who most probably purchased it in Egypt.

“The binding of the sky, the binding of the earth, the binding of the air, the binding of the firmament, the binding of the Pleiades, the binding of the sun, the binding of the moon, the binding of the birds, the binding of the ring of the Father, the binding with which Jesus Christ was bound (?) upon the wood of the cross, the binding of the seven words which Elisha spoke over the head of the saints, whose names are: Psukhou, Khasnai, Khasnai, Thoumi, Anašns, Šourani, Šouranai; let that binding be upon the male member of Pharaouō and his flesh so that you dry it up like wood and make it like a rag upon the dung heap! His penis will not become hard! He will not become erect! He will not ejaculate! He will not have intercourse with Touaein, the daughter of Kamar, nor any woman, nor man, nor beast until I read it, myself! But let the male member of Pharaouō, the son of Kiranpoles, dry up! He will not have intercourse with Touaein, the daughter of Kamar, yea, yea, quickly, quickly!”

In February 1935, the OI Iraq Expedition came upon two robust, pedestal-like objects while excavating an area of the lower town northwest of Citadel Gate A at Dur-Šarrukin (modern Khorsabad), the Assyrian capital city of King Sargon II (r. 722–705 BCE) (figs. 1–3). Fashioned from light-colored stone, their tripod-shaped bases are adorned with three legs carved in relief that terminate in the most elegant of lion’s paws. While neither object’s top was preserved in full, enough remained to speak to their once-circular form with a flat upper surface protruding from the sturdy base. What is more, the intact vertical faces of the objects’ rims displayed cuneiform signs that once formed part of a dedicatory inscription of Sargon to the divine Sibitti, “the Seven” protective gods astrologically associated with the Pleiades star cluster. These skillfully crafted objects once served as offering tables in Assyrian temple practice.

A century before the OI’s discovery in the lower town west of the citadel, the French expedition at Dur-Šarrukin under the direction of Paul-Émile Botta—who led the expedition from 1843 to 1845 accompanied by artist Eugène Flandin—found two solid-stone offering tables of the exact same type and with the same inscription, though better preserved, “thrown on the ground a few steps from the mound of Khorsabad” (Monument de Ninive V, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1850, p. 171) (fig. 4). One of these tables, now exhibited in the Richelieu Room of the Musée du Louvre, gives a more complete account of the dedicatory inscription carved into the rims: “To the Sibitti, warrior(s) without equal, Sargon (II), king of the world, king of Assyria, governor of Babylon, king of the land of Sumer and Akkad, set up and presented (this object)” (E. Frame, “Sargon II 49,” Royal Inscriptions of Sargon II, University Park: Eisenbrauns, 2020).

Of his visit to Dur-Šarrukin a few years later, British archaeologist Austen Henry Layard published the following: “In one or two unexplored parts of the ruins my workmen had found inscribed altars or tripods, similar to that in the Assyrian collection of the Louvre” (Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon, New York: Putnam, 1853, p. 131).

A couple decades following the OI’s expedition at Dur-Šarrukin—that is to say, in the 1950s—the Iraq Directorate General of Antiquities excavated the temple of the Sibitti, a building situated along the outer town wall to the northwest of the city’s principal citadel that had not yet attracted the attention of scientific archaeological excavation. Inside the temple’s cult room (a space that has also been called the antecella), the team uncovered eleven stone offering tables, as well as three additional tables in the neighboring courtyard, all of the exact same type as those previously found by the OI and French expeditions (fig. 5).

Finally, yet another tripod-shaped offering table with circular top and lion’s paws had been discovered around 1850 during the British excavations led by Austen Henry Layard at Kalhu (modern Nimrud), which was the Assyrian capital city prior to Dur-Šarrukin. Here, the table was found flanking the entrance to a secondary cult room (Room c) of the Ninurta temple (fig. 6). A 20 cm recessed hole that was carved into its flat top at some point suggests that the table was repurposed as an incense burner; Julian Reade, curator of the British Museum from 1975 to 2000, proposes that black stains preserved at the bottom of the hole may be traces of bitumen once used to secure a censer in place.

Visual imagery from the Neo-Assyrian period remarkably complements these archaeological examples recovered from Assyrian sites. Representations of such ornate offering tables are most commonly included in scenes of ritualized practice carved in relief on stone wall panels (orthostats) from Assyrian palaces (fig. 7). Here, the tables are shown draped with a tablecloth and laden with vessels and containers—objects that would have held spices, oils, liquid libations, and food offerings such as mirsu, a confection consisting of dates, butter, syrup, and flour—as well as portions of meat and vegetables, all of which were beautifully articulated in low relief by the stone carvers. Additional offering scenes of this type are found on freestanding stone obelisks, bronze bands decorated with repoussé relief that once adorned the wooden doors of Assyrian palaces and temples, and decorated glazed vessels.

From this imagery, and also thanks to preserved textual sources, we know that this style of table was one of the fundamental furnishings for the presentation of offerings to the gods in Assyria—both within the temple, specifically the cult room in front of the divine image on the dais, and in open-air practice, representations of which often show such activities taking place in areas connected to particular natural formations or landscapes, such as the head of the Tigris River. The Akkadian words paššūru and paširu (possibly also
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 12</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>Pot Thickened</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>As Shown</td>
<td>K-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. S. 1194</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cylindrical</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>As Shown</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. S. 1195</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cylindrical</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>As Shown</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 16</td>
<td>D. S. 1196</td>
<td>Bracelet</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>As Shown</td>
<td>Z-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 19</td>
<td>D. S. 1197</td>
<td>Cylindrical</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>As Shown</td>
<td>K-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 19</td>
<td>D. S. 1198</td>
<td>Bracelet</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>As Shown</td>
<td>&quot;F&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 19</td>
<td>D. S. 1199</td>
<td>Bracelet</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>As Shown</td>
<td>&quot;F&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEFT: Figure 6. Watercolor and pencil drawing of a doorway to the Ninurta temple, Kalḫu, by F. Cooper. After Layard, Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon, New York 1853.

BELOW: Figure 7. Carved relief panel showing an offering scene, North Palace of Ashurbanipal, Nineveh, Neo-Assyrian period (ca. 645–640 BCE). British Museum (BM 124886). ©The Trustees of the British Museum.


OPPOSITE RIGHT: Figure 10. Stone offering table from Dur-Šarrukin, on display in the OI Museum’s Assyrian Hall in the twentieth century.
maškittu, though Neo-Assyrian sources seem to correlate this with sacrificial practice and ritualized butchering) are used in reference to tables used for the presentation of offerings to the gods; written logographically, their determinatives suggest something of their material composition—wood and reed, respectively. Additional texts speak of tables made of precious metals.

One can imagine that all of the examples excavated at Dur-Šarrukin, owing to their uniform dedicatory inscription, were once situated together in the Sibitti temple, while the uninscribed example from Kalhu may once have stood in the cult room of one of that city’s temples, prior to being repurposed as an incense burner and stationed at the Ninurta temple doorway. Yet, where do they stand today?

As mentioned, one of the two fashionable stone tables uncovered by the French expedition is displayed in the Richelieu Room of the Musée du Louvre (AO 19900). The table discovered at Kalhu traveled to London to become part of the British Museum collection (BM 118806), though it is not currently on display. Of the tables excavated in the Sibitti temple in the 1950s, five made their way to the Mosul Cultural Museum, joining a comparable rectangular stone offering table (MM 2) with the same style of lion paw legs and a dedicatory inscription to the Sibitti, albeit of the ninth-century King Shalmaneser III; contrastingly, this table was found “within the walls of the plain or ‘chol’ of Nineveh” (J. N. Postgate, *Sumer* 26 [1970]; A. K. Grayson, “Shalmaneser III A.0.102.95,” *Assyrian Rulers of the First Millennium BC II*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996). At the time of the Islamic State’s attack on the Mosul Museum in 2015, four of the tables from Dur-Šarrukin stood in the garden near the entrance to the museum and the fifth was displayed in its entrance hall, while the Nineveh table stood in the Assyrian Gallery, as reported by Paolo Brusasco in his assessment of Assyrian sculptures in the museum collection (*Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 75 [2016]). Also worth noting is that a number of the tables excavated in the 1950s remained at Dur-Šarrukin inside the Sibitti temple, where they still stand today (fig. 8). An additional table from Dur-Šarrukin, with the same inscription to the Sibitti, is part of the Museum of the Ancient Orient in Istanbul, where it is exhibited in the Mesopotamian Hall (fig. 9). Last but certainly not least, following the division of finds that took place at the conclusion of the 1934–35 field season of the OI expedition at Dur-Šarrukin, one of the two tables discovered in the lower town traveled to Baghdad to join the collections of the Iraq Museum (DS 1195) (fig. 1), and the other came to Chicago, joining the collections of the OI Museum (DS 1194; OIM A17547) (fig. 2).

For much of the twentieth century, the offering table in the care of the OI was displayed in the southwest corner of the museum’s east gallery—what was then the Assyrian Hall—alongside a monumental carved threshold and palatial wall panels also from Dur-Šarrukin (fig. 10). When the museum’s exhibition of the Assyrian collection was redone in the 1990s and early 2000s—which included the de-installation and relocation of the relief panels from Dur-Šarrukin to the newly formed Khorsabad Court (situated at the east end of the north gallery) and Assyrian Empire Gallery (the north section of the east gallery)—the offering table was removed from display. Since that time, the table has lived in the museum’s large-objects storage in the lower level of the OI, remaining hopeful that it may one day find its way back to the public galleries where it can help tell the story of Assyrian temple practice.
WHAT IS A GRIMOIRE?

by Christopher A. Faroone and Sofia Tovallas Tovar

A grimoire is a modern word for a book of spells, arcana, and secret sciences. The commonly accepted etymology is from Old French grammair, applied to any book in Latin in the eighteenth century. Today, grimoires feature in fantasy and mystery literature, horror movies, and even cartoons. But how did these books, so iconic in the present-day world of fiction, come about? From antiquity to the present, many cultures have collected and arranged magical knowledge, recipes, rituals, and prayers in formularies or handbooks of magic. These books and recipes systematize traditions of knowledge developed to deal with everyday human concerns, including those related to love, wealth, health, and many other spheres of life.

We know of early magical books and their use in the Greco-Roman period through references in historical and literary texts. The second-century author, Lucian of Samosata, is one of our very few sources about handbooks of magic in antiquity. In a satiric episode in his Lover of Lies (Philopseudes 31) about the exorcism of a haunted house, the Pythagorean character Arignotus brings along his Egyptian books, and when he is attacked by a fearsome ghost, he drives the spirit away with an appalling adjuration in the Egyptian tongue and thereby frees the house from its possession. Here, of course, it is unlikely that our Pythagorean actually could read Demotic Egyptian; rather, when Lucian uses the adjective “Egyptian” in this story, we should understand a “Greco-Egyptian” book with charms filled with strings of vowels and nonce words, but inscribed in the Greek alphabet. Also in the second century, Antonius Diogenes included in his lost novel an Egyptian priest named Paapis, who seems to be healing (and poisoning) people in Tyre armed with “a satchel of books” and an herb chest (attested by Photius, 110a 18–19).

The first book of the Demotic tale Setne Khamwas describes a mysterious book of spells written by Thoth himself and kept in the tomb of a prince named Naneferkaptah. The book itself is not described, but only its circumstances and its powerful aura. The book was kept inside several boxes of iron, copper, and wood and guarded by an eternal serpent. Its contents were apparently just two spells: one to charm the whole universe and understand the language of the birds and fish, and the other to see a theophany of Ra and the Ennead.

Other allusions to magic in the period before the fourth century do not mention specifically books of magic or descriptions thereof, except in references to the burning of books, such as in the biblical Acts of the Apostles 19:17–19, in which some Christians in Ephesus in the first or second century CE denounced their magical practices and “brought their books together and burned them”—books that were worth “fifty thousand pieces of silver.” At least we get some important information about their price.

There are many allusions to magical handbooks in later texts, most of them generated by changes in Roman law. In the Lex CorNELLA, for the first time, those who simply know about the ars magica will be condemned to death, along with the seers. Magical handbooks are forbidden, and their owners proscribed. These laws created a climate of fear that is reflected in Ammianus Marcellinus’s reports (29.1.26 and 29.2.4), according to which wealthy men in the East burned their whole libraries to escape suspicion in the years 371–372 CE. These references suggest that such books were previously available in book markets and libraries, and perhaps they are not mentioned before the fourth century because of their ubiquity.

Other fourth-century texts give us some insight into the production of these books. Ammianus (28.1.26) tells us that the son of a former Roman prefect was executed for writing a book of the “black arts” (noxiarum ratium), and John Chrysostom (Acta Apostolorum, PG 60.274–75) recalls how, as a child in fourth-century Antioch, he watched as a friend discovered a codex floating on the river and...
realized that “magical recipes” were written in it. This anecdote suggests that magical handbooks were being written or at least copied in Antioch despite the Roman ban. The fact that these accusations and arrests continue unabated in Christian times implies the continuing use of such books. When the famous magician Cyprian converted to Christianity, he burned magical books in public, and we get some interesting details from a fifth-century Syriac hagiography (Zacharias Scholasticus’s Life of Severus) that describes a group of law students in Beirut who had acquired a great reputation for magic. Their leader was a student named John the Fuller, a native of Egyptian Thebes, who hid his books of magic under his chair—books that, we are told, contained drawings of daimones, nomina barbarica, and unholy and unfulfillable promises. But he was not the only one: at least four other students in the ring—George from Thessalonica, Chrysosorius of Tralles, Asclepiodotus of Heliopolis, and an unnamed Armenian—“collected magic books from everywhere and shared them” (PO 2:57–59). Books collected “from everywhere” by students in cities all over the eastern empire suggest a kind of interregional traffic in these handbooks.

Finally, there are cases where we can intuit the role of handbooks from the description of the magical procedure. In Jerome’s Life of St. Hilarius of Gaza, we hear how a lovesick young man was rebuffed by a Christian virgin in Gaza and then travelled to Memphis in Egypt to learn how to seduce her with magic. This is what happens next (PL 23.39–40):

After a year of instruction with the prophets of Asclepius (i.e., Imhotep), he returned home. . . . At the home of the young woman, under the threshold, he buried a metal tablet, made of bronze from Cyprus, engraved with various portentous words and potent figures. Immediately the young virgin went crazy.

Unfortunately Jerome does not tell us precisely which words and images were inscribed on the bronze tablet, but the story seems to fit well with the type of elaborate recipes one finds in magical handbooks. The young man was instructed in magic, and he also must have come back with a book or a model for the bronze tablet he created.

Though these historical sources provide us with only sketchy and fragmentary references to the magical handbooks, we have the testimony of the actual handbooks. The corpus of “magical texts” from Egypt—manuscripts written on papyrus, parchment, paper, ostraca, wood, and other materials—attest to private religious practices designed to address all kinds of daily needs and calamities. As vital pieces of information for vernacular religion, they not only provide rich information about the experiences of common individuals but also attest to the transitions from traditional Egyptian religion to Christianity and Islam, the diffusion and interaction of different forms of Christianity, and conceptions of the human and divine worlds.

Egypt’s arid climate has enabled the preservation of organic materials, most importantly papyri, in the sands of the deserts on both sides of the Nile basin. The Theban magical library is the largest known hoard of magical handbooks and includes some of the most famous magical manuals in Greek, Demotic, and Coptic, kept today in libraries in London, Leiden, Berlin, Paris, and Warsaw. Since these manuscripts were acquired through the antiquities market, it is impossible to know the archaeological context of any of them. If they were found together, were they part of a temple library? Were they hidden together in antiquity to avoid proscription and burning? Or were they just secret documents kept away from uninitiated eyes? (Indeed, we do find commands in the handbooks to keep a recipe secret or to share it only with your son!) It is difficult to answer these questions, but these papyri provide an incredibly large source of diverse textual, scribal, and material information to study the transmission of magical knowledge.

It seems, moreover, that most magical handbooks were produced with techniques similar to those used to create other kinds of literature. A comparison of contemporary biblical manuscripts with examples like PGM V (see photo opposite)—a fourth-century codex containing, among other things, procedures to find stolen property—prove that the scribes who produced them had learned and used similar binding techniques, materials, and handwriting styles.

The magical handbooks contain all sorts of recipes and instructions for dealing with everyday crises, including curses, love charms, divination techniques, amulets for protection, and cures for gaining a wide variety of abstract gifts, such as victory, strength, beauty, and sexual charm. As such, these handbooks offer us an extraordinary window into the popular beliefs, rituals, and culture of the inhabitants of Egypt during the Roman empire, and they point to interesting interconnections with other fields of study, such as scribal practices, information storage, and the production of ancient books.
MAGIC IN WESTERN SOCIETY

Magic in Western society is not the domain of organized religion but of witches, sorcerers, and magicians. It does not involve worshipping the creator and ruler of the universe, gathering regularly under the leadership of a church official, or studying the holy books that are the basis of organized religion; rather, it entails fortune-telling, gems that channel energy and protect the wearer, incantations for protection against diseases and evil, and voodoo dolls—in short, acts and objects that serve “to acquire knowledge, power, love, or wealth; to heal or ward off illness or danger; to guarantee productivity or success in an endeavour; to cause harm to an enemy; to reveal information; to induce spiritual transformation; to trick; or to entertain” (Encyclopedia Britannica, bit.ly/BritannicaMagic).

Leaving reform movements aside, faith leaders in organized religion tend to be male, while magic is often associated with women. Denied agency outside the domestic sphere by the Abrahamic religions, women developed alternative ways to gain control. That they did this, or were believed to do so, in nontraditional ways could be reason enough to be associated with the devil and end up on the pyre. It is no coincidence that feminism and nontraditional spirituality often go hand-in-hand in the eyes of both opponents and supporters. The suffragette and women’s rights activist Victoria Woodhull was depicted as Mrs. Satan (fig. 1). Nontraditional forms of spirituality, such as Goddess Spirituality and native and African spirituality, were embraced by second-wave feminists (see Elizette Santana-Caballo, “Goddess Spirituality” and “Women of Color and Native Spirituality,” The Feminist Poetry Movement, bit.ly/FeministPoetryN).

The scholarly differentiation between magic and religion (and science) can be traced back to the colonial late nineteenth century and was created to distinguish European culture from the cultures of Africa, South America, and New Guinea. The distinction itself, and the negative connection of magic with women, is quite old. By the Late Roman Republic (ca. 146–31 bce), superstitio was clearly distinguished from religio. Those who were considered superstitious were thought to believe in all kinds of prophecies, to participate in extreme rituals (especially those related to foreign deities), and to try to learn about their future fate by all means necessary. In his rather misogynistic Satura VI, Juvenal, the Roman poet of the late first to early second century ce, attributed superstition especially to women (trans. A. S. Kline, bit.ly/JuvenalNN):

While the soothsayer from Armenia or Commagene, having

Probed the meaning of a dove’s lungs, will promise a tender


OPPOSITE: Figure 2. Frieze on stag vessel (see fig. 3). Drawing by C. Koken from R. M. Boehmer, “Reliefkeramik von Bogazköy,” as modified by H. Güterbock in Anadolu 22 (1981/1983).
Lover, or a vast inheritance from some childless millionaire; He'll dig into chicken breasts, the guts of a puppy, and now And then a male child; himself reporting what he has done. But even greater faith's placed in the Chaldeans: whatever The astrologer claims, women will believe to have issued Out of Ammon's oasis, the Oracle at Delphi having fallen Silent, and the human race now blind as regards the future. (Sat. VI: 548–56)

But worse is the woman who practices superstition:
Remember always to avoid encountering the kind of woman With a dog-eared almanac in her hands, as if it were an amber worry-bead, who no longer seeks consultations but gives them, Who won't follow her husband to camp, or back home again, If Thrasylus the astrologer's calculations advise against it. When she wishes to take a ride to the first milestone, she'll find The best time to travel in her book; if her eye-corner itches When rubbed, she checks her horoscope before seeking relief; If she's lying in bed ill, the hour appropriate for taking food, It seems, must be one prescribed by that Egyptian, Petosiris. (Sat. VI: 572–81)

Modern scholars of preclassical religion, on the other hand, know how ill advised this distinction between religion and magic is. There is simply no textual evidence for it in Mesopotamia, Egypt, or Hatti. In his seminal book The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 2008), Robert K. Ritner rejected the Western perspective that had nothing to do with what the texts actually showed:

Seen always from a Western perspective, “religion” was to be distinguished from magic by the pious attitude of the practitioner, the humble supplication of its prayers, and the noble, all-inclusive world view of its rituals and theology. In contrast, magic demanded hubris and blasphemy of its devotees, its spells did not beg but threaten, and its goals were immediate, limited, and personal. The limitations of this approach become readily apparent when one attempts to apply it to actual texts. (p. 5)

His return of magic to its proper place in Egyptian culture has inspired my own work on Hittite religion. I dedicate the following observations to Robert, who was taken from us far too soon.

THE PRACTITIONERS OF MAGIC AND THEIR CLIENTS IN HITTITE SOCIETY

As in Egypt, things were quite different in Hittite society. Magic was an integral aspect of religious practice. It functioned next to and was just as important for engaging with the divine world as prayers, vows, and the religious festivals celebrating the gods. And women played a major role in Hittite religion. The queen was the highest-ranking priestess, just as her husband was the highest-ranking priest. Together with priests, priestesses formed the core of the Hittite cult.

Hittite priests and priestesses should not be compared with priests in the Catholic church or Christian ministers in general. Their job was to attend to the needs of the deities, not of humans. They celebrated deities on a regular basis during festivals throughout the year, and they made sure that the statues of the deities in their temples were taken care of on a daily basis. Descriptions and depictions of libations in front of a divine statue are ubiquitous (figs. 2–3).

Religious care for humans was the domain of female and sometimes male ritual practitioners. Royals and commoners alike turned to ritual practitioners and their magic to avoid and undo mischief. Some magical rituals applied only to the royal family, such as rituals for accession to the throne or the death of members of the ruling dynasty, but other rituals dealt with concerns that affected everyone—preventing and curing illness, warding off evil, countering gossip and rumors, stopping domestic violence, protecting mother and child during pregnancy and childbirth, and so forth.

One of the most frequently attested ritual practitioners is the Wise Woman (MUNUS ŠU.GI, literally “Old Woman”). The magical rituals of Wise Women treated a host of issues, such as sickness, depression, and anxiety; they assisted people suffering from slander, victims of sorcery, relatives cursing each other, perpetrators of incest, and those who were bothered by ghosts, all in order to allow their clients and their environment to maintain or restore favorable relationships with the divine world:

Tunnawi, the Wise Woman, speaks as follows: “If a person, either a man or a woman, has put him/herself in any impurity, or someone else has named him/her for impurity, or a woman’s children keep dying, or her fetuses keep miscarrying, if either a man’s or a woman’s body parts are disabled because of a matter of impurity, […]” (KUB 7.53 i 1–6, CTH 409, Tunnawiya's ritual of the river)
Mastigga, woman of Kizzuwatna, speaks as follows: “If a father and a son, or a husband and his wife, or a brother and a sister quarrel, when I bring them together, I treat them as follows: [ . . . ]” (KUB 12.34 i 1–4, CTH 404, Mastigga’s ritual against domestic quarrel)

Wise Women not only cured and protected but also acted as counselors. They advised their clients regarding the correct course of action by divining the will of the gods through an oracle procedure that involved the manipulation of symbols—the KIN oracles (the Hittite reading behind KIN is aniyyatt- “performance”), perhaps a kind of a board game. As a graduate of the University of Chicago’s Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations (NELC), Hannah Marcuson, has shown, Wise Women also acted as advisers to the king in matters of state by using KIN-oracle inquiries for political appointments, accessions to the throne, and military campaigns (Marcuson, “‘Word of the Old Woman’: Studies in Female Ritual Practice in Hittite Anatolia,” University of Chicago PhD diss., 2016).

MAGIC IN ACTION

Magical rituals consisted of the manipulation of symbolic objects, often accompanied by incantations. The combination of manipulation and incantation was believed to effect a change in the world. In the following Old Hittite psychotherapeutic ritual, a Wise Woman manipulates all kinds of objects to cure the royal couple from their anxiety. How the listed objects symbolically affect the royals’ anxieties is unclear to us, but somehow sheaves of barley and emmer extract the negative emotions from their bed, woodpiles from their thrones, cops of colored yarn and a figurine from their bodies, and a cup with a leaden lid from their hearts. At crucial points during the ritual, the Wise Woman uses a performative formula of extraction, without which the ritual manipulations would have been powerless:

When I start removing pain, woe, and anxieties from the king and the queen, the queen gives me five small cops of yarn: one white, one black, one red, one green, and one blue. Along with that there is one piece of wood, with five twigs. I suspend one cop from each twig. There are two small woodpiles. With mud plaster and with lard I form(?) one figurine of clay. There are ears of barley, bound into a sheaf, and ears of emmer, bound into a sheaf. I place all these items in a basket and place them at the headrests of the king and queen. I throw a cloth on top so that no one will see them.

Three thick-breads and a libation vessel with marnu-drink lie (there). When it dawns, a deaf man and I enter (the bedroom) and we pick them up. The king and queen are sitting (on the throne). I stick the cops on their fingers, while holding the brush and the figurine. But as for the woodpiles, one set is placed at the feet of the king and one set is placed at those of the queen.

Then I say to the figurine: “Take the king’s and queen’s pain, woe, and anxieties.” I then single out a cop, still wrapped around their fingers, with the brush. As for the woodpiles, one set is placed at the feet of the king and one set is placed at those of the queen.

I unspool the cop by means of the fingers and the brush. I hold a cup of clay, and the king and queen spit three times into the cup. Its lid is of lead, and I close it. I secretly hold two partoni-birds, and I release them to the branch, scaring the king and queen, while I call out: “I have removed from you pain, woe, and anxieties!”

The text is fragmentary at this point, but it is clear that the Wise Woman brings all ritual materials outside. After that, she addresses the gods:

“I have just removed the pain, woe, and anxieties from the king and the queen. I have removed it from their throne, their bed, their hearts, their bodies. O Sun God of Heaven, [ . . . ], Sun Goddess of the Earth, you too take the pain, woe, and anxieties [of the king] and of the queen. Please give [them . . . ].” (KBo 17.1+ iv 14–40, with duplicate KBo 17.2+ iv 10–51, CTH 416, Four Old Hittite rituals for the royal couple)

Rituals could also be more gruesome—for example, some involve cutting puppies and people in half. Fortunately, these were extreme measures taken in extraordinary circumstances, such as the defeat of an army:

If the troops are defeated by the enemy, then the offerings are prepared behind the river as follows: Behind the river they sever a human, a billy goat, a puppy, (and) a piglet. On one side they set halves and on the other side they set the (other)
halves. But in front (of these) they make a gate of hawthorn and stretch a decoration up over it. Then on one side they burn a fire before the gate (and) on the other side they burn a fire. The troops go through, and when they come alongside the river, they sprinkle water over them (Themselves). (KUB 17.28 iv 45–56, CTH 426, Lustration ritual for a defeated army)

This must have been an utterly awful experience. Not only were the soldiers defeated, but they probably also witnessed a person (presumably a prisoner of war) and some animals being cut in half along the long axis. Then they had to walk through a fire: through a gate with long, sharp thorns “ripping off their sins” (and likely breaking their skin); then again through fire. No wonder they had to douse themselves with water.

Rituals were available to everyone, rich and poor, royal and commoner. Ritual practitioners could take the background of their clients into account. If a client was a commoner or “poor” man (Sum. "MASDA or Hitt. ašiwant-), he carried a smaller financial burden (sometimes substantially smaller) than a wealthier person. Instead of a scape donkey, for example, a poor ritual client could use a clay donkey:

When they are done with eating (and) drinking, the ritual client gets up, and they bring the donkey. But when it concerns a poor man (MASDA), they make a donkey of clay. Next, they turn his eyes toward the country of the enemy and they speak as follows: “You, Iyarri, have caused evil in this country and army. May this donkey lift it and carry it into the country of the enemy.” (KUB 7.54 iii 10’–18’, CTH 425, Ritual against a plague in an army camp, performed by the augur Dandanku from Arzawa)

BLACK MAGIC

Not all forms of magic were acceptable. The Hittites distinguished between magic, for which we do not have the Hittite term, and alwanzatar, which is usually translated as “sorcery.” Another NELC graduate, Ilya Yakubovich, argued convincingly that the root behind alwanzatar ultimately means “foreign, alien.” Black magic or sorcery was perceived as magic that served to alienate its victim from the gods (Yakubovich, “The Luvian Enemy,” Kadmos 47 [2008]: 16–17), and therefore to expose the victim to the anger of the gods. This anger could then result in disease and death, or in bodily or spiritual impurity.

The Hittites were therefore quite afraid of black magic. Several sources from the Old Hittite Kingdom (ca. 1650–1400 BCE) address the problem of alwanzatar. A Hittite law imposed a fine of one mina of silver on any free man who killed a snake while mentioning a person’s name, while a slave who did the same was killed (Harry A. Hoffner, The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition, Leiden: Brill, 1997, p. 136). The Telipinu Edict (ca. 1500 BCE), a major source for the history of the Old Hittite Kingdom that also describes misdeeds within the extended royal family and proclaims countermeasures, required that royal sorcerers be arrested and brought to the palace gate to undergo judgment:

Whoever among the members of the royal family is proficient in sorcery, you seize him from among the family, and bring him to the palace gate. (KUB 11.1 iv 23’–24’, CTH 19, Telipinu proclamation)

The intentions of Telipinu with his edict were noble: among other things, he established rules to prevent the preferred method of succession to the throne—namely, homicide. These rules did not survive him long, and sorcerers were likely not deterred for long either. At least Mursili II (1322–1295 BCE) was convinced that the queen, his stepmother Tawananna, caused the death of his beloved wife Gassulawiya (fig. 4):

She (the queen, Mursili’s stepmother) stands before the gods day and night, and she keeps cursing my wife before the gods. […] She keeps requesting her death: “Let her die!” O gods, my lords, why did you listen to that evil talk? Did my wife in any way harm the queen? Did she in any way demote her? Yet, Tawananna killed her! (KUB 14.4 iii 18–22 (CTH 70, Prayer of Mursili II regarding the crimes of Tawananna)

Black magic did not seem to require special skills. It could be as simple as uttering a curse, casting a spell by mentioning someone’s name while killing a snake, or burying an image with the name of the depicted. But since black magic was forbidden, the palace and temple archives would certainly not have contained tablets carefully laying out the procedures and incantations for harming others.

ONE PERSON’S RELIGION IS ANOTHER’S SUPERSTITION

Juvenal’s description of the soothsayer from Armenia or Comagene studying the entrails of some animal to divine the future is reminiscent of the liver oracles from Bronze Age Anatolia and Mesopotamia. His mention of the puppy, of the person used for magical purposes, and of women practitioners of divination reflect magical practice in Anatolia as well. All these unacceptable forms of engaging with the divine world had been perfectly acceptable 1,500 years earlier in Hittite society. Magic, performed by women and men, was an integral part of Hittite religion, at every level of society.

Figure 4. Modern meme on the role of Mursili II’s stepmother Tawananna in the death of his beloved wife Gassulawiya. Source: sisterofisis; bit.ly/HittiteLove.
MUSEUM ARCHIVES SPOTLIGHT
THE QUSTUL INCENSE BURNER:
A REMNANT OF ANCIENT NUBIAN RITUAL
by Camille R. Banks

During the 1960s, under the direction of Keith C. Seele, Oriental Institute archaeologists excavated cultural sites belonging to the ancient African civilization known as Nubia, also called Kush. Seele and his crew worked to document Nubia’s history and to salvage artifacts before the area was flooded by the construction of the Aswan High Dam and Nubian populations were forcibly uprooted and relocated. One area where OI staff worked was Qustul, located about 180 miles south of Aswan near the present-day border of Egypt and the Sudan. During their excavations there, OI archaeologists found a significant network of cemeteries. Excavations at the Qustul cemeteries unearthed artifacts that showed how ritual was integral to Nubian life. The tombs in the Qustul cemeteries had been looted and destroyed by fire in antiquity, and many valuable items inside had been smashed. Even though these areas were damaged, the number of tombs and the wealth and diversity of materials in them led OI archaeologists to conclude that some cemeteries at Qustul were royal burial sites dedicated to pharaohs and other rulers.

Seele and his staff uncovered a variety of royal tomb objects at the Qustul cemeteries that provide insight into the ritual practices of ancient Nubians. One of these artifacts is the Qustul Incense Burner, found in February 1964 at Tomb L24 and attributed to the Middle A-Group of Nubia. The A-Group (ca. 3800 to 3000 BCE) was a southern neighbor of Egypt’s emerging state and the first powerful culture of northern Nubia. Dated between 3200 and 3000 BCE, the Qustul Incense Burner, also referred to as a “censer,” is one of the earliest-known artifacts to depict the likenesses of Nubian kings. It is composed of indurated clay or limestone, and OI staff found it smashed into pieces that were able to be restored. Not only does the material composition of the Qustul Incense Burner establish it as Nubian, but the images carved into it do as well. Complete with elements once thought to be exclusively Egyptian but now understood as also Nubian, the scenes on the sides of this censer depict the procession of three conjoined boats.

The Qustul Incense Burner bears characteristics that provide evidence for the intermingling of Egyptian and Nubian cultures. Carved in the technique of Nubian rock art, the censer is decorated on the rim with both typical Nubian designs and Egyptian artistic flourishes. The three incised boats carry prominent symbols of royalty and ceremonial standards. It appears that the procession is headed toward a royal palace. The forward boat, the only one equipped with a sail, approaches a niched serekh, or palace facade, and carries a man bound at the elbows and kneeling on a platform. He is held by a cord grasped by a man who holds a mace, the head of which points downward. The boat rests on a ground line, which may indicate that it was pulled up onto a bank. The center boat contains a pharaoh, indicated by the white crown of Upper Egypt that he wears, and has a bent prow (now damaged) and a splayed stern. In front of the crown is a falcon, a symbol of royalty among Nubians and Egyptians. In front of the falcon is a rosette, another symbol of royalty that appeared before the First Dynasty of Egypt and is therefore possibly a Nubian characteristic. Parallel vertical lines that meet at the top in a curve are another feature emblematic of Nubian art. Finally, the rear boat carries a large cat (originally thought to be a baboon) and another falcon on a standard, which indicates that the cat is also a deity. A man standing in front of the boat salutes the feline.

Some rulers of Nubia and Egypt were considered to be ordained by the gods to rule, while others were seen as deities themselves and were therefore worshipped. In addition to the tombs built in reverence of past pharaohs, grand monuments were also erected at Qustul in honor of these rulers. The temple at Gebel Sheikh Suleiman is one such temple that OI archaeologists found. Incense burners were regularly used by priests and priestesses in Nubia and Egypt for religious and other ceremonial purposes, as incense was burned during rituals as a means of summoning the presence and blessings of various deities. The Qustul Incense Burner was most likely used in an ancient Nubian temple during rituals of worship and reverence for the Nubian gods and pharaohs. It is one object of over a thousand pots recovered either whole or in fragments, and of over a hundred stone vessels found. The Qustul Incense Burner is one of a few artifacts on display in the OI’s Robert F. Picken Family Nubian Gallery. Archival documents from the Qustul excavations are also held in the OI Museum Archives.
ABOVE: Archival document recording the location and date of discovery and attribution to the A-Group.
LEFT: Registration card for the Qustul Incense Burner.
BELOW: Qustul Incense Burner on display in the OI Nubian gallery.
OPPOSITE: Detail of lines on the rim.

DESCRIPTION:
ARTIFACT: Stone religious/ceremonial censer
MATERIAL: Limestone, modern restoration
ORIGIN: Qustul, Nubia (Egypt)
DATE: 3200–3000 BCE
DIMENSIONS: H 89 mm × D 152 mm
OIM REGISTRATION NUMBER: E24069 (D. 17527)
LOCATION: Robert F. Picken Family Nubian Gallery
PROGRAMS & EVENTS

BRAIDWOOD VISITING SCHOLAR LECTURE

**Skulls and Animate Houses: The Development of Sedentism and Agriculture in Central Anatolia and the Antecedents of Çatalhöyük; Excavations at Pınarbaşı and Boncuklu in the Konya Plain**

*Wednesday, March 1, 7:00pm | Breasted Hall, and streaming live on the OI YouTube channel*

Douglas Baird, Garstang Chair of Archaeology, University of Liverpool

One of the great things about an archaeological perspective is the ability to examine social developments and social practices at a range of temporal and spatial scales simultaneously. The OI welcomes Douglas Baird for a lecture that explores the development of the Neolithic in the Konya Plain based on approximately twenty years of excavations at the sites of Pınarbaşı and Boncuklu, the latter apparently a direct antecedent of Çatalhöyük. This lecture focuses on the contemporaneous adoption of variable sedentary practices, small-scale cultivation, herding, and in some cases avoidance of farming by early Neolithic communities. The role of the development of distinct community identities within such networks of diverse proximate communities will be evaluated, together with more intimate and specific household and individual histories and identities, rituals, and ancestral practices within these longer-term developments.

Registration is for in-person attendance only. This lecture will also be live-streamed on the OI YouTube channel.


APRIL MEMBERS’ LECTURE

**Do You Believe in Thoth? My Life with an Amiable Ancient Egyptian God**

*Tuesday, April 4, 7:00pm (note the Tuesday date, to accommodate the Passover holiday) | Breasted Hall, and streaming live on the OI YouTube channel*

Richard Jasnow, professor of Egyptology and chair, Department of Near Eastern Studies, Johns Hopkins University

While he does not profess to be a historian of religion, Richard Jasnow has been engaged with Thoth, the Egyptian “god of wisdom,” for the past thirty years. Thoth has an immense range of responsibilities: writing, magic, astronomy, and even time itself. As with all Egyptian deities, Thoth can be difficult if not impossible to pin down—a true shape-shifter. In this talk, Jasnow explores in image and text various aspects of this profoundly approachable god.

Registration is for in-person attendance only. This lecture will also be live-streamed on the OI YouTube channel.

To register, visit: [bit.ly/oiThothApril](http://bit.ly/oiThothApril)

OI MUSEUM GALLERY TALK

**To Restore or Not to Restore—Who Makes the Decision? Restoration at the OI from the 1930s to the Present**

*Thursday, February 23, 12:00pm*

Join Laura D’Alessandro, head of conservation at the OI, for a tour of the museum galleries that will discuss restoration of notable sculptures on display and how the choices made leave a lasting impression on visitors. The last stop on the tour will be a discussion of the restoration work carried out this past summer on the life-sized male statue currently on display in the special exhibition *Making Sense of Marbles: Roman Sculpture at the OI*.


ADULT EDUCATION CLASS

**Explore How Ancient Artists Used Color: Polychromy in Ancient Sculpture**

Sundays, 10:00am–12:00pm, February 26–March 12 | in-person and online, live and recorded

$118 for OI Members; $147 for the general public; $59 for OI Docents; $37 for UChicago/Lab/Charter school students, faculty, and staff. To register, visit: [bit.ly/OICromy](http://bit.ly/OICromy)

Instructors: Tasha Vorderstrasse, PhD, manager, continuing education program, and Alison Whyte, MA, MAC, associate conservator, OI Museum

When we look at sculptures from the ancient world, we tend to forget that we are often missing how they would have originally appeared and been experienced. Increasingly, scholars are discovering the different colors that once decorated three-dimensional statues and reliefs. In this class, we will look at the evidence for polychromy in sculptures at the OI and how researchers have identified colors using different techniques. We will also examine the strategies scholars use in general to reconstruct ancient polychromy on different objects and how this helps us better understand the way people viewed these sculptures in antiquity. We will also specifically discuss the evidence for how textiles were depicted on sculpture and what that tells us about polychromy. Each class will consist of a lecture component and a tour of the OI museum (either in-person or virtual). Virtual attendees should expect the lecture component to last approximately one hour.
The OI celebrates the retirement and contributions of longtime head of OI volunteers, Sue Geshwender.

After starting as a volunteer docent at the Oriental Institute Museum in 2008, Sue Geshwender became the volunteer manager in 2013. When she left that role in 2022, she once again became “just” a volunteer docent. In this Volunteer Spotlight, we ask Sue to share her unique perspective on being a volunteer at the OI Museum.

Can you give us a short summary of your background before you started volunteering at the OI?

After graduating with a degree in business management from Bradley University, I embarked on a career holding management positions in the corporate world. I left that career when our first child was born, staying home to raise our three children in Barrington. I also began my serious volunteering around then, in the Parent–Teacher Organization, Junior Women’s Club (as president), and American Cancer Society (as fundraiser chairman). I also held a few part-time jobs doing bookkeeping, as I loved the order it provided.

How did you hear about the OI Museum?

I was at the Barrington Library reading books on the royal tombs of Ur and ancient Mesopotamia when I saw a picture of the Diyala worshipper statues, and the photo was credited to the Oriental Institute, Chicago. I never knew! The next week I was at the Museum of Science and Industry as a chaperone and went to the OI afterward. I couldn’t believe what I found.

How did you originally become interested in volunteering at the OI? What attracted you about becoming a volunteer?

I took an adult education class taught by then Museum director Geoff Emberling. He suggested I become a volunteer. What particularly attracted me was the chance to learn and dive deep into ancient history, having such close access to some of the most brilliant ancient history scholars in the world, and having a home and making friends with people who loved history as much as I did.

Did you have any interests or training in the ancient Near East prior to becoming a volunteer?

No training—just a love of history, especially ancient Egypt. As a young child, all my goldfish and stuffed animals were named Cleopatra. Every year I was Cleopatra or an ancient Egyptian for Halloween.

Did your initial understanding of the ancient Near East change over the years you were at the OI? If so, what contributed to that change?

Upon reflection, I knew nothing! I learned so much through the OI’s training, being mentored by volunteer managers Terry Friedman and Cathy Duenas, and all the faculty lectures given for Volunteer Days.

What did you enjoy most about being the volunteer manager?

The people! All the volunteers, and the OI faculty and staff. I’m most proud of the volunteer docent training program that was reimagined and implemented in 2015. I had recently completed training to become a docent at the Chicago Architecture Center, which was an intensive, three-month program where I went from knowing nothing about architecture to successfully becoming certified to give a two-hour tour. I knew that model would fit well to what we wanted our OI docents to learn. Former volunteer manager Janet Helman came in and met with me weekly to literally map out eight 8-hour training days over the course of the summer, enlisting the help of faculty, graduate students, and OI docents. Developing, implementing, and maintaining the OI docent training was exhilarating and rewarding—and exhausting! I loved every minute of it. And the best thing in the world was giving tours. So much fun!

What are you personally looking forward to doing at the OI in the coming years?

Giving tours, sitting in on volunteer training, and helping in any way.

What would you say to someone who is thinking about volunteering at the OI?

It is one of the best things I ever did. It has enriched my life beyond measure. When the OI once again accepts applications for the various volunteer positions (you can read about them at bit.ly/OIVolunteers), don’t hesitate! Come join the OI community!
MEMBERSHIP

YOUR PARTNERSHIP MATTERS!
The Oriental Institute depends on members of all levels to support the learning and enrichment programs that make the OI an important—and free—international resource.

As a member, you'll find many unique ways to get closer to the ancient Middle East—including free admission to the Museum and Research Archives, invitations to special events, discounts on programs and tours, and discounts at the OI gift shop.

$50 ANNUAL / $40 SENIOR (65+) INDIVIDUAL
$75 ANNUAL / $65 SENIOR (65+) FAMILY

JOIN OR RENEW
ONLINE: oi.uchicago.edu/member
BY PHONE: 773.702.9513

OI MUSEUM
For visitor information and Museum hours: oi.uchicago.edu/museum