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Fig. 1. Anubis as embalmer, from the coffin of Djehutymose, 625–580 BC (KM 1989.3.1).
I've been fascinated by the ancient Egyptian jackal gods since I was a kid, but I can still remember my ten-year-old disappointment at finding out that the bright yellow book I had bought with a jackal god on the cover (fig. 180) was not, in fact, a book about Anubis. Hopefully the book you hold in your hands now will better live up to its cover.

The initial idea for this exhibition and its catalogue came as I was working on my book on the Kelsey Museum’s coffin of Djehutymose, a priest of the Saite Period (Wilfong 2013a). In choosing images from the coffin and looking for supporting material from the Kelsey collections, I was struck by all the jackal gods I was finding. I wasn't able to use all the material I found in the coffin book, and the idea of doing an exhibition to pursue these gods took root.

Another impetus came during preparations for my 2011–2012 exhibition “Karanis Revealed” (Wilfong and Ferrara 2014). I hadn't expected that this project would involve jackal gods, but they kept coming up—the jackals on the funerary stelae from the site of Terenouthis, the faience jackal head, and, especially, the coffin panel with an image of the jackal god Anubis from Karanis. And dogs kept appearing in archival photographs of the Michigan excavation, something I later wrote about (Wilfong 2013b). Meanwhile, Andrew Ferrara, my assistant on the exhibition, had adopted a replica Anubis head (fig 180) as our office mascot, around which Anubis-themed toys and games (along with a plush Sobek, fig. 177) began to accumulate, as another theme for the present exhibition began to come together.

Early in the research for the exhibition, I kept returning to certain 19th- and early 20th-century books for images and inspiration. In the Kelsey Museum library, I went through facsimiles of wall reliefs and funerary papyri, while in Kelsey Museum storage I explored the Kelsey's copy of the lavish Description de l’Égypte as sources of images of jackal gods, supplemented by vintage volumes in my own collection. Although often outdated in scholarship, these volumes have beautiful illustrations that are, in themselves, works of art and testaments to the printing craft that produced them.
Looking at the 19th- and early 20th-century sources for the jackal gods made me think about what came before. I’ve long been interested in the early dissemination of images of ancient Egypt through the works of 17th-century proto-Egyptologist Athanasius Kircher and, while preparing a lecture on Kircher, came across a jackal god illustration that had a long-lasting impact (fig. 163). My late friend Dominic Montserrat was an avid collector of 17th- and 18th-century prints of Egyptian artifacts, and by chance he had given me one that showed a jackal god in fanciful form, which led me to seek out even more.

My work on the Egyptian jackal gods owes much to the work of Terence DuQuense, an independent scholar who devoted much of his life to the study of these deities. DuQuense’s passion for his subject resulted in an extensive body of authoritative scholarship that is essential reading for anyone interested in Anubis, Wepwawet, and the other Egyptian jackal gods. His unexpected death in April 2014 was a great loss to us all and cut short work on his magnum opus: the planned multivolume Jackal Divinities of Ancient Egypt. The sole volume of this work published to date (DuQuense 2005), along with DuQuesne’s other publications, underlies much of what you will read in the following pages.

My friend Greg Madden has encouraged and supported me in my endeavors, Egyptological and otherwise, for over thirty-five years and counting: this book is for Greg.

T. G. Wilfong
Exhibition Curator
Introduction

Jackal gods are among the most recognizable and vivid symbols of ancient Egypt, but they are rarely considered as distinct individual beings. These canine gods, associated with the dead and the afterlife, are immediately identifiable as “Egyptian” but not so well known or well understood. These “Death Dogs” may seem hostile and fierce to us but were, in fact, protective and helpful to the ancient Egyptians, assisting them from death into the afterlife.

The Egyptian jackal gods were usually represented with jackal heads on human bodies or entirely as animals and, as such, were distinctively Egyptian deities. They served essential functions in the Egyptians’ understanding of what happened after death, acting as guides and protectors in the complex process of reaching the afterlife.

We do not know exactly when and why ancient Egyptians began associating jackals and other canines with funerary gods. But the association began at some point in prehistory, perhaps from observations of these animals’ scavenging habits. Already in the Predynastic period (ca. 5200–3100 BC), jackals had become identifiable symbols of the gods of specific towns, and they appear in some of the earliest written documents to survive from Egypt. They are among the earliest funerary gods in Egypt and remain prominent symbols in Egyptian religion for more than 3,000 years.

Through ancient Egyptian artifacts from the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology and the University of Michigan Library Papyrology Collection, this exhibition explores the changing roles and identities of these jackal gods in Egyptian belief and practice, using more recent images and objects from the 17th century to the present to follow these gods into the modern world. Although not physically a part of the exhibition, the Kelsey Museum’s elaborately decorated coffin of Djehutymose (an Egyptian priest who died around the years 625–580 BC) supplies imagery used throughout the exhibition and this publication to show details of how the jackal gods appear on this coffin:
Fig. 2: Jackal gods in a procession: Anubis (left) and Duamutef (right), from the coffin of Djehutymose, 625–580 BC (KM 1989.3.1)

The coffin of Djehutymose, a priest of Horus of Edfu
Wood, gesso, paint; 181.25 cm h., 52.5 cm w. (widest), 54 cm d. (deepest)
Ca. 625–580 BC
Nag el-Hassiya, Egypt
Donation of Albert M. Todd
KM 1989.3.1
Figs. 1–2, 21, 29–30, 34, 46, 54–58, 69, 71, 85, 87, 92
**Jackal God Places**

The jackal gods were worshipped throughout Egypt. This map shows some of the more important centers, as well as the places where objects in this exhibition were made or found.
Jackal, Dog, Wolf, or Fox: What Is This Sacred Animal?

Egyptian representations of the canine animal associated with funerary gods are remarkably consistent, but the precise identity of these animals is hard to determine (see Osborn 1998, 55–79 for a summary). They most closely resemble jackals in form and size (the golden jackal, *Canis aureus*, being the jackal known to the ancient Egyptians), but the black coloring typical of the sacred animal does not appear in any jackal found in ancient Egypt.

The Greeks and Romans often called these animals dogs or wolves. Wolves were not present in Egypt, although the Egyptians certainly had domestic dogs as pets, work animals, and wild strays (Brewer et al. 2001, 28–48). But Egyptian representations of dogs do not correspond directly to their representations of the sacred animal. One scholar suggests that the animals were foxes, which did exist in Egypt (Osborn 1998, 78–79), but foxes did not
reach the size of the sacred animals depicted in Egyptian art or regularly show their black color. What is clear is that, although the jackal is the closest, no single canine embodies all the features of the Egyptian sacred animal.

This ambiguity about the sacred animal is probably intentional since Egyptian representations of animals are usually specific and identifiable. Dogs, for example, appear as distinct breeds that resemble modern salukis, basenjis, and Pharaoh hounds (fig. 5), and jackals are definitely intended in some representations (fig. 4). Egyptians did differentiate between images of dogs and jackals, such as in the gaming pieces of the ancient Egyptian board game known by the modern name “Hounds and Jackals” (fig. 7). Rather than being a specific species found in nature, the sacred canine of the ancient Egyptians was, instead, a mythical animal: a black jackal-like creature, combining features of jackals, dogs, and even foxes, whose gods could be represented by any of these canines.

Jackal figure from coffin or canopic chest
Wood, paint; 22.5 cm l., 10 cm h. at ears, 5 cm w., 10 cm l. tail
Late Period (26th–30th Dynasty, 664–332 BC)
Egypt
Bay View Association Collection purchase, 1971
This figure of a couchant black jackal is a classic representation of the mythical beast sacred to many Egyptian gods, and is most likely intended to be specific to the god Anubis. Such images of black jackals with long ears and tails are common in two-dimensional art in Egypt, and sculptural representations of them like the present object were also common elements of Egyptian burials.

The Egyptians placed images of jackals like the present example into tombs in a variety of ways. In the New Kingdom, royal and elite burial equipment often featured a larger image of a jackal sitting on a shrine. The best known example is the large wood and gilt figure from the tomb of the 18th Dynasty king Tutankhamun (fig. 171), but such figures also featured in private burials of the period as well, as can be seen in representations of funerary processions from illustrated copies of the Book of the Dead (fig. 11). The New Kingdom also saw the placement of smaller jackal figures in niches in tomb walls in association with “magical bricks,” as detailed in Book of the Dead chapter 151 (Allen 1974, 149). The Kelsey Museum’s jackal figure is later than these examples, probably Late Period (664–332 BC), and would have
rested on some essential piece of burial equipment, like a coffin or a chest containing canopic jars (Aston 2009, 299–302 and 389 for such uses in earlier periods). The placement of such a figure can be seen in the 21st Dynasty canopic chest of Queen Nodjmet (fig. 12), where the jackal is situated so that its tail would hang over the edge of the chest. The Kelsey Museum figure does not have an obvious hole on its underside for pegging it to a chest or coffin, although there is an area of damage beneath the front part of the jackal that might have once contained such a hole.

This jackal, along with other objects in this exhibition (6, 11), came to the Kelsey Museum in 1971 with its purchase of the Bay View Association Collection, an assemblage acquired, for the most part, in Egypt in the late 19th century by Rev. Camden M. Cobern for display in a biblically oriented museum in Bay View, Michigan. The acquisition of the Bay View Association Collection was a major addition to the Kelsey Museum’s holdings, providing an important supplement of Dynastic Egyptian material to the museum’s extensive collection of Graeco-Roman period artifacts from Egypt. (For more about the Bay View Association Collection and the other sources of Kelsey Museum artifacts, see Talalay and Root forthcoming.)

Dog skull with skin and eyes
15.0 cm l., 8.5 cm h., 8.6 cm w.
Domestic dogs were an important part of life in ancient Egypt, and even when they were not specifically tied to the jackal gods, they were still sometimes regarded as kindred animals. This skull of a small domestic dog comes from the village of Karanis in the Fayum, a small agricultural community in the Graeco-Roman period excavated by the University of Michigan from 1924 to 1935. Over eleven years of excavation, the Michigan team found more than 68,000 artifacts, of which more than 45,000 were ceded to the University of Michigan by the Egyptian government in a division of finds. The Karanis material forms a major component of the Kelsey Museum’s collection, its value greatly enhanced by the wealth of contextual information recorded by the excavators.

Karanis inhabitants kept dogs as pets and work animals, and images of such dogs do survive (figs. 16, 131–133 of object 37 below). But wild, stray
dogs would also have been a ubiquitous part of life in Graeco-Roman Egypt (much as they are in many parts of Egypt to this day), and the present skull is most likely that of a stray dog. It comes from a context likely to have been a dumping area in a later level of the site and was not specifically treated or buried as a pet might have been. In spite of this neglect, the level of preservation in this specimen is extraordinary, with skin and eyes still largely intact and the skin showing a lighter brown coat with a darker nose. Other dog remains survive from Karanis—the remains of more stray dogs (fig. 15, for example), as well as a dog bone used for magical purposes (see object 33 below). Dogs also played a part in the lives of the Michigan excavators at Karanis (Wilfong 2013b and fig. 17).

Fig. 16: Object 37 (see below for details): ceramic dog figurine from Karanis (KM 6909)

Fig. 17: Plupy, one of the household pets of the Michigan Karanis expedition, photographed in an ancient stone mill outside the dig house (Kelsey Museum archival photograph, neg. 327)
Introducing the Jackal Gods

The ancient Egyptians worshipped a number of gods associated with the mythical black jackal, all of whom were connected to death and the afterlife. Only a few of these gods were well known even to the Egyptians: Anubis, Wepwawet, and Duamutef. But many other jackal gods were revered in ancient Egypt (including such gods as Wepiu, Sed, and Igai, for whom see...

The Egyptian jackal gods were nearly all male. Female jackal gods are rare and most often existed in relation to male deities: Anupet as wife of Anubis (DuQuesne 2005, 402–404) and Qebehut as his daughter (DuQuesne 2005, 409–411) are presumed to be jackal gods as well. There are only rare instances of independent female jackal deities like Hereret (DuQuesne 2005, 404–406). The roles and activities of the jackal gods largely reflect male gender roles in Egyptian society.

The jackal god Khentiamentiu is an unusual case of a god who was ultimately subsumed into another deity (DuQuesne 2005, 384–389). He began as an important early jackal god associated with death at Abydos, but his functions competed with the rising funerary god Osiris. Through a process not entirely understood or documented, Khentiamentiu was merged with Osiris, losing his independent identity entirely. However, he did survive in a way: his name became a title of Osiris that lasted for more than 2,000 years (fig. 21).

Most Egyptian gods had their origins in local cults of prehistoric times, each local god being identified with a locally significant symbol, often an animal, and having its own traditions and origin stories. As local tribal
groups in Egypt began to coalesce in the Predynastic Period (ca. 5300–3100 BC), these local gods were brought together into larger systems of beliefs and practices. By the point at which Egypt united as a single political entity, sometime around the year 3100 BC, local religious traditions had come together into a single religious system: some local gods were brought into national significance, while others disappeared or were subsumed in other traditions. To some extent, the origins, antecedents, functions, and iconography of the various gods brought together in this way were harmonized and made part of a larger story. But the Egyptian religious system accommodated many variant traditions and ideas about their gods; they were largely comfortable with a system that, to us in the present, seems riddled with contradictions and conflicts. And Egyptian religion, as well as the roles and identities of its gods, continued to evolve over 3,000 years of Egyptian history. The jackal gods are part of this story: their origins, functions, and even identities changed and evolved over time.
Names and Iconography of the Most Important Jackal Gods

ANUBIS (Greek form of the name, original Egyptian more like Anoub or Anoup)

_Name means:_ possibly derived from the similar word for “puppy” and/or related to another similar word for “prince,” a reference to Anubis’s status as son of Osiris (DuQuense 2005, 367–368).

_Typical iconography:_

Anubis is also sometimes represented by the “Imiut,” a symbol of an animal skin on a stand (Köhler 1975):

WEPWAWET

_Name means:_ “Opener of the ways”

_Typical iconography:_

DUAMUTEF

_Name means:_ “He who adores his mother”

_Typical iconography:_

KHENTIAMENTIU

_Name means:_ “Foremost of the Westerners”

_Possible iconography:_

Images that can be definitely identified as Khentiamentiu are unknown, but his name is sometimes determined with this hieroglyph (DuQuesne 2005, 386).
The Jackal Gods at Abydos

The University of Michigan’s Abydos Middle Cemetery project, led by Kelsey Museum Curator Janet Richards and involving Kelsey Museum staff and Michigan students and alumni, reveals Egyptian jackal gods at an important period of transition. The Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period remains excavated and recorded by the Michigan team provide a window onto the changing roles of Egyptian funerary deities, including the jackal gods Anubis.
and Khentiamentiu, set against the backdrop of one of the most important mortuary landscapes in ancient Egypt. Old Kingdom tomb chambers excavated by the Michigan team show the demotion of Khentiamentiu in favor of Osiris, while First Intermediate Period votive activity at an Old Kingdom tomb demonstrates ongoing devotions to Anubis at Abydos.

These images from Michigan’s Abydos Middle Cemetery project show the kinds of evidence that Janet Richards and her team are finding for the jackal gods of Abydos.
Fig. 26: Inner lintel inscription describing the deceased as “revered before Anubis,” Tomb of Idy [6th Dynasty (ca. 2300–2181 BC)], Abydos Middle Cemetery (image courtesy of the Abydos Middle Cemetery Project)

Fig. 27: First Intermediate Period (ca. 2181–2025 BC) votive stela (as found) with offering inscription invoking Anubis, votive area east of Idy Tomb, Abydos Middle Cemetery (image courtesy of the Abydos Middle Cemetery Project)

Fig. 28: First Intermediate Period (ca. 2181–2025 BC) votive stela with offering inscription invoking Anubis, votive area east of Idy Tomb, Abydos Middle Cemetery (image courtesy of the Abydos Middle Cemetery Project)
Anubis: Embalmer and Protector of the Dead

Anubis is the best known of the Egyptian jackal gods, in part because of his importance both locally, as a god associated with specific towns, and nationally, as a god playing a central role in the Egyptians’ understanding of death. (For a summary of what is known about Anubis in earlier periods, see DuQuesne 2005, 367–384; for Anubis in later times, see Durisch-Gauthier 2002.) Anubis played a crucial role in the processes through which every person hoped to survive death and live on in the afterlife: he was in charge of the preservation of the dead body, essential in the Egyptian conception of life after death. Anubis functioned as divine embalmer, and the priests who supervised the mummification of the dead would wear masks of Anubis to stand in for the god. This divine impersonation extended to the funeral for the dead, where Anubis (in the form of a disguised priest) would present the mummy for essential ceremonies.

Beyond his specific roles in mummification and burial, Anubis had more general duties for the overall protection of the dead. Protective images of Anubis on coffins and in the form of amulets worn by the dead invoked the god’s powers on behalf of the deceased. The proliferation of Anubis images around the dead attest to the hopes the Egyptians placed in him as a protector after death.

Anubis was active not only in embalming and burial but also in the post-mortem judgment of the dead. In Egyptian belief, the spirit of the deceased went on a dangerous journey to a final judgment. In the course of this judgment, the dead person’s heart—the seat of memory and identity—was weighed against a feather representing the Egyptian concept of truth and order. Anubis supervised the weighing of the heart, checking the balance of the scales and making sure the weighing was fair. At a crucial point in this process, described in Book of the Dead chapter 125A, Anubis vouched for the deceased, and he did so in terms that invoked his canine nature. In front of the council of the gods, Anubis would say that he had sniffed the dead person, who smelled like the gods and belonged in their circle. He would go on to ask the deceased some final questions and, when these were successfully answered, allowed the deceased to pass (Allen 1974, 101–102).

Alongside his duties toward the dead, Anubis is also involved in the central Egyptian institution of kingship. Although not a primary god of...
kingship like Horus, Anubis carried out a number of supporting duties. Many of these, of course, involved the death, embalming, and afterlife of the king—as early as the Old Kingdom, Anubis protects and guides the dead king, as documented in the Pyramid Texts (summarized in DuQuense 2005, 380–384). In royal burials, such as the nearly intact New Kingdom tomb of Tutankhamun (ca. 1333–1323 BC, fig. 171), Anubis features prominently in representations on tomb walls and in burial equipment, while one of the divisions of the Book of Caverns, a text found in New Kingdom royal tombs, is characterized as “The Cavern of Anubis” (Piankoff 1954, 1:105–106). But the roles of Anubis with regard to the king are not limited to death: he also assists in the king’s life. In the New Kingdom account of the divine birth of Hatshepsut, for example, Anubis assists in the complex processes surrounding the transmission of kingly divinity (fig. 33 and see Brunner 1964, 153–166). And Anubis himself takes on kingly attributes: in Ptolemaic temple reliefs he is frequently represented with royal crowns (fig. 97), and the accompanying texts attest to Anubis’s complex and ongoing roles in the theology and processes of kingship in Egypt (Durisch-Gauthier 2002, 297).
Fig. 33: Anubis rolling the disk of the moon, from the divine birth story of Hatshepsut (ca. 1473–1458 BC), from her temple at Deir el Bahri (Naville 1896, pl. 55)

Fig. 34: Anubis embalming a mummy, from the coffin of Djehutymose, 625–580 BC (KM 1989.3.1)
Anubis amulet
Faience; 4.4 cm h., 2.0 cm l., 0.8 cm w.
Late–Ptolemaic Periods (664–30 BC)
Fayum, Egypt
David Askren Collection purchase, 1925
KM 23431
Unpublished
Fig. 35

Anubis amulet
Faience; 3.7 cm h., 1.4 cm l., 0.6 cm w.
Late–Ptolemaic Periods (664–30 BC)
Fayum, Egypt
David Askren Collection purchase, 1925
KM 23433
Unpublished
Fig. 36

Anubis amulet
Faience; 4.5 cm h., 1.8 cm l., 1.0 cm w.
Late–Ptolemaic Periods (664–30 BC)
Fayum, Egypt

Fig. 35: Object 3: Faience Anubis amulet
Fig. 36: Object 4: Faience Anubis amulet
Fig. 37: Object 5: Faience Anubis amulet
Amulets of a standing, striding Anubis with a human body and jackal head were common in the Late and Ptolemaic periods. The Kelsey Museum has a number of examples of these amulets made of faience (a mineral compound fired and glazed like ceramic that most often takes on a classic blue-green color) the best preserved of which are featured in the exhibition. (See figs. 38–41 for other examples in the collection, and note the parallels in Petrie 1972, 42 and pl. 36, no. 197h and Andrews 1994, 24, fig. 20b.) These amulets depict Anubis striding, wearing the kilt common to most male gods. Such amulets were mold-made, although sometimes bearing signs of hand finishing. They vary considerably in detail and quality. Amulets such as these would have been worn by people in life and also placed on mummies for afterlife protection. They could show devotion to a god while invoking the particular god’s protection.

Objects 3–5 and another example illustrated here came to the Kelsey Museum as part of its acquisition of the collection of David L. Askren in 1925, the source of a number of other artifacts in the present exhibition (9–10, 14–22, 22, 25). Askren was an American doctor resident in the Fayum who assisted Michigan faculty in their collecting activities and archaeological excavations. (For more information about Askren and his collection at the Kelsey Museum, see Talalay and Root forthcoming.)

Anubis amulet
Bronze; 5.7 cm h., 2.3 cm l., 1.7 cm w.
Late–Ptolemaic Periods (664–30 BC)
Egypt
Bay View Association Collection purchase, 1971
KM 1971.2.141
Published: Richards and Wilfong 1995, 16 (no. I.12)
Fig. 42

Bronze figures of Egyptian gods were common in the later periods, and many such figures of Anubis survive. Such figures would be left at temple
altars as votive offerings: as such figures accumulated, they would periodically be cleared away to make room for newer figures. The old figures would ultimately be buried in caches associated with the temples, and these caches form the source of the majority of these figures that survive today.

This bronze jackal could have been used as a votive offering, but since it is small and bears a loop for suspension, it is much more likely that the figure was worn as an amulet. Bronze amulets are less common than faience ones, being more expensive, and are more likely to have been worn in life rather than used as funerary amulets on mummies. (Note the parallels in Petrie 1972, 42 and pl. 36, nos. 197c and especially d.)

The jackal god Anubis was closely involved in the final judgment of the dead, as documented in the Egyptian Book of the Dead, and illustrations from the classic New Kingdom papyri show his most visible involvements (fig. 31). This papyrus fragment in the Kelsey Museum shows a subtler jackal god presence, in the form of a jackal god seated as part of a group of judging gods. The main focus of the fragment is a figure of the goddess Ma’at, personification of the ancient Egyptian ideal of order and rightness. Ma’at was the standard by which the dead person was judged. She wears the feather that is her symbol upon her head; she accompanies the person for whom the papyrus was made, identifiable in the fragment by his upraised arm (the coloring of the arm allows us to tell that the papyrus was made for a man—a darker brown in contrast to the lighter color of Ma’at’s skin). The fact that the dead man’s arm is raised is significant: this is a gesture of both prayer and triumph, a sign that the deceased has successfully passed through his judgment. Above the scene sit the judges, including the jackal-headed figure at the top left that must represent Anubis (fig. 43). Anubis would have appeared
more prominently in the missing portions of the scene, assisting with the weighing of the heart.

This papyrus came to the Kelsey Museum in 1981 as part of the donation of the collection of Samuel A. Goudsmit, a renowned physicist who was, for many years, a professor at the University of Michigan. Goudsmit was also a passionate amateur Egyptologist, collecting a number of artifacts in the course of his travels. Thanks to the generosity of his daughter, scientist Esther Goudsmit, the bulk of his collection came to the Kelsey Museum after his death in 1978 (including 24 and fig. 91 below). The Goudsmit collection proved to be an important addition to the Kelsey’s holdings, in particular providing essential examples of Egyptian language funerary papyri and inscriptions. (For more information on the Goudsmit collection, see Root 1982 and Talalay and Root forthcoming.)

8 Jackal with human arms: mold for a figure, amulet, or inlay
Stone; 7.8 cm l., 6.1 cm h., 1.3 cm w.
Ptolemaic Period (332–30 BC)
Egypt
A. E. R. Boak donation
KM 88208
This object, a small tablet of stone bearing a deep carving of a couch-ant jackal facing left, is likely a symbol of Anubis. Unusually, this jackal has human arms and hands. The style of the carving suggests a late date for the piece. The background is gridded—Egyptian art was built on a strict grid system, which allowed for a very specific canon of proportions and also assisted in the reproducibility of images. On this piece, the grid may have helped the artist lay out the image for carving, but it may also suggest that this image was a model for reproduction. Above the jackal’s back is a hole, but this hole does not go all the way through.

This cryptic artifact has historically been interpreted as a mold for a terracotta or bronze figure; presumably there would have been a corresponding back half of the mold, with the two pieces aligned using the hole above the jackal’s back. An alternate interpretation would be to see this as a mold for a faience amulet: the image is the correct size for an amulet, but there is no obvious provision for a suspension loop. Another, and perhaps the most likely, possibility is that this was a mold for a glass inlay. Two glass jackals of similar style from the Fayum (although with regular jackal arms and paws) in the Cairo Museum are both published as amulets, although they lack obvious loops or holes for suspension (Cairo 13369-79 in Reisner 1958, 107 and pl. XVI). Another similar amulet in the same group displays clear signs of its manufacture: the back shows traces of the still-pliable glass having been tamped into a mold with a stick (Cairo 13121 in Reisner 1958, 80 and pl. XIII). These figures, whether amulets or inlays, would have been made in a mold like the present piece. In any of these interpretations, the guideline grid might have permitted the carver to reproduce the design easily from an existing model.

This piece was acquired by A. E. R. Boak in Egypt and donated to the Kelsey Museum. Boak was an ancient historian specializing in the history of the Roman world and a longtime professor at the University of Michigan (1914–1962). In addition to his many important publications in Roman history, Boak also contributed greatly to the Kelsey Museum’s work at Karanis and Soknopaiou Nesos, acting as author or coauthor for the reports on the Michigan expedition to these sites. Boak also acquired the papyrus below, now in the University of Michigan Library Papyrology Collection.
Wepwawet: Opener of the Ways

As “Opener of the Ways,” Wepwawet helped the deceased through the frequently dangerous paths to the afterlife, clearing the way to the final judgment of the dead. (For Wepwawet in the earlier periods, see DuQuesne 2005, 390–397.) Although frequently paired with Anubis in connection with protecting the dead, Wepwawet also had his own independent identity, as well as important cult centers at Lykopolis (“Wolftown”) and Abydos (Pouls Wegner 2007). An extensive trove of devotional stelae and related items from Lykopolis attests to Wepwawet’s status as beloved local god (DuQuense et al. 2007; 2009). On his own, Wepwawet often appears as a standing jackal or standing jackal-headed god; when he and Anubis are paired in funerary art, the two gods are typically shown as identical seated jackals facing each other.

Fig. 46: Wepwawet, from the coffin of Djehutymose, 625–580 BC (KM 1989.3.1)

Fig. 47: Mummy cartonnage showing jackals representing Anubis and Wepwawet (Description de l’Égypte 1809–1821, 5:89)
9  

Wepwawet amulet  
Bronze; 3.5 cm h., 3.5 cm w., 0.6 cm d.  
Late–Ptolemaic Periods (664–30 BC)  
Fayum, Egypt  
David Askren Collection purchase, 1925  
KM 3142  
Unpublished  
Fig. 48

This small bronze amulet provides a classic representation of Wepwawet, in animal form. The most common easily identifiable amulets of Wepwawet show him as a standing jackal, often atop a standard. This amulet is particularly fine, with good detail; such Wepwawet amulets could be much simpler (for which see object 34 below and note the range in Petrie 1972, 46 and pl. 39, nos. 229a–d; Andrews 1994, 25 and fig. 21c).

10  

Coffin panel showing two jackals (Anubis and Wepwawet) and goddess  
Wood, paint; 27.5 cm w., 15.6 cm h., 0.8 cm d.  
Ptolemaic Period (332–30 BC)  
Egypt  
David Askren Collection purchase, 1925  
KM 88725  
Published: Wilfong 2013a, 49 (fig. 90)  
Figs. 49–50, 52–53

When two jackals are shown together in Egyptian art, the assumption is usually that they represent Anubis and Wepwawet, as on this Ptolemaic panel from a coffin. These jackals sit atop pylons, facing a shrine with bolted doors (perhaps a shrine for divine images as seen with object 39 below). Below the jackals is a goddess who could be either Isis or (more likely) Nut, with her winged arms outstretched, in a panel from the chest or foot area of a coffin. Images of two facing jackals like this are extremely common in later Egyptian funerary art (see the examples from Roman period funerary stelae below, objects 40–41 and fig. 51). These joint images of Anubis and Wepwawet emphasize their collaborative work in protecting the deceased on the journey from death to judgment and afterlife.
This object is part of a project in which conservators at the Kelsey Museum are using multispectral imaging (MSI) to document and characterize ancient pigments. MSI utilizes different light sources and camera lens filters to capture the reflectance and luminescence phenomena of paint surfaces. One technique, visible-induced infrared luminescence (or VIL) imaging, can be used to identify Egyptian blue, a pigment manufactured by the Egyptians that luminesces at a specific wavelength in the infrared (figs. 52–53). (Thanks to Caroline Roberts for information about this project and her images of the results.)
Duamutef: Canopic God, Son of Horus

Although Anubis is the best known of the jackal gods, Duamutef may be the one that we most often see. His jackal head features on one of the most quintessentially Egyptian artifacts, the canopic jar. One of the four sons of the god Horus, Duamutef, with his brothers Imsety (human-headed), Hapi (baboon-headed), and Qebehsenuf (falcon-headed), guarded the four canopic jars containing the internal organs of the deceased. The process of mummification involved removing internal organs to slow decay, and in earlier periods these organs would often be treated and placed into jars, usually with stoppers bearing the heads of their respective gods. Together the four sons of Horus assured the integrity of the dead body, and separately each god protected specific organs: Duamutef guarded the stomach. Even when the organs were not placed in the jars, the four sons of Horus still bestowed very specific protections.

In later periods, mummies often include amulets of the four sons of Horus worn as necklaces or sewn to wrappings, to provide extra protection.
or even to take the place of the removed organs they protect. The four sons of Horus also protected other things, most notably the cardinal directions, of which Duamutef protected the East. Each of the sons of Horus derived special protection from a senior goddess, the ancient goddess of war Neith protecting Duamutef.

The four sons of Horus most often acted corporately—they did not usually appear independently of each other—but may have evolved independently, only coming together as a group secondarily. Egyptologists have suggested that Imsety and Hapi, later represented with human and baboon heads respectively, were the older of the four gods, with jackal-headed Duamutef and falcon-headed Qebehsenuf being later developments, perhaps evolving specifically to supplement the first two (Duquesne 2005, 427–428). Duamutef, however, is the only one of the four to have had an independent cult, suggesting perhaps that he might have been a particularly ancient god later co-opted into a quartet of sons of Horus for a more specific funerary purpose.

Canopic jar with Duamutef-headed stopper
Limestone; jar: 24 cm h., 11.3 cm dia. (at opening), 15.5 cm dia. (widest), 10.5 cm dia. (base), 2.3 cm wall thickness near rim, 13.0 cm depth of cavity; stopper: 10.5 cm h., 9.0 cm dia. (at socket), 12.5 cm dia. (widest)
Late Period (664–332 BC)
Egypt
Bay View Association Collection purchase, 1971
KM 1971.2.195a–b
Fig. 61: Object 11 with the other canopic jars from the set (KM 1971.2.193–196)

Published: Root 1979, 20–21 (no. 5)
Figs. 60–61

This canopic jar with a jackal-headed stopper is part of a set of four jars of limestone in the Kelsey Museum (fig. 61). In this particular set of jars, details of the gods’ features have been picked out in ink (in particular, the jackal’s eyes are noticeably outlined, and the characteristic marks around the eyes of the falcon are detailed), but otherwise these jars are undecorated and uninscribed. The heads form stoppers that fit into the tops of the jars, but the jars themselves are only hollowed out about one third of the way down, and the remainder of the jar is solid. This fact, and the relatively unstained appearance of the jars’ interiors, suggests that these jars were never used to contain the internal organs of the deceased. In the later periods, there was a tendency to take the removed organs, treat and wrap them in packets, and return them to the body cavity before the mummy was wrapped, sometimes accompanied by figures of the sons of Horus. In spite of this practice, canopic jars continued to be used in burials where the organs had been returned to the body. Although the present jars likely did not contain internal organs, their presence in a burial would have invoked added protection from the four sons of Horus over the dead person’s essential innards.
**12. Amulet of Duamutef**
Faience; 9.1 cm h., 2.4 cm w.
Late–Ptolemaic Periods (664–30 BC)
Egypt
Dr. Robert W. Gilman donation, 1952
KM 1980.4.40
Published: Wilfong 2013a, 47 and fig. 82
Fig. 62

**13. Necklace with amulet of Duamutef**
Faience, cord (modern); amulet: 6.3 cm h., 1.3 cm w.; chain of beads approximately 60.5 cm l.
Late–Ptolemaic Periods (664–30 BC)
Egypt
Dr. Robert W. Gilman donation, 1952

Fig. 62: Object 12: Amulet of Duamutef

Fig. 63: Object 13: Amulet of Duamutef on chain of beads

Fig. 64: Object 13, detail, showing Duamutef amulet

Fig. 65: Necklace with Duamutef amulet; Late–Ptolemaic Periods (664–30 BC); Egypt; Dr. Robert W. Gilman donation, 1952 (KM 1980.4.46)

Fig. 66: Detail of Duamutef amulet (KM 1980.4.46)
Aside from appearing as canopic jars, the four sons of Horus are most often represented as mummiform gods with their respective animal and human heads, and images of Duamutef as a jackal-headed mummy are common. As amulets, sets of the mummiform images of the four sons of Horus would be placed on mummies, sometimes strung from necklaces around a mummy’s neck, sewn to mummy bandages, or just placed among the wrappings. These amulets not only invoked protection but could also serve as backups—either for the canopic jars or the internal organs themselves if they were somehow separated from the mummy.

These amulets are specifically funerary in purpose and would not have been worn by the living. In the case of these particular examples, their fragility, and even more the fragility of the beads in the necklaces that accompanied them, would have made them impractical for wear during life. An additional Duamutef amulet on a necklace, but with the amulet broken, comes from the same donation (figs. 65–66), as do several amulets of the other sons of Horus (figs. 67–70).
Fig. 71: Anubis embalming a mummy, from the coffin of Djehutymose, 625–580 BC (KM 1989.3.1)
Jackal Gods Working Together

Although the individual jackal gods had their own particular roles and duties, they frequently coordinated their efforts. Thus, the jackal gods are often represented together. In temples, they are frequently shown in groups, acting as escorts to senior gods, carrying their sedan chairs, or guiding their boats (figs. 20, 72–74).
Fig. 75: Location of jackal gods on the Saite Period coffin of Djehutymose (KM 1989.3.1): Anubis (red), Duamutef (blue), and Wepwawet (yellow)
The jackal gods most often worked together on behalf of the dead, pooling their powers and particular talents for the most effective protection they could provide. In embalming scenes, we see Anubis embalming and Duamutef protecting internal organs. An example of such jackal god collaboration can be seen in the coffin of Djehutymose, a priest of Horus of Edfu from the Saite Period (Djehutymose died around the years 625–580 BC).

On the lid of the coffin, the major jackal gods are represented in full force, giving a sense of how important they were for the protection and guidance of the dead (fig. 75). Wepwawet appears once (highlighted in yellow) in a procession of gods. Duamutef appears twice (highlighted in blue), once in procession and once in the form of a canopic jar. Anubis appears three times (highlighted in red), twice in the divine processions on either side of the coffin and once in the very center, embalming the dead Djehutymose.

Openwork mummy decoration
Wood, paint
19th–20th Dynasties (ca. 1292–1069 BC)
Fayum, Egypt
David Askren Collection purchase, 1925
KM 3217, 23410–23416
Published: Richards and Wilfong 1995, 37, 39 (nos. VI.15–22).
Figs. 76–84

These figures, cut out of thin sheets of wood and detailed with paint, were originally used as openwork decoration covering the body of a mummy. There is a comparable example, from the 19th Dynasty tomb of Iurudef at Saqqara, where similar wooden figures are attached to a wooden framework used to cover the lower body of a mummy (Raven 1991, 38–39 and pls. 10, 39, and 43; note parallels cited there). The Iurudef figures are more elaborate than the Kelsey’s and are set in a wooden frame with inscriptions. The Kelsey’s eight figures suggest a similar arrangement, with facing lines of figures showing the deceased adoring Osiris and the sons of Horus, with the jackal figures representing Anubis and Wepwawet likely below them. Given the Egyptians’ insistence on symmetry, it is also likely that at least two figures are missing: a remaining son of Horus figure and another image of the deceased. One possible reconstruction of the arrangement of these figures
Fig. 76: Object 14: Jackal
Fig. 77: Object 15: Jackal
Fig. 78: Object 16: Duamutef
Fig. 79: Object 17: Deceased
Fig. 80: Object 18: Osiris
Fig. 81: Object 19: Hapi
Fig. 82: Object 20: Qebehsenuf(?)
Fig. 83: Object 21: Osiris
is shown here (fig. 84). When originally placed on a mummy, these figures would provide protection, both literal and magical, and would underscore the collaborative nature of the jackal gods’ roles in this protection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jackal</td>
<td>15.6 cm w., 7.4 cm h., 0.4 cm th.</td>
<td>KM 3217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jackal</td>
<td>16.9 cm w., 6.6 cm h., 0.3 cm th.</td>
<td>KM 23411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Duamutef</td>
<td>22.6 cm h., 4.0 cm w., 0.3 cm th.</td>
<td>KM 23412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Deceased person</td>
<td>22.9 cm h., 6.5 cm w., 0.4 cm th.</td>
<td>KM 23416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18  Osiris
   24.7 cm h., 6.7 cm w., 0.4 cm th.
   KM 23414

19  Hapy
   24.0 cm h., 5.1 cm w., 0.3 cm th.
   KM 23410

20  Qebehsenuf?
   22.3 cm h., 4.2 cm w., 0.4 cm th.
   KM 23413

21  Osiris
   23.0 cm h., 6.7 cm w., 0.4 cm th.
   KM 23415
Jackal God Relations

The Egyptian jackal gods were part of a wider religious system—one in which the gods were related to one another in various ways. Family relations among gods are complicated by the fact that Egyptian religion accommodates many different (and sometimes contradictory) traditions arising from the integration of different local myths.

Thus, the jackal god Anubis is sometimes described as the son of the cow goddess Hezat. Most often, however, Anubis is identified as the son of the gods Osiris and Isis, and thus fits into their complex mythological stories. There are also variant traditions that describe Anubis as the son of an adulterous relationship between Osiris and Nephthys: this story is given in Plutarch’s *De Iside et Osiride*, and recent scholarship has identified new Egyptian language evidence for it as well (Feder 2008). Whether the son of Isis or Nephthys, Anubis fits into one of the central lineages of Egyptian gods—that of the sun-god variously identified as Re, Atum, or Khepri (fig. 85, far right). In these traditions, Anubis is also either the full or half brother...
of the god Horus (son of Osiris and Isis) and, as such, he is also related to the jackal god Duamutef, one of the four sons of Horus.

In later periods, Anubis is sometimes described as the son of Isis and Serapis, a form of the god Osiris that was Hellenized to appeal to the growing Greek population of Egypt in the Ptolemaic period. Serapis, Isis, and Anubis were often worshipped as a group outside of Egypt, sometimes in connection with Harpocrates, the child form of the god Horus.

**Object 22: Figure of Osiris**

Clay, pigment; 16.7 cm h., 10.3 cm w., 4.8 cm d.
1st–3rd century AD
Fayum, Egypt
David Askren Collection purchase, 1925
KM 3239
Published: Haeckl and Spelman 1977, 52 (no. 35)
Fig. 86
The god Osiris is central to Egyptian understandings of kingship as well as their understandings of death and the afterlife. The core myth involves Osiris as legendary first king of Egypt, killed by his jealous brother Seth, mourned by his wife Isis and their sister Nephthys, embalmed into the first mummy by Anubis, and ultimately succeeded as king by his son Horus. Images of Osiris most often show the god as a mummy with royal attributes, emphasizing his role as king of the land of the dead. This terracotta shows the persistence of these classic images of Osiris into the Graeco-Roman period, but there are many earlier images of Osiris in the Kelsey Museum collections (figs. 87–89).

Amulet of Isis, Nephthys, and Horus  
Faience; 3.1 cm h., 1.7 cm w., 0.7 cm d.  
Ptolemaic Period (332–30 BC)  
Egypt  
Dr. Edwin W. Dennison donation, 1981  
KM 1981.5.88  
Published: Wilfong 1997, 34 (no. 21)  
Fig. 90
This faience amulet is a common type, showing Isis (right) and her sister Nephthys (left) holding hands, with Isis’s son Horus between them. We can tell that Horus is a young child because of his distinctive side-lock of hair, but he is nearly the same height as the two adult goddesses. Size is often an indicator of status in Egyptian art, and the particular message that an image such as this might send is that Horus (as king-to-be) is of equal status to his mother and aunt. Given the roles that Isis and Nephthys take in mourning the dead Osiris, this amulet also underlines Horus’s status as successor to Osiris. In spite of the close connection between Anubis and these goddesses, we never get comparable images involving Anubis. There is another such amulet in the Kelsey Museum (fig. 91), very similar except that it flips the position of Isis and Nephthys (see also Petrie 1972, 35 and pl. 27, no. 152a, for a good parallel).

Figure of Nephthys
Wood, paint; 37.5 cm h., 7.3 cm w., 18.7 cm l.
Ptolemaic Period (332–30 BC)
Egypt

Esther M. Goudsmit donation, 2001

KM 2001.01.1

Published: Root 1982, 20

Fig. 91

Originally one of a pair, this striking figure of the goddess Nephthys shows her wearing her characteristic headdress, which incorporates the
hieroglyphs of her name, with her arm raised in a gesture of mourning. This figure would have accompanied a similar image of the goddess Isis. Such figures would have been placed at the head and foot of a coffin, invoking the primal act of mourning Osiris, carried out by his wife Isis and their sister Nephthys.

Lamp handle fragment: Serapis
Clay; 10.7 cm h., 6.4 cm w., 4 cm d.
1st–3rd century AD
Fayum, Egypt
David Askren Collection purchase, 1925
KM 3227
Published: Haeckl and Spelman 1977, 53 (no. 36)
Fig. 94

The god Serapis (Sarapis in Greek) is an example of an Egyptian god created to fill specific needs. He derives from Osiris–Apis, the deified form of the deceased bull-god Apis, but most often is shown in human form with various attributes of Osiris. Yet Serapis was created, at least initially, to appeal to the increasing non-Egyptian population of Egypt in the early
Ptolemaic period—his costume, hair, and beard were similar to contemporary representations of Zeus, to which were added attributes making him more Egyptian. The introduction of Serapis was a success—not just with the Greeks in Egypt but also with Egyptians. His worship quickly spread outside of Egypt as well and lasted well into the Roman period. Images of Serapis are common in Graeco-Roman Egypt; he appears on utilitarian objects, such as lamps as in this case, coins (fig. 95), and other objects of daily life, in addition to specific sculptural representations of the god (fig. 96).

Fig. 96: Calcite head of Serapis, 1st–3rd century AD, from the University of Michigan Karanis excavations at Karanis, field number 27-C50A-U (KM 8523)
Jackal God Myths and Stories

In general, Egyptians did not write formal accounts of their myths, and the jackal gods appear only rarely and incidentally in Egyptian myths written down by Greek and Roman writers. Plutarch in particular, in his De Iside et Osiride, gives an account of Anubis that is the standard “story” of the god. Indeed, it is the classical authors’ accounts of Egyptian religion that provided the first information about Anubis to Western scholars, before the decipherment of Egyptian. But the Egyptian language texts do not, typically, give consecutive narratives of the gods and their activities, so our knowledge of Anubis and the other jackal gods comes primarily from more elliptical references.

One important document for the jackal gods is Papyrus Jumilhac in the Louvre Museum (Vandier 1962). This extensive illustrated hieroglyphic papyrus of the late Ptolemaic or early Roman period concerns the religious history of the 18th nome of Upper Egypt and includes reference to a number of episodes involving Anubis. In many of these, Anubis is in conflict with the god Seth: in one episode, Seth disguises himself as Anubis to gain entry to a restricted area, and Anubis must pursue and punish him (see Hollis 2008, 195–199 for English translations). Papyrus Jumilhac does not, however, provide an ongoing narrative, concentrating instead on very specific events and references. Similar references to Anubis can be found in temple texts of the Ptolemaic period (Durisch-Gauthier 2002), but again these do not provide a consecutive story of the god.

The Egyptians did tell less formal stories and fables about the gods, and jackal gods do figure in these. The D’Orbiney Papyrus in the British Museum (fig. 98) preserves the “Tale of Two Brothers,” an elaborate story of the adventures of brothers named Bata and Anubis. The tale begins as an account of family strife (Bata is falsely accused of making advances on the wife of his beloved elder brother Anubis) but quickly enters the realm of magic as Anubis pursues Bata, who seeks to prove his innocence. Aided by a talking cow, Bata’s escape from his brother’s wrath leads to a self-castration, and later a series of reincarnations that ultimately transform Bata into a bull, a tree, and then the child of the king of Egypt. Bata reunites with Anubis as the two brothers go from being farmers to ruling as kings of Egypt (fig. 97 for Anubis as king).
Literature in Demotic, the cursive script used in Egypt from the Late through later Roman periods (ca. 664 BC–AD 456) provides more material relating to jackal gods. In the second of the stories of Setna, the Ramesside prince who became the magician-hero of a series of Demotic tales, Setna accompanies his son Siosre to the Netherworld, where they see Anubis presiding at the judgment of the dead (Lichtheim 2006, 140). The second Setna story also alludes to a Nubian magician’s knowledge of the “language of jackals” (Lichtheim 2006, 149), which may reference the gods. Another text seems to disguise a myth of jackal gods: a Demotic collection of animal fables (fig. 99) includes a brief story about two jackals who face down a rampaging lion with logic and escape being eaten (Spiegelberg 1917, 42–43; De Cenival 1988, 49–51; and see recent German translation in Hoffmann and Quack 2007, 220–221). But the jackals in this simple animal fable may also represent Anubis and Wepwawet, advising calm in the face of death in their roles as funerary protectors and guides.
Fig. 99: Demotic papyrus containing the fable of the two jackals (Spiegelberg 1917, pl. 15)
Jackal God Cults

The Egyptian jackal gods, for the most part, had their own temples and cults, with major centers for Anubis at el-Qeis (known in Greek as Kynopolis “Dogtown”) and Wepwawet at Asyut (Greek Lykopolis “Wolftown”), as well as cult centers throughout Egypt for these and other jackal gods. But no temples devoted exclusively to jackal gods have survived, and few sites dedicated to their worship in the temples of other gods exist. The Anubis chapel of the New Kingdom mortuary temple of Hatshepsut is a rare exception: its reliefs (fig. 101) provide useful imagery of the god in a temple setting but no real details about the functioning of the cult of Anubis at this temple. So specifics about the worship of jackal gods must be inferred from what is known of the cults of better-attested gods.

Temple cults in ancient Egypt typically centered on a cult image of the god—usually a small statue made of precious metals and inlays that had been specifically “activated” through a ceremony called the “Opening of the Mouth” to be suitable as a home for the god. These cult images would be part of a daily ritual involving the washing, feeding, and clothing of the god, as well as processions and other ritual activities. Cult images or other divine images specifically made for the purpose could deliver divine oracles—the head of a jackal-god image with a moveable jaw in the Louvre (Barbotin 1992) might be such a divine oracle figure. Although the bulk of temple ritual happened
within the restricted confines of the inner parts of the temple, the cult image would be brought out for specific ceremonies and festivals. Worshippers could leave offerings: it was common to leave votive images of the god, and many of the bronze images of jackal gods to survive were used as such offerings.

The temple cults of the jackal gods would have also included animal cults featuring live animals as part of their activities. Keeping wild animals like jackals at cult centers was not practical, so jackal god cults featured domestic dogs, often in great numbers. Such temples became major tourist attractions and destinations of religious pilgrimage. One of the best-attested features of such animal cults was the creation of animal mummies (Bleiberg 2013; Ikram 2004, 2007). With larger animals (such as bulls, cows, and rams), a single animal would be mummmified with great ceremony after its natural death. With smaller animals (like dogs, cats, and birds), mummies could also be left at the temple as votive offerings. The details of the process are not entirely certain, but in the most likely scenario, a temple visitor would pay a fee, temple workers would kill one of the many animals, embalm it, and then deposit it in a special crypt or burial place as a votive offering. Many thousands of votive animal mummies survive from these cults, and dog mummies are known from sites such as Saqqara and Abydos. Camden M. Cobern, the man who assembled the Bay View Association Collection now in the Kelsey...
Museum, records his excavation of a crypt filled with dog mummies at Abydos in a 1913 article for National Geographic (thanks to Margaret Cool Root for this reference):

Although deep underground, the stench was so great when it was first reopened that it was disagreeable at a hundred yards distant. The first man who attempted to enter the cave with me was almost asphyxiated, but we crawled out without harm. . . . Crawling on hands and knees for four hours over these piles of bodies, one sees many a ghastly sight—thousands of skulls or half-mummified heads; bodies broken and mashed; bones that crumble at a touch; eyes staring wild or hollow sockets filled with black paste; mouths closed just as they had been reverently arranged by the priestly undertaker 2000 years ago, or sprung wide open as if the creature had sent out a terrible wail in the last moment of its life. The sight of white, sharp teeth glinting everywhere in the light of the candle was indeed weird and gruesome. . . . Let us be careful, too. If this mummification was with bitumen, it only needs a careless movement of the candle, and in a moment your body and those of the sacred beasts will be offered to the gods in a hecatomb of flame! (Cobern 1913, 1047)

“Dog” mummy
Linen, pitch, human bones; 57.1 cm l., 16.5 cm w.
Ptolemaic–Roman Period (ca. 300 BC–AD 100)
Egypt
Phocion Tano purchase, 1952
KM 88821
Unpublished
Figs. 100, 104–105

Thousands of dog mummies survive from these cults, with major deposits at Saqqara and Abydos. The mummies were sometimes decorated with details invoking the jackal gods, but more often they were left plain, simply shaped as dogs.

The Kelsey Museum has one example of a dog-shaped mummy from such a cult, but x-rays have revealed some surprises. The Kelsey mummy
Fig. 104: Object 26. "Dog" mummy

Fig. 105: X-ray of object 26, showing placement of human child bones within the dog-shaped mummy.
contains not a dog skeleton but a miscellaneous jumble of human child bones, possibly from more than one individual (thanks to the investigations of Kelsey Museum Research Scientist Richard Redding). This mummy is not a modern fake but is rather evidence of a common ancient fraud: priests of animal cults often used random bones (and even sticks) to create an “animal” mummy for unsuspecting worshippers. The Kelsey Museum has another example of an ancient fraudulent animal mummy, a baboon-shaped bundle containing human arm bones (KM 88822, for which see Wilfong 2013a, 15 and figs. 13–14).
Anubis in the Greek and Roman World

As Egypt became more involved in the wider Mediterranean world, the worship of its gods spread beyond its borders. Isis was the most popular Egyptian religious export, and she was often accompanied by Anubis, who added an especially exotic element to the Isis cult. The Greeks and Romans were fascinated by Egyptian religion but in some ways repulsed by Egyptian gods, particularly those, like Anubis, who used animals as their symbols. Indeed, some sympathetic classical writers tried to understand the Egyptians’ use (and choice) of animals as deeper symbolism, but this approach was generally ridiculed (Smelik and Hemelrijk 1984, 1968–1970). Anubis was sometimes equated or compared to Cerberus, the three-headed dog guardian of Hades in the Greek tradition, an equation that took account of Anubis’s roles as guardian and escort to the dead but misunderstood them. Roman writers could see Anubis as a ferocious and frightening god, but, as time...
Fig. 106: Anonymous 18th-century engraving of a Graeco-Roman magical gem featuring Isis and Anubis (from Anonymous 1792, collection of the author)
went on, he became more familiar and domestic, like a pet dog (Manolaraki 2012, 198–200).

Inscriptions with dedications to Anubis, often in conjunction with Isis and Serapis, dating from the 3rd century BC to the 2nd century AD are found throughout Greece, with examples also appearing in Italy and even Roman France (Grenier 1977, 84–133). The temple of Isis on the Greek island of Delos (fig. 107) was the site of an Anubis cult, with many votive inscriptions to the god from the 2nd–1st centuries BC. (For a detailed list of the inscriptions at Delos honoring Anubis, see Grenier 1977, 86; for the history of Egyptian cults at Delos in general, see Moyer 2008, 194–205.) The worship of Anubis was a popular adjunct to the cult of Isis in Rome. Indeed, a Hellenized form of the god, called Hermanubis, made him more accessible to a non-Egyptian population.
In spite of his sporadic popularity, classical authors often treated Anubis with contempt, referring to him as “dog-face,” and they cited the worship of Anubis as a sign of decadence. Josephus recounted the story of a 1st-century AD Roman matron seduced by a priest disguised as Anubis, clearly intended to bring the Egyptian cults in Rome into disrepute (Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 18:65: Feldman 1998, 52–57). The devotion of 2nd-century AD Roman emperor Commodus (figs. 108–109) to Anubis was repeatedly cited as a sign of his misrule, in part due to his practice of striking fellow worshippers with an image or mask of Anubis (in the *Historia Augusta*: Magie 1921, 286–289). But Roman emperors showed specific honor to Anubis, as part of the Isis cult, well into the 4th century AD, as commemorated in specially issued medallions (fig. 158 below).
Jackal Gods in Greek and Roman Egypt

Its conquest by Alexander the Great in 332 BC, and subsequent rule by the Macedonian Greek Ptolemies and (later) the Romans, brought many changes to Egypt but did not eliminate the Egyptian language, culture, or religion. Although Greek became the language of government and business, Egyptian hieroglyphs and Demotic cursive continued in use in daily life and in religion. The rulers of Graeco-Roman Egypt built temples and supported the cults of Egyptian gods, including the jackal gods.

Indeed, the cults of Anubis and other jackal gods thrived under the Ptolemies; much of what we know about these gods comes from texts and images produced under the Ptolemies. The jackal gods continued their important roles in Egyptian funerary practices and beliefs, and their representations form amulets and adorn funerary artifacts like mummy labels through the Ptolemaic and into the Roman period. Roman emperors continued the Ptolemies’ support of jackal god cults, even representing Hermanubis, often accompanied by a small jackal or dog, on their coins.
These two coins of the mid-3rd century AD from the Michigan Karanis excavations show how the Roman emperors of this period represented Anubis on their coins for circulation in Egypt. Both show portraits of their respective issuing emperors (Gordian III and Philip II) on their obverses, and their reverses show standing images of the god Hermanubis, in human form, wearing a modius and carrying a winged caduceus and palm branch. Such images of Hermanubis are very much in the classical mode and make no specific reference to Anubis’s animal form. But, in each case, a canine animal—a small jackal or (more likely) dog—sits behind the god. Such an image might have been much more acceptable to Roman tastes than a jackal-headed Hermanubis, but it still invokes one of the most distinctive features of the god. Other coins simply show a bust of human-form Hermanubis, as in figs. 115–116.

These coins from the Michigan excavation are made of billon—bronze with a small amount of silver added. Both are tetradrachms, a standard denomination of Roman coinage in the East that was the equivalent of a denarius. It is difficult to compare the values of ancient and modern money but, as a point of comparison, the New Testament refers to a denarius (= 1 tetradrachm) as a day’s wage for a laborer (Matthew 20:2). Both of these coins come from hoards found by the Michigan excavators at Karanis: a significant number of the coins from the excavations were found in hoards that had been deliberately cached or hidden.
The cults of Anubis and other jackal gods thrived in the Ptolemaic period, when the Ptolemies in general contributed vast resources to the building of new temples to indigenous Egyptian gods. Although none of the Ptolemaic jackal god temples survive, Ptolemaic temples to other gods attest to the extensive information gathered, codified, and preserved in these temples, and Ptolemaic temple texts in general contain much “new” information about the jackal gods (Durisch-Gauthier 2002). Other documents attest to the cults of jackal gods and their activities. This papyrus, written in Demotic (the later cursive form of Egyptian hieroglyphs) dated to year 23 of King Ptolemy VI Philometor, records a self-dedication to Anubis: a woman, whose name is lost, dedicates herself to the “great god” Anubis, promising service and a servant fee to the god in exchange for protection from spirits, demons, or malevolent dead people. More than fifty of these self-dedication documents (to various gods) are known, but the precise nature of the transaction they record is not entirely clear (DePauw 1997, 136–137).
Mummy labels were tags attached to wrapped mummies for identification purposes; most often they listed the name and parentage of the dead person, sometimes the age and other information as well. Mummy labels also sometimes included images of funerary gods. This label, from the University of Michigan Library Papyrology Collection, shows two jackals—standing for Anubis and Wepwawet. The label’s inscription in Demotic includes another jackal god connection: the dead person’s father was named Pasheranoub, which means “the son of Anubis.”
Fig. 119: Group of animal bones with magical designs, including dog jawbone, found at Karanis (KM 3503, 3503, and 10099)
Jackal Gods in Magic

Although Anubis was sometimes invoked in Egyptian magic of the earlier periods in a protective capacity, he takes a more visible role in magic in the Graeco-Roman era. In addition to the standard amuletic representations of the god also seen in earlier times, images of Anubis appear in carvings on so-called magical gems of the Graeco-Roman period. These amulets, made of semi-precious stones and carved with images, wishes, and magical words, often serve specific functions as protectors of health, but they can simply promote good luck as well.

Anubis also takes a more active role in textual magic. Demotic and Greek magical papyri show Anubis serving as an intermediary in acts of divination: he sets the stage and brings the gods to answer questions. Other papyri show even more central roles, as in the illustration to a Demotic magical papyrus in which Anubis shoots a nude man with an arrow, in an act of hostile magic or romantic compulsion.

Magical gem with Anubis figure
Nicolo (a form of onyx); 1.3 cm h., 1.1 cm w., 0.3 cm th.
1st–5th century AD
Egypt
Maurice Nahman purchase, 1932
KM 26068
Published: Bonner 1950, 259 (no. 37)
Fig. 120

In this magical gem, a jackal-headed Anubis is shown holding a *situla* (a handled vessel used in religious ritual) in one hand and the traditional *was* scepter, with a jackal head, in the other. Images of Anubis appear with some regularity in Graeco-Roman period magical gems, although other deities (such as Harpocrates and Serapis) and mythical creatures appear more often.

The inscription (reading *tyche* or “(good) luck!”) marks this amulet as a generic good luck piece. The text is carved in reverse because this gem would have been used as a personal seal, impressed on wet clay, hot wax, or molten lead to present a mirror image of the gem, with the inscription in its proper
direction. Such magical gems not only served amuletic purposes but also served as markers of identity for their owners: a person might have used this gem to seal documents or to secure personal possessions. Many seal impressions of comparable magical gems serving as personal seals were found in the course of the Michigan excavations of the Graeco-Roman period Egyptian villages of Karanis (Gates-Foster 2014).

Demotic magical papyrus with illustration of jackal-headed god shooting an arrow
Papyrus, ink; 21.5 cm h., 11.5 cm w.
1st–2nd century AD
Fayum, Egypt
Courtesy of the University of Michigan Library Papyrology Collection; purchased for the University of Michigan in 1924
P.Mich. inv. 1444
Unpublished
Figs. 121–122

This papyrus is a single sheet, oriented vertically, containing thirty-six lines of Demotic text and an illustration at the bottom. The writing suggests a date in the early Roman period. The text is, as yet, unedited, but the illustration—showing a jackal-headed god most likely to be Anubis shooting a bow and arrow toward a grotesque naked male figure—makes it all but certain that this papyrus is a magical text. A jackal-headed god shooting a bow and arrow is sometimes represented in amulet form (for example, see Andrews 1994, 47, fig. 52a), and this image may be related.

None of the jackal gods are particularly associated with the practice of magic in earlier periods in ancient Egypt, but in the Graeco-Roman period Anubis is increasingly used for specific magical roles, particularly in the practice of divination, where he is called upon to gather more specialized gods who will answer questions. Thus, in the London-Leiden Demotic magical papyrus (PDM XIV 528–553: Betz 1986, 225–226), there is a full invocation of Anubis, characterizing him as “Pharaoh of the Underworld.” Anubis is summoned in order to bring in the town gods to answer questions: he is to bring the gods, seat them at a table, and provide them with food and drink as a prelude to the gods’ answering of questions. One can see in these texts an
extension of Anubis’s earlier role as facilitator and guide in conducting the deceased through judgment.

Magical materials also increasingly relate to Anubis in the Graeco-Roman period: there are repeated references to the use of “Anubis-threads” or cords to bind things in magical rituals (Betz 1986, 7 and n. 33). An “Anubis plant” is used as an ingredient in magical spells, and the papyri even provide information about its identity as an aquatic flowering plant (Betz 1986, 219–220 and n. 339). Greek and Demotic magical texts of the period occasionally call for the use of the blood of a black dog, or blood from the tick of a black dog, sometimes specifically invoking Anubis in the process (for example, *PDM Suppl.* 101–116 in Betz 1986, 327). And it is not out of the question that a dog bone used in magic (object 33 below) may have some connection to Anubis as well.
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Dog jawbone with magical symbols
Bone, paint; 8.3 cm l.; 4.7 cm h., 1.8 cm th.
3rd–5th century AD
Karanis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations 1925; field number 25-265
KM 3503.28

Fig. 123: Object 33: Dog jawbone with magical symbols
This jawbone of a dog with marks drawn on it in a reddish paint comes from a group of animal bones covered with lines, dots, and pseudo-writing found at Karanis (fig. 119) that were clearly used for magical purposes. Two deposits containing some eighty-four such decorated animal bones were found near each other in the 1925 season of the Karanis excavations. The majority of bones from the two deposits are from larger domestic animals—pigs, cows, sheep, goats, horses—along with three human skull fragments, two fish bones, and this dog bone, as well as some pieces of plaster decorated like the bones.

Researcher Andrew Wilburn has suggested a range of possibilities for the intention behind these deposits of decorated bones (Wilburn 2012, 140–160). The use of bones in general and the red paint used to mark them suggest some kind of hostile magic. The presence of a single dog bone in a large diverse group may not be specifically invoking the action of dog-associated gods like Anubis, but the kinds of animals represented in the bones may suggest some kind of connection between bones and divine animals (at least in the cases of cows and sheep) or, perhaps more likely, hostile magic directed at a farmer’s livestock.

The magical deposits from which this bone comes were found near the dog skull 2 and other examples of nonpainted animal bones. This proximity may suggest some connection. Perhaps the bones that were later painted with magical symbols were originally taken from the same dump or trash areas where the unpainted bones were found.
Jackal Gods at Karanis

The University of Michigan’s 1924–1935 excavation of the village of Karanis shows the worship of jackal gods in action in Graeco-Roman Egypt. Amulets of Wepwawet and Duamutef demonstrate, at a minimum, an ongoing presence for these jackal gods at Karanis. Anubis had a stronger presence in the village. One document records a loan to a priest of Anubis (named after the god, no less) at Karanis and attests to a cult of the god, perhaps in a side-chapel of one of the crocodile god temples there. A coffin board from Karanis that shows Anubis embalming was repurposed as a shrine door, possibly to enclose an image of the god for cult purposes.

Images and remains of dogs from Karanis also show their presence in daily life. A terracotta figure shows a dog that may have been a pet, while the dog skull (2) and the dog jawbone with magical symbols (33) discussed earlier more likely attest to the presence of stray or wild dogs at Karanis.
Amulet of jackal: Wepwawet
Bronze; 2.6 cm h., 1.5 cm w., 0.1 cm th.
1st–3rd century AD
Karanis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations; surface find
KM 21426
Unpublished
Fig. 125

Duamutef amulet
Faience; 1.7 cm h., 0.6 cm w., 0.6 cm th.
1st–3rd century AD
Karanis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1930; field number 30-C191F-F
KM 24175
Unpublished
Figs. 126–128

These two tiny amulets, representations of the jackal gods Wepwawet and Duamutef, show at least a minor presence of these gods at Graeco-Roman period Karanis. The Wepwawet amulet has a spike in the bottom and no obvious means of suspension, so it may have served as an ornament to an object rather than been worn as an amulet. The Duamutef amulet is pierced for suspension and could have been part of a necklace featuring all four sons of Horus (al-
though this is the only such amulet to come from the Michigan excavations. The Duamutef amulet is made of blue faience decorated with yellow dots; this style of decoration is found in other faience amulets from the site, mostly amulets of the god Bes. Neither amulet, nor any other textual or artifactual material from the site, suggests any sort of ongoing cult of these gods at Karanis.
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**Jackal head of Anubis**

Faience; 7.3 cm l., 4.4 cm h., 3.8 cm w.

1st century BC–1st century AD

Karanis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1933; field number 33-C124B-F

KM 25972

Published: Wilfong and Ferrara 2014, 58 (no. 23)

Figs. 129–130

This fragment preserves the head of a jackal, with details picked out in black over the characteristic blue faience. The fragment probably comes from a jackal figure rather than serving as a jackal head on a human body. Although faience was most often used for amulets, this head comes from a larger figure that probably would have served as a decorative element on a
functional object, perhaps a vessel of some sort, rather than a stand-alone image of a jackal. Although this jackal could have represented any of the jackal gods, it was most likely a symbol of Anubis.

Figurine of a dog
Clay; 7.4 cm h., 7.6 cm l., 3.4 cm w.
1st–3rd century AD
Karanis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1932; field number 32-C83B-B
KM 6909
Published: Gazda 1978, 72 (no. 43); Allen 1985, 286–287 (no. 18)
Figs. 16, 131–133

We have already seen the presence of domestic dogs at Karanis from their physical remains (2 and fig. 15 above), and these are supplemented by a number of representations of domestic dogs in ceramic. This figure is one of several very similar hollow, mold-made ceramic dogs found during the Michigan Karanis excavations; this shaggy dog with a curled tail seems to have been a popular type in Roman Egypt. The precise function of these figures is uncertain, and they may have served multiple purposes. Although images like this are often identified as toys, this is probably the least likely
possibility (although a number of much cruder hand-made clay animals from Karanis were probably made as children’s toys). This particular dog (and many of the other examples) is represented wearing a collar with what may be a bell or an amulet on it (fig. 132).

Greek loan agreement for a priest of Anubis
Papyrus, ink; 19.5 cm h., 10.0 cm w.
October 10, AD 131
Karanis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations 1930; field number 30–C123CCH2-A (1)
Courtesy of the University of Michigan Library Papyrology Collection
P.Mich. inv. 5890
Published: Husselman 1971, 123–124 (P.Mich. IX 572)
Fig. 134

This papyrus provides valuable evidence of the presence of a cult of Anubis at Karanis in the 2nd-century AD, although this information is tangential to the document’s original purpose. It is a legal contract that records a loan of wheat to a man named Heranoubis, described as “priest of Anubis in the village of Karanis”: Heranoubis agrees to repay a significant quantity of wheat, with interest in two installments, out of the proceeds of land he has been farming. For identification purposes, Heranoubis is not only named but also described physically (common in such documents) as “about 60 years old, with a scar on his left eyebrow,” and further designated as “illiterate,” also relatively common in such papyri.

For our purposes, of course, the main interest of this papyrus is its record of the presence of a priest of Anubis at Karanis, but the contents of the document actually help flesh out our understanding of the life of such a priest. We have a priest who is also a farmer, not an uncommon arrangement as people of most occupational groups in ancient Egypt would have supplemented their income by farming, or indeed had farming as a primary revenue source. Our priest of Anubis is also named after Anubis, which suggests a family connection with the cult of Anubis that would have contributed to such a name being given (and indeed there was relatively little occupational mobility so a strong likelihood that Heranoubis’s father would have also been a priest of Anubis). Given the historical connections of temples with
Fig. 134: Object 38: Greek papyrus with loan agreement for a priest of Anubis.
writing and education in ancient Egypt, Heranoubis’s illiteracy may seem surprising. But illiteracy was not uncommon in transactions documented in Greek papyri. In this particular case, the designation of illiteracy might just refer to the language of the document (Greek); Heranoubis may well have been (given his role as priest to an Egyptian god) literate in Egyptian.

Priests are well represented in the documentary record from Karanis, and an exceptionally fine sculpture from the Michigan excavation preserves an image of one Karanis priest (fig. 135, for which see Wilfong and Ferrara 2014, 47–48). Several Egyptian gods (Rübsam 1974, 98–101) as well as some Greek deities (Rübsam 1974, 102–104) were worshipped at Karanis, but crocodile gods predominated, as they did throughout the Fayum. At Karanis, the crocodile gods Pnepheros and Petesuchos were the most important, their joint cult centered at the South Temple at Karanis. No temple or structure specifically dedicated to Anubis (or many of the other gods attested at Karanis) is known. Heranoubis may have been in charge of an Anubis cult that shared space in the Pnepheros and Petesuchos temple, with the worship of the jackal god supporting the main cult of the crocodile gods there.

**Coffin panel repurposed into a shrine door**
Wood, gesso or plaster, paint; approximately 61 cm × 25 cm
Ca. 200 BC–AD 100
Karanis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1930; field number 30-C189B-C
Original piece retained in Egypt, represented in exhibition by Kelsey Museum archival photograph, neg. 7.2469
Unpublished
Figs. 124, 136–137

This artifact is not physically in the exhibition: a find from the Michigan Karanis excavations, it was retained in Egypt. But its appropriateness to the exhibition, and also its unusualness and potential importance, warrant its inclusion in the form of an archival photograph from the excavation as an entry in the exhibition catalogue.

This object is a piece from the chest/abdomen area of an anthropoid coffin lid made of wood, covered with gesso or plaster, and painted. The style of the painting suggests a late Ptolemaic/early Roman date. It shows,
in horizontal registers from top to bottom: at top, Osiris, flanked by the Thoth ibis (right) and a figure of the goddess Ma’at (left) and standing winged figures of Isis and Nephthys; at middle: Anubis standing, embalming a mummy (with diagonally decorated wrappings) on a lion-headed couch supported by a goddess, flanked by Isis and Nephthys making a gesture of ritual mourning; and at bottom: a Djed-pillar (as symbol of Osiris) flanked by two small falcon-like birds (kites) that represent Isis and Nephthys. As a fragment of a coffin, it is an unexceptional piece—this kind of design is fairly common in contemporary coffins—and its illustration of Anubis embalming a mummy shows, if nothing else, the persistence of this motif at Karanis. In itself, this image tells us nothing more.

What makes this piece of interest, and of potential significance for the cult of Anubis at Karanis, is that the coffin panel has been reused: deliberately cut out and repurposed as a door. The wooden rod added to the left side of the piece would have gone into holes above and below, allowing the panel to pivot back and forth as a door. The original excavator’s notes on this piece describe it as a door to a shrine, and this is almost certainly what it was: a door to a portable shrine containing a cult image. (See fig. 137 for a speculative reconstruction of what the completed shrine might have looked like.) Such shrines were often used to contain the images of gods, sometimes the image of a god that served as the focus for cult activity at a temple. Although no complete examples survive from Karanis, we can see how these shrines looked from models—see fig. 138 for a shrine model from the Michigan excavation at nearby Soknopaiou Nesos—and a terracotta figure from the Fayum in the Graeco-Roman period shows priests bearing a portable shrine containing a cult image (fig. 139).

The retention of the original coffin image on the Karanis shrine door and the centering of the cut-out panel specifically on the image of Anubis embalming (fig. 124) suggests that this choice was intentional. This coffin panel bearing an image of Anubis and repurposed as a shrine door may have helped conceal an image of the god Anubis in its shrine, perhaps even a cult image of Anubis that was the focus of ritual activity. Such an image in a shrine is attested at the nearby town of Bacchias, where a 2nd-century AD inventory of temple equipment includes “a gilded wooden shrine containing a gilded wooden dog,” clearly a jackal representing Anubis (Rübsam 1974, 74). This inventory comes from the temple of Soknobra...
Fig. 136: Object 39: Coffin panel repurposed into a shrine door, from Karanis

Fig. 137: Reconstruction showing how object 39 might have appeared in use as a shrine door (drawing by Lorene Sterner)
Bacchias—Soknobrasis was a crocodile god much like Pnepheros and Pete-suchos at Karanis. The presence of an Anubis image in a shrine at a crocodile god temple at Bacchias may support the idea of a parallel situation at Karanis: a smaller subsidiary cult of Anubis, such as that served by our Anubis priest above (38), with a cult image of a jackal kept in a shrine, perhaps even the shrine for which the coffin panel 39 was repurposed.
Jackal Gods at Terenouthis

Artifacts from Terenouthis, a cemetery site in northern Egypt excavated by the University of Michigan in 1935 (currently under new excavations directed by Sylvain Dhennin for the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale), show how the jackal gods are represented in burials in the Roman period. The Michigan excavations yielded nearly 200 carved stone tablets, known as stelae, mostly of the mid–late 2nd century AD, that show the dead person and often record name, age at death, date of death, and other information. In overall appearance, the stelae are very “Roman”-looking—the carving style, the clothing and hairstyles worn by the deceased and the furniture and ar-

![Funerary stela of Heraklea and Ares with standing man making an offering, reclining woman, and jackal, Terenouthis, Egypt, University of Michigan Excavations, 1935, field number 10-X (KM 21179)](image)
Fig. 141: Funerary stela of Aphrodite with standing woman in "orant" position and two jackals; late 2nd century AD; Terenouthis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1935, field number 10-A80 (KM 21067)

Fig. 142: Funerary stela of Serenos with standing man making an offering and jackal; late 2nd century AD; Terenouthis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1935, field number 10-X (KM 21076)

Fig. 143: Funerary stela of Heras with reclining man and jackal; late 2nd century AD; Terenouthis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1935 (KM 21150)

Fig. 144: Anonymous funerary stela with reclining woman and jackal; late 2nd century AD; Terenouthis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1935 (KM 29012)

Fig. 145: Funerary stela of Seosouthis with reclining woman flanked by jackals on either side and cobra far left; late 2nd century AD; Terenouthis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1935, field number 10-A75 (KM 21170)
chitectural features they show are typically Roman. The inscriptions are all in Greek, reflecting a world in which most business was transacted and recorded in Greek and where most of the population would have spoken Greek at least as a second language. But this was an Egyptian population, and one that had a connection to Egyptian jackal gods.

In the representations on these stelae, the dead are often accompanied by figures of jackals, a single jackal or two. These jackals clearly stand in for Anubis (and, when two are involved, Anubis and Wepwawet), serving as both guardians and guides for the dead person. More rarely, other Egyptian sacred animals such as falcons and cobras appear on these stelae, often in the company of jackals (as in figs. 145–146).

These funerary stelae were mounted in niches in mud-brick constructions that served as a focus for offerings or remembrance of the dead (fig. 150). The niches themselves were sometimes decorated with paintings on plaster that further invoke jackal gods’ protections. The paintings from a niche at Terenouthis currently on display in the Kelsey Museum’s permanent installation (figs. 147–149) show images similar to the stelae, painted in vivid colors, of jackals flanking an image of the deceased (unusually, also painted on plaster rather than a separate stone stela).

Not all of the Terenouthis stelae have jackals on them: 81 of the 194 published examples from the excavation (Hooper 1961) feature jackals, so about 42 percent. Similar numbers of stelae with jackals have been found among those excavated since the Michigan project (see, for example, Abd el-Al 1985, 63–67). There seems to be no gendered preference for jackals—they appear on stelae for men and women at roughly the same rates. The use of one jackal or two tends to correlate with overall design: stelae with figures standing with hands raised in the “orant” position are likely to have two jackals or none, while stelae with single reclining figures, single standing offering figures, or multiple figures tend to have one jackal or none.

The carving style of these jackal figures varies dramatically. Some are deeply carved and incorporated into the overall design of the stela, clearly carved by the primary sculptor along with the human images (fig. 151). But other stelae show jackal figures that seem to have been added after the main stela carving, in some cases apparently by different sculptors. Some of the jackal figures are scratched in lightly, sometimes enhanced with paint, and some jackals are so faintly scratched in as to be barely visible (figs. 145,
Figs. 147–149: Paintings from a funerary niche at Terenouthis: two jackals facing a painted stela for a woman named Isidora; late 2nd century AD; Terenouthis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1935, field numbers 10-L1-L3 (left to right: KM 29016, 29014, 29015)

Fig. 150: Placement of jackal painting (center right) and painted stela (middle) in mud-brick construction (Kelsey Museum Archival photograph 5.4349)
Most of the stelae were originally painted; although many still bear traces of paint, it is possible that more stelae had jackal figures that were painted on after the stela was carved but are no longer visible.

Not only does the level and quality of carving vary, but the representations of the jackals themselves also differ greatly. In many cases, the “classic” profiles of the figures are close to the jackals seen thousands of years earlier (figs. 141–146, 151, 154, 156). But a significant number of the “jackals” on the Terenouthis stelae are more like earlier Egyptian representations of dogs: they have shorter legs, ears, and snouts and, most telling, short curly tails (figs. 147, 149, 152, 155). This variability may well reflect the ambiguous nature of the sacred animal in Egyptian thought, but it may also be a sign of changing times. By the mid–late 2nd century AD, some Egyptian temple-based cults had begun to die out, and indigenous Egyptian religion was, in parts of Egypt, becoming somewhat less pervasive than it had been before. It is possible that by this time inhabitants of Terenouthis no longer knew the specifics of Anubis and Wepwawet but knew that canine animals were associated with death and the afterlife in some way, to the extent that their presence on funerary monuments was desirable but by no means mandatory. These images are among the latest active uses of jackal god imagery in Egypt, and their variability may foreshadow their ultimate disappearance.

Fig. 151: Funerary stela of Artemis, Isidora, and Karpime with two reclining women, standing woman in “orant” position, and sculpted jackal; late 2nd century AD; Terenouthis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1935, field number 10-X (KM 21180)

Fig. 152: Detail of incised and painted jackal, clearly added after main carving, from stela of Heraklea and Ares; late 2nd century AD; Terenouthis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1935, field number 10-X (KM 21179)

Fig. 153: Funerary stela of Pebos with reclining man and lightly incised and painted jackal (upper left, barely visible); late 2nd century AD; Terenouthis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1935, field number 10-X (KM 21153)
Funerary stela of Kopres
Limestone, paint; 24.1 cm h., 17.1 cm w., 7.0 cm th.
Late 2nd century AD
Terenouthis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1935; field number 10-A53
KM 21047
Published: Hooper 1961, no. 47 (= SEG XX 539)
Text: “Kopres, who died before his time, about six years old. Year 10,
Phamenoth 6.”
Fig. 154

Funerary stela of Nemesion
Limestone, paint; 38.7 cm h., 30.4 cm w., 10.7 cm th.
Late 2nd century AD
Terenouthis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1935; field number 10-X
KM 21052
Published: Hooper 1961, no. 72 (= SEG XX 578); Haeckl and Spelman 1977, 95 (no. 93)
Text: “Nemesion, about 24 years old, (in the month of) Hathyr, (day) 7.”
Fig. 155

Funerary stela of Isa(dora?)
Limestone, paint; 21.5 cm w., 20.4 cm h., 3.1 cm th.
Late 2nd century AD
Terenouthis, Egypt; University of Michigan Excavations, 1935
These three stelae from Terenouthis show the most common configurations for stelae with jackals. Two of them (40, 41) show the deceased standing, with arms raised in what is known as the “orant” position, flanked on either side by jackals. This is the most common style of stela with jackals, and these two examples give an idea of the range of workmanship found at Terenouthis. The stela of a six-year-old boy named Kopres (40) is simply carved in low relief, the standing figure and the two jackals (shown entirely in profile) framed by a single line. The stela of the twenty-four-year-old man named Nemesion (41) provides a striking contrast: the human and jackal figures are carved in deep relief with much detail, and the figures are enclosed in a hybrid architectural structure with a classical pediment supported by Egyptian-style lotus-capital pillars. The jackals’ bodies are in profile, but their heads face forward.

The third stela is an example of another common type in which the deceased is shown reclining on a couch and a single jackal sits on a pedestal or shelf above. In the case of 42, the stela shows the young woman Isidora (although her name is damaged, this is by far the most likely restoration) reclining on a couch holding a jug (most of these reclining figures hold a libation cup), with a jackal seated above her legs. The scene is enclosed in an architectural structure simpler than that of 41. Beneath the couch are depicted a number of items common in these stelae: a sheaf or bouquet, a wine jar in a stand, and a three-legged table supporting a libation cup. Other standard types of these stelae show the deceased making offerings in an altar with a single jackal (such as in fig. 142) as well as groups of individuals, reclining or standing, also typically with single jackal figures (such as fig. 140).

Incidentally, the name of the deceased boy in 40 tells a brief story of its own. This boy, dead around the age of six, was named Kopres, literally “Shit” or “Dung,” a name (in masculine and feminine variants) found with some frequency in Roman Egypt. These so-called “copronyms” call for some explanation. Some scholars have suggested they are apotropaic in nature, giving a
child a disagreeable name in the hope of averting the attention of demons or the evil eye. But most scholars instead see these names as commemorations of child abandonment—the traditional place to leave an abandoned child was the village dung-heap, and these “dung names” reference this tradition (Harris 1992, 7–8). This explanation could account for the slight vagueness in the age given for Kopres: having found him on a dung heap, Kopres’s parents may not have been able to determine his exact age.
Jackal God Survivals

In the later Roman period, Christianity came to dominate the Egyptian religious landscape, and the older Egyptian religion died out. The earlier Egyptian script systems (hieroglyphs, hieratic, Demotic) gave way to the alphabetic Coptic, closely associated with Christianity in Egypt. Animal cults are last definitely attested in Egypt in AD 340 (although some may have lasted longer), and the active worship of jackal gods would have ended around that time, if not before. Christian authors such as Tertullian and Athanasius...
wrote contemptuously of Egyptian animal gods, and Anubis was particularly singled out for ridicule, building on earlier classical writers’ contempt for their perceptions of the Egyptians’ “worship” of “dogs.” Ironically, attestations of cultic activity relating to Anubis can be found outside of Egypt even later than within Egypt. Later 4th-century Roman emperors’ public devotions to Isis and Anubis were marked through the issue of special medallions commemorating the “Vota Publica” (Alfoldi 1937 and fig. 158), although recent work on late paganism advises caution in interpreting such images as actual evidence of ongoing pagan worship (Cameron 2011, 694–695).

But the earlier jackal gods persisted in Egypt after they ceased to be worshipped, at least in name. Anubis is occasionally invoked (along with Isis, Osiris, and Horus) in Christian magical texts from Egypt. More frequently, Greek and Coptic papyri attest to people named after Anubis (Anoup and Anoub being the most common such names) long after the disappearance of the god’s cult. If anything, the use of Anubis as a personal name increases in these later periods.

Images of the jackal gods also persisted, at least in an indirect way. Earlier Egyptian representations of jackal-headed gods appear to have inspired Byzantine and medieval Eastern Christian images of saints, most notably St. Christopher, with human bodies and dog heads, often seen in icons (White 1991, 22–46 and fig. 159). The connection between the dog-headed
St. Christopher and the earlier Egyptian gods may come through North African intermediaries. Christopher was not a particularly prominent saint in Egypt, and the history of his dog-headed form suggests that images of Anubis that spread through Roman North Africa with the cult of Isis may have been the source for the Christian saint (Doresse 1960, 45).

Greek letter fragment that refers to a man named Anoup
Papyrus, ink; 12.7 cm h., 12.0 cm w.
5th–6th century AD
Oxyrhynchus, Egypt
Courtesy of the University of Michigan Library Papyrology Collection, purchased by A. E. R. Boak in 1925
P.Mich. inv. 3726
Published: Sijpesteijn 1986, 81 (= SB XVIII 13115)
Fig. 157
Coptic list of scribes, including one named Anoup
Papyrus, ink; 23.5 cm h., 9.5 cm w.
7th century AD
Egypt
Courtesy of the University of Michigan Library Papyrology Collection,
acquired with Nahman lot, 1924
P.Mich. inv. 1307
Published: Breen 1985, 31–32
Fig. 161

These two papyri, written in Greek (43) and Coptic (44), are documents of daily life from Egypt in the centuries after Christianity had become the dominant religion there. Both concern individuals named “Anoup,” the most common vocalization of the name of Anubis by this time. The first is a document of uncertain purpose involving a number of named people, including one Anoup, a nyktōstrategos, or commander of the night watch. The second is a list of scribes, perhaps from a monastic context. The last line of the papyrus lists a scribe named Anoup, further described as a pneumatikos, or “spiritualist.” Many more documents from the later Roman period relate to men named after Anubis in some way, including the contract illustrated here (fig. 160) from AD 499, in which a man named Aurelius Anoup, in connection with a man who is a cumin seller, makes a lease in the ancient town of Oxyrhynchus (a town, coincidentally, quite near the ancient city of Kynopolis, sacred to Anubis).

None of the individuals in these Christian era documents named after Anubis would have owed any allegiance to the ancient pagan god or would necessarily have even known who Anubis was. The impression created by the documents, however, is that the use of Anubis as a personal name increases in these later periods. In earlier periods when the god was still worshipped, names that honored him would have been more likely to record a relationship to the god (e.g., Pasheranoup “the son of Anubis”) than the name of the god himself. It may be that the relative popularity of the name Anoup in the Christian era (and indeed the many other names that honored Egyptian gods found in this period) might have been more a sign of Egyptian-ness than a record of any other connection to Anubis.

Fig. 161: Object 44: List of scribes including one named Anoup (last line) (photograph by Randal Stegmeyer, courtesy of University of Michigan Library Papyrology Collection)
Fig. 162: Engraving of a relief of Anubis, derived from the image in fig. 163 but also including a selection of magical gems showing Anubis (Luyken 1700, 2717)
Direct knowledge of ancient Egyptian religion came to an end with the dominance of Christianity; without knowledge of the earlier Egyptian scripts (the latest inscriptions in hieroglyphs date to AD 394 and Demotic to AD 456) no one could read the ancient texts. Such information about ancient Egypt as did survive was filtered through the works of the Greek and Latin authors on Egyptian religion that remained. After the Arab conquest of Egypt in AD 641, direct contact between Egypt and the Western world was largely cut off for centuries, and access to Egyptian representational material was limited. Although the medieval Crusades brought intermittent contact between Europe and Egypt, these encounters had relatively little impact on Western understandings of ancient Egypt.

The European Renaissance saw a revival of Western interest in ancient Egypt, thanks largely to the wider revival of knowledge of the classical written and visual culture. But the growing interest in Egypt was hindered by an inability to read Egyptian hieroglyphs, and the decipherment of hieroglyphs was the major priority. It was not until the 17th century that significant progress began in this endeavor. Jesuit scholar Athanasius Kircher devoted much of his career to his ultimately unsuccessful attempts to decipher ancient Egyptian hieroglyphs, but his greater contributions to the study of ancient Egypt were the images of Egyptian art and inscriptions that circulated widely in his publications.

It is to Kircher that we owe important early images of jackal gods: he presented an image of Anubis based on a Roman style sculpture that was widely reproduced from the original engraving in Kircher’s 1650 book Obeliscus Pamphilius (fig. 163). But his engraver presented a vision of Anubis rather unlike the original, with the head of a dog more like the lap dogs popular in the period than like the ancient canine. This image in Kircher’s book was extraordinarily influential in the understanding of Anubis: it is adapted and redrawn through the 17th and 18th centuries. Luyken 1700 elaborates on Kircher’s original, making Anubis’s human parts more anatomically correct, but he also adds many images of Anubis from magical gems, rather like above (fig. 162). Kircher’s engraving persists for a surprisingly long time, even reappearing in a late 18th-century textbook (fig. 164). Even when not drawing on Kircher’s engraving, 17th- and 18th-century scholars tended to use
Fig. 164: Hand-colored engraving of a relief of Anubis (Bertuch 1798)

Fig. 165: Engraving showing figures of Osiris (1), Isis (2), and Anubis (3) near the Sphinx (4) and a pyramid (Pluche 1739, 4:225)
Roman-derived images of Anubis (figs. 107 and 165) to illustrate the Egyptian jackal god.

One of the more original images of Anubis in the 18th century can be found in a book illustration with a complex history (fig. 166). In 1791,
London publisher J. Johnson issued a volume of poetry, *The Botanic Garden*, by Erasmus Darwin (grandfather of evolutionary pioneer Charles Darwin) that presented the botanical ideas of scientist Carl Linnaeus in poetic form. Artist Henry Fuseli (perhaps best known today for his iconic painting *The Nightmare* in the Detroit Institute of Arts) contributed a number of drawings to illustrate Darwin’s poem. Canto 3 of the poem includes a description of the Nile’s irrigation of Egypt’s “showerless lands” that invokes “Dog of Nile, ANUBIS” (3:134). To illustrate this passage, Fuseli contributed an extraordinary drawing titled “Fertilization of the Nile” (this drawing is now British Museum 1863,0509.931). Fuseli’s drawing was then redrawn by artist William Blake (British Museum 1863,0509.932), who engraved his own drawing for the early editions of Darwin’s book. (Blake’s engraving was in turn reengraved on a smaller scale by engraver P. Maverick for the American edition of the book, the source of fig. 166.) This striking image shows a dog- or jackal-headed god straddling the Nile, a sistrum abandoned at his feet. Although the composition is not particularly Egyptian, this image of Anubis was, at least, closer to the Egyptian version of the god than most of the others of its time, accurately portraying the god’s costume and other details. Fuseli and Blake created a vigorous image that perhaps comes closer to the spirit of the Egyptian god.

It was not until accurate images of ancient Egyptian art began to be published in the 19th century that the Egyptian jackal gods started to be known in their original forms. A major source for this rediscovery of Anubis was in the lavish illustrated volumes of the *Description de l’Égypte*, a
luxury production documenting the findings of the Napoleonic expedition to Egypt (1799–1801) (figs. 167–169). The Kelsey Museum has in its collection a particularly fine copy of the first edition of this set (Description de l’Égypte 1809–1821; KM 2003.4.1a–w), from which a number of illustrations in the present volume were made. The Napoleonic expedition, of course, also yielded the Rosetta Stone: an inscription of Ptolemy V Epiphanes in Egyptian hieroglyphs followed by versions of the same text in Demotic Egyptian and Greek that ultimately permitted the decipherment of Egyptian hieroglyphs and Demotic. Using this knowledge, scholars were able to read ancient Egyptian texts, and serious study of the Egyptian jackal gods began.

The vivid jackal god images that are best known to us come from the New Kingdom Book of the Dead papyri of Ani and Hunefer, first published in sumptuous facsimile editions by Egyptologist E. A. Wallis Budge. It is not an exaggeration to say that Budge’s images of Anubis (fig. 170) remain among the most iconic such images to modern audiences, assisted certainly by the vivid cover of Dover Publications’ widely distributed paperback reprint of Budge’s popular book on the Papyrus of Ani (fig. 180 below). But perhaps even more compelling were the images of Anubis from the New Kingdom tomb of King Tutankhamun, discovered by Howard Carter in

Fig. 169: Mummy cartonnage showing the four sons of Horus, including jackal-headed Duamutef (Description de l’Égypte 1809–1821, 2:59)
Fig. 170: Image of Anubis from E. A. Wallis Budge’s *Gods of the Egyptians* (Budge 1904)
1922, which contained representations of the jackal gods unparalleled in their fineness and quality. The circumstances of the finding of this nearly intact royal tomb, filled with the glitter of gold and found after years of frustrating search, made the images that came from its excavation even more compelling to a popular audience. The iconic photographs of the discovery and clearance of the tomb by Harry Burton, and their presentation in 1920s media like *The Illustrated London News*, made the images all the more riveting for the public. And of these, perhaps none was so arresting or mysterious as Burton’s photograph of the life-size seated jackal figure representing Anubis that guarded the doorway to the tomb’s “treasury” (fig. 171). These iconic images have, in turn, directly influenced the representations of Egyptian jackal gods that we see in contemporary popular culture.
Fig. 172: Fierce Anubis—(front row, left to right): Anubis! El dios chacal, Joel and F. Lemus, Mini-Terror 88, EDAR 1968; Patch: United States Air Force National Reconnaissance Office Launch Booster, Space Vehicle NRO L-38 (Drake), Launch Vehicle AV-023 (Anubis), June 201; Anubis Guard keychain, Lego: Pharaoh’s Quest; “Battle with Anubis” ceramic table accent, Lemax Spooky Town Collection, article no. 93726; (back row, left to right): Anubis II, game for Nintendo Wii, Conspiracy Entertainment, 2006; The Jackal King, Spawn: Age of Pharaohs, Series 33, McFarlane Toys, 2008; Anubis Warrior, cover by Fabio H. Chibilski and Maxflan Araujo, Arcana Studio, 2011

**Jackal Gods Today**

Today, images of Egyptian jackal gods occur frequently in popular culture—in comics, graphic novels, music videos, computer games, toys, and other media. Their distinctive appearance forms a convenient shorthand for “Ancient Egypt,” but the jackal gods have also taken on a life of their own within our contemporary world and have developed in ways the ancient Egyptians would probably not recognize or understand.

Modern representations of Egyptian jackal gods—almost all images of Anubis as the best known of these deities—veer between the cute and the fierce, with plush Anubis puppies jostling with warrior Anubis action figures. But the fierce definitely predominates: nearly all of the modern uses
and presentations of Anubis are warlike and aggressive, even dangerous, and sometimes malevolent (figs. 172–174). In these representations, our versions of Anubis and the other jackal gods are at odds with the ancient Egyptians’ understandings of these gods as protectors and guides. They reflect, to some extent, a discomfort with these canine-headed gods that we have inherited from the Greeks and Romans.

This selection of contemporary images of jackal gods barely scratches the surface of what is available and is largely limited to objects for display in the exhibition. The material that follows comes from my own collection—not particularly systematic, extensive, or deep. Specific objects and groups were selected by students in my “Exhibiting Ancient Egypt” seminar. These students (Caitlin Clerkin, Ivory Edwards, Alison Rittershaus, Chavon Taylor, Emily Thibeau, and Anna Volante) specifically noted and commented on the prevalence of aggressive imagery in this material, and also the fact that its raw materials (comics, action figures, computer games, and gaming cards) skewed toward material from comic or “geek” culture.

These uses of jackal gods do have one thing in common with their ancient Egyptian precedents, in that the figure of Anubis is most often a supporting character. Even the dramatic “Jackal King” figure of Anubis...
is part of a much larger “Spawn: Age of Pharaohs” series of comics that involves many Egyptian gods. When Anubis is the focus of, say, a comic or video game, it tends to be a one-off issue: thus the single issue of *Anubis Warrior* or the Spanish-language comics, while the title of the video game *Anubis II* designates “Anubis the Second,” not the second in a series. Other apparently longer-running Anubises, the multipart graphic novel *Anubis* and the *Halls of Anubis* quests (fig. 175), rely less on the Egyptian god and more on the mystique of his name.

In other areas, we see that references to Anubis in recent music appear across genres—from the Celtic-Metal sounds of the band named Anubis to the rap of The Lost Children of Babylon’s *Words from the Duat: The Book*...
of Anubis, to the prog-rock of Blue Öyster Cult, who use the classic Anubis image from the tomb of Tutankhamun on the cover of their compilation CD *Workshop of the Telescopes* (fig. 178). To these examples one could have added many more, such as contemporary classical composer Harrison Birtwistle’s *The Cry of Anubis* for tuba and orchestra (1994), prog-rock band Anubis Spire, and heavy metal bands Anubis Unbound and Anubis Gate, while the name of Bond Bergland’s post-Factrix band, Saqqara Dogs, is surely a reference to the thousands of dog mummies found at the Anubeion at Saqqara. And Anubis, often shown playing a guitar or riding a motorcycle, sometimes appears as a mascot for outposts of the Hard Rock Cafe in Egypt and in the United States. Anubis as a celebratory god, seen in Mardi Gras parade doubloons for the long-lived Anubis Krewe and a beer coaster from the now-defunct Oasis Brewery, came as a surprise (fig. 179). Anubis is also clearly a valuable tool for more educational purposes, in the promotion of knowledge about ancient Egypt (fig. 180). But scary modern images of jackal gods clearly predominate.

There are, of course, many other manifestations of Egyptian jackal gods in current popular culture; for this exhibition we chose to focus on objects,
but of course movies and television provide many vivid examples. One could, for example, trace the evolution of jackal gods in the movies—from the relatively innocuous (and accurate!) images of Egyptian jackal figures in films such as the 1932 *The Mummy*, or its 1959 Hammer Films remake, to the strangely inaccurate downward-facing jackal god statues in 1999’s *The Mummy* that help set the scene for the otherwise nonexistent Hamunaptra, City of the Dead. One could also track the use of jackal gods as threatening reanimated creatures in cartoons, the sinister menace of Jonny Quest’s “The Curse of Anubis” (season 1, episode 3) to the comic pursuit of animated jackal gods in Venture Bros. episode “Escape to the House of the Mummies (part 2)” (season 2, episode 4) or their more ambiguous roles, such as the Anubis-featuring “T-Shirt of the Dead” in the eponymous Aqua Teen Hunger Force episode (season 3, episode 11). Jackal gods are everywhere in Egypt-themed movies, music videos, and animation.

Thanks to our ongoing fascination with ancient Egypt, jackal gods are still very much a part of our popular culture, and we will certainly see them evolve and transform even more in the future.

Fig. 181: Detail of “Battle with Anubis” ceramic table accent from fig. 172.
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<td>70–71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Mich.inv. 5890</td>
<td>81–83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Excavation Field Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Number</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karanis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-4028F-A</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-239C-C</td>
<td>15–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-261-E</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-265</td>
<td>75–76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-C50A-U</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-SG-QIII</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-C123CCH2-A(1)</td>
<td>81–83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-C189B-C</td>
<td>83–86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-C191F-F</td>
<td>78–79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-C83B-B</td>
<td>80–81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-B514A-S</td>
<td>68–69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-B514K2-A</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-C124B-F</td>
<td>79–80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-C414F-B</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-C418E-C</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface find</td>
<td>78–79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soknopaiou Nesos</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terenouthis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-A38</td>
<td>34–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-A53</td>
<td>92–95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-A59</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-A75</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-A80</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-L1</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-L2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-L3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-X</td>
<td>87–89, 91–94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Subject Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abydos</td>
<td>22–24, 33, 60–61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amulets</td>
<td>28–32, 34, 78–79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhai, Papyrus of</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal bones, magical</td>
<td>73, 75–76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anoup (personal name)</td>
<td>96–99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anubis, 6–8, 10, 18–19, 21–34, 44–45, 50–53, 56–58, 64–72, 74–77, 79–86, 89, 91, 97–104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anubis (band)</td>
<td>110–112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anubis (graphic novel)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anubis II (video game)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anubis Gate (band)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anubis Krewe</td>
<td>111–112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anubis plant</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anubis Spire (band)</td>
<td>111–112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anubis–threads</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anubis Unbound (band)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anubis Warrior (comic)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anupet</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Teen Hunger Force</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Askren, David L.</td>
<td>28–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanasius</td>
<td>96–97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchias</td>
<td>84, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bata</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay View Association Collection</td>
<td>15, 29–30, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake, William</td>
<td>103–104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blood of a black dog</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Öyster Cult</td>
<td>111–112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boak, A. E. R.</td>
<td>31–32, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book of Caverns</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book of the Dead</td>
<td>14, 25, 30–31, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budge, E. A. Wallis</td>
<td>105–106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton, Harry</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canopic chest</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canopic jars</td>
<td>37–39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Howard</td>
<td>105, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerberus</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>96–99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher, St.</td>
<td>97–98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobern, Camden M.</td>
<td>15, 60–61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coins</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodus</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copronyms</td>
<td>94–95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crocodile gods</td>
<td>77, 83, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cult image</td>
<td>59, 84, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin, Erasmus</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deir el Bahri</td>
<td>26–27, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demotic texts</td>
<td>57–58, 70–71, 74–75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description de l’Égypte</td>
<td>7, 43, 104–105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djehutymose</td>
<td>6, 10, 18, 20, 25–27, 33, 37–38, 42, 44–45, 50, 52–53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dogs, 12–13, 15–17, 60–63, 68–69, 75–77, 80–81, 84, 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duamutef, 10, 18, 21, 37–41, 44–48, 51, 78–79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuQuesne, Terence</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edfu, 10, 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esna, temple of</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falcons</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foxes, 12–13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuseli, Henry</td>
<td>103–104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordian III</td>
<td>68–69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudsmit, Samuel A.</td>
<td>30–31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek papyri</td>
<td>81–83, 96, 98–99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halls of Anubis (comic)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapi, 37–41, 47, 49–50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Rock Cafe</td>
<td>111–112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpocrates</td>
<td>51–53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatshepsut</td>
<td>26–27, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereret</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermanubis</td>
<td>66, 68–70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezat</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horus, 26, 37–41, 50–53, 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunefer, Papyrus of</td>
<td>15, 19, 26, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igai</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imsety</td>
<td>37–41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isis, 50–54, 64–67, 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonny Quest</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jackals, 12–15, 60, 68–69, 88–94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephus</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karanis, 7, 15–17, 67–70, 73–86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khentiamentiu</td>
<td>19, 21–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khepri</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kingship and jackal gods, 25–26, 52–53, 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kircher, Athanasius</td>
<td>8, 101–102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kynopolis</td>
<td>59, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Children of Babylon</td>
<td>110–112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lexor, temple of, 43
Lykopolis, 33, 59

Ma’at, 30–31
magic, 72–76
magical gem, 72, 74
mummies, animal, 60–63
Mummy, The (films from 1932, 1959 and 1999), 112
mummy label, 70–71

Nephthys, 50–54
Nodjmet, Queen, 15

Oasis Brewery, 111–112
Osiris, 50–54, 97

Papyrus D’Orbiney, 56–57
Papyrus Jumilhac, 56

Philip II, 69
Pnepheros and Petesuchos, 83
Plutarch, De Iside et Osiride, 50, 56
priests of Anubis, 77, 81–86
Ptolemy VI Philometor, 70–71
Pyramid Texts, 26
Qebehenuf, 37–41, 47, 49–50
Qebehut, 19
Rome, 66–67
Saqqara, 45, 60, 61
Saqqara Dogs (band), 111
Sed, 18
Serapis, 51, 54–55
Seti I, sarcophagus of, 19
Setna, Demotic stories of, 57
shrine, 83–86
Soknobra, 84, 85
Soknopaioi Nesos, 84, 86

“Tale of Two Brothers,” 56–57
Terenouthis, 7, 87–95
Tertullian, 96–97
Tutankhamun, 14, 26, 105, 107
Venture Bros., 112
“Vota Publica,” 97
Wepiu, 18
Wepwawet, 18, 21, 33–36, 44–45, 58, 71, 78–79, 89, 91
wolves, 12
Zeus, 55
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