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Abstract

In Roman Egypt, a new form of funerary art known as "mummy portraits" emerged. As a development from the earlier funerary masks common in Pharaonic and Ptolemaic Egypt, mummy portraits, images of the deceased painted on wooden panels and inset into the mummy wrappings over the face, became a growing trend from the early 1st century AD and continued to be popular for the next 200 years. Even though scholars have adopted various approaches in studying mummy portraits stylistically in terms of hair, clothing, and jewelry styles for chronological sequencing, little stylistic analysis has been carried out to attribute specific portraits to specific sites using style of painting or panel shape as criteria. An exception is Lorelei Corcoran, who drew associations between the panel and the site to which it belongs, identifying arched panels with Hawara and angled ones with Er-Rubayat. These remarks may indicate that each site had a portrait-painting workshop, each with its own distinctive characteristics. This study analyzes portraits excavated from Hawara, Abusir el-Melek, Tebtunis, and Antinoopolis. These sites have been selected because they have yielded the highest numbers of excavated, and thus securely provenanced, portraits. These have been divided into two categories: the first consists of mummy portraits that are no longer attached to their mummies and the second includes those still in situ on the mummy. The variables examined are the material on which the portrait is painted, painting technique, panel shape, the presence of frames, the posture of the portrayed subject, presence of gilding, and areas gilded. For the second category, the decorative scheme of the mummy wrappings and the shape of the opening are added to the variables. The information has been entered into a database, and the results of the analysis provide a 'fingerprint' for each site. The 'fingerprints' can be used to tentatively assign portraits with unknown or uncertain provenance to specific sites, and thus has wide reaching implications to the study of Roman mummy portraits.
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## List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Mummy portrait (detached)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Portrait mummy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1: Introduction and Methodology

In 1887, Theodore Graf, an Austrian antiquities dealer, exhibited for the first time a large collection of exquisitely realistic painted portraits on wooden panels from Roman Egypt. Graf purchased the collection from locals who claimed to have uncovered the portraits at a site called er-Rubayat, located near Roda in the Fayum (Ebers 1893, 6). A year later, W. M. F. Petrie was excavating at Hawara, 14 miles south of er-Rubayat, when he uncovered 81 complete mummies with the same type of portraits affixed to the areas over their faces. When Petrie returned for his 1910-1911 season, he uncovered 65 more (Thompson 1982, 4). While Graf’s collection was detached from their mummies, Petrie’s excavated portraits were still in situ, which provided a context for their original position, and gave clues as to their use.

The portraits depicted a person’s head and shoulders, painted on a wooden or linen panel, and were positioned over the face of a mummy and secured by the wrappings. Because they were discovered covering the face of the mummy, they came to be known as "mummy portraits" (Drerup 1933). They are also known as "Fayum portraits" because they were first discovered in the Fayum, which remains the largest source of mummy portraits. These portraits are the focus of this study.

Inhabitants living throughout Egypt used mummy portraits to cover the faces of the deceased from the 1st century AD, until the early 3rd century AD (Borg 1995, 233). Modern excavations have uncovered mummy portraits as far north as Marina el-Alamein (Daszewski 2008, 451), as far south as Luxor (Winlock 1924, 33), and at sites in between, including Saqqara (Bierbrier 1997, 23), Er-Rubayat (Grenfell and Hunt 1901b, 7), Hawara (Petrie 1911), Tebtunis (Grenfell and Hunt 1901b), Abusir el Melek (Bierbrier 1997b, 24), el-Hibe he (Grenfell and Hunt 1902), Antinoopolis (Bierbrier 1997b, 24), and Akhmim (Bierbrier 1997b, 24).

The concentration of mummy portraits at specific cemeteries suggests the presence of portrait-painting workshops at nearby towns or associated cemeteries. Each workshop most probably had its own painting technique and practices. For example, scholars attributed the portraits which were painted in tempera to the site of er-Rubayat as opposed to those from Hawara, which were painted mostly using encaustic technique (Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 86). In addition, the shape in which the panel was cut differed from one site to another; for example,
Klaus Parlasca noted that the stepped panels are unique to Antinoopolis (Parlasca 1966, 125–126). Thus, each site probably had its own characteristic features that differed from the others.

This study analyzes mummy portraits from the four different sites that have yielded the highest numbers of excavated portraits. The variables analyzed are panel material, painting technique, presence of gilding, posture (upper body is turned to proper right, proper left, front), presence of frames, panel shape, shape of the wrapping opening around the portrait, type of wrappings, and the presence of chest bands and cartonnage foot cases. The results of the analysis identify the unique features of each site, which differentiates it from the others.

Many publications discussed the different aspects of mummy portraits, but few of them attempted to identify the variations among portraits from different sites. Corcoran's study of red shrouded mummies together with her endeavor to assign a provenance for this type of portrait mummies is considered one of the few studies that addressed the issue of regional variations (Corcoran 1995, 39–45). However, none of the studies carried on provenances and assigned specific characteristics to sites used a quantitative methodology, but they all depend on personal observation, which is often inaccurate. This thesis addresses the gap, and re-examines the ideas that scholars have previously accepted at face value, by relying on statistical analysis of specific variables. The results of the analysis accurately identify the 'fingerprint' of each site, and thus provide a group of traits that are unique indicators of each site, which could be used to tentatively assign portraits with unknown or uncertain provenances to specific sites.

**Previous Work**

After the appearance of the Graf Collection and Petrie's first excavation season at Hawara, Georg Ebers published one of the initial studies that discussed these portraits. His book, *The Hellenic Portraits from the Fayum*, published in 1893, mistakenly dated the mummy portraits to the Hellenistic Period specifically to 2nd century BC (Ebers 1893, 49). Ebers' suggested date of Hellenistic Period affirmed the dating that Graf assigned to his own collection (Borg 1995, 229). Ebers reached his conclusion by deciding first that the portraits must belong to the period before Christianity. He based his assumption on several factors, including the depictions of Egyptian deities such as Isis, Nephthys, and Osiris on the mummy wrappings, as well as depictions of the ancient Egyptian scene of bound enemies on the bottom of the stucco foot casings that adorned the feet of some of the mummies with portraits (Ebers 1893, 42–43).
Ebers believed that these portraits must be Hellenistic rather than early Roman. He based his dating on the portraits of children who were depicted with the typical ancient Egyptian side lock of youth, which he believed had been adopted by the Greek inhabitants of Egypt, with the lock cut off when adolescence was reached. However, the Ptolemaic royal children were known to have retained the lock for sometime after adolescence, and Ebers thought that some of the children with side locks in the mummy portraits were "grown-ups" (Ebers 1893, 54). Thus, Ebers thought that this must have been a Ptolemaic trait and assigned the portraits to the Ptolemaic era and some of the images to royal children (Ebers 1893, 52–54).

Petrie, on the other hand, was among the first scholars to argue against dating the portraits to the Hellenistic Period in his *Roman Portraits and Memphis (IV)*, published in 1911. He dedicated his publication to the study of the mummy portraits he found during his excavations at Hawara. He provided an archaeological context for the mummy portraits in terms of how and where he uncovered them (Petrie 1911, 1–5), and he proposed a chronological sequence for the excavated mummies that had stucco masks, and the ones found with portrait panels (Petrie 1911, 3). Petrie also explained his own perspective regarding the social context and the use of these portraits. He suggested that the inhabitants of the Fayum kept the mummies in their houses to venerate their dead relatives and then buried the mummies collectively by "shoving them roughly" in a pit (Petrie 1911, 2–3), which was rather paradoxical. In addition, he discussed the painting technique (Petrie 1911, 9–12), making him the first scholar to touch upon this subject. Although Petrie's overview is among the best of his time, his sample is restricted to Hawara and it does not encompass other portraits such as those of the Graf collection. Additionally, his treatment of the subject is very general, and compared to the studies that have been undertaken since then, Petrie's fairly basic. However, it remains very useful as it discussed the archaeological context in which these portraits were found. This information provides insight into the burial practices of the inhabitants of the Fayum at the time when mummy portraits were popular, and contextualizes these portrait mummies in their funerary landscape.

Heinrich Drerup's *Die Datierung der Mumienporträts* discussed the styles of each Roman era separately. He compared the imperial hairstyles, clothing, and jewelry depicted in imperial statues to those worn by the individuals in the Egyptian mummy portraits. Accordingly, he dated twenty individual portraits to specific eras (Drerup 1933, 28–40), using a methodology upon which we still depend. Although, he was among the first to assign dates to individual mummy
portraits, there were several problems with his dating, the most important of which is his dependence on Roman coins and private statues whose chronology was still "far from established" at that time (Borg 1995, 231). Therefore, when the chronological sequence of those statues changed, the chronological sequence for some mummy portraits he studied changed as well (Borg 1995, 231).

The first systematic and comprehensive treatment of mummy portraits was Klaus Parlasca's publication, *Mumienporträts und Verwandte Denkmäler*, in 1966. This work included 237 mummy portraits. Even though the study did not survey the entire known collection, it included portraits that were not restricted to a specific site. Parlasca's study was not only focused on the portraits, but also included the other funerary objects found with the burials at the same sites, such as cartonnage and stucco masks. Previous scholars have generally overlooked these objects in their studies. Parlasca provided dates for some portraits using the same dating methodology adopted by Heinrich Drerup (Borg 1995, 231). In addition to dating the selected portraits for his study, Parlasca observed some stylistic differences in mummy portraits from different sites. For example, he was the first to assign specific panel shapes to specific sites. However, his categorization was rigid and was limited to his own observations, instead of a quantifiable analysis. In addition, Parlasca's sample of 237 panels was not comprehensive enough for drawing absolute differences based on panel shape. His results might have been different and more accurate if he had taken all the known portraits excavated from a particular site into consideration, rather than choosing the ones that fit his hypotheses. Exceptions to his categorization in panel shape are evident in portrait no. 31161, 4, located in the Vorderasiatisches Museum in Berlin. This portrait is from er-Rubayat yet it does not have the angled panel shape that Parlasca attributed to portraits from er-Rubayat. The panel of this portrait is round-topped which, according to Parlasca, is characteristic of the Hawara portraits. This example and others indicate that Parlasca's categorization was not accurate and that there are exceptions to his categories. Thus, Parlasca's observations of stylistic differences of different sites will be only taken as a point of comparison with the results of the statistical analysis in this thesis.

Parlasca addressed the issue of his earlier insufficient sample of mummy portraits in his next work *Ritratti di Mummie*, a four-volume work published during the span from 1969 to 2004. This is the most complete catalog of mummy portraits in museums as well as in auction houses
around the world. Even though this catalog addressed the problem in *Mumienporträts und Verwandte Denkmäler* concerning the sample size, it did not address the categories of regional styles that his previous work addressed. Despite that, this catalog is comprehensive and it is the main reference for mummy portraits collected for this thesis.

David Lowell Thompson adopted a completely different approach to the study in his work *The Artists of the Mummy Portraits*, published in 1976, based on his dissertation that focused on the painters of Antinoopolis in particular. Both the dissertation and the book were used in this study. In his dissertation, he identified painters by their styles and he placed them within date ranges. In this book, he added another painter he identified through the style of his portraits from Er-Rubayat and another two painters from Hawara. The originality of his approach is of great importance as it take individual styles into account, and compares the portraits from Antinoopolis to those found at other sites. However, his methodology is based on his personal observation and his dating is usually based on Parlasca’s work, which was not quite accurate.

In 1995, Lorelei Corcoran published her work *Portrait Mummies from Roman Egypt*, which was also based on her dissertation, in which she focused on the representations depicted on the casings of complete mummies with portraits. The term she used to refer to those complete mummies was "portrait mummies." She collected 22 portrait mummies for her study from museum collections in Egypt to study the iconography on the mummy casings associated with the portraits, instead of removing the mummy portraits from their context (Corcoran 1995, 2–5).

Corcoran analyzed the symbolism and the religious meaning of the scenes on the wrappings and casings of the portrait mummies. She noticed that the ancient Egyptian scenes on the mummy wrappings were not chosen randomly, but they instead held intentional meanings related to the Egyptian beliefs in the afterlife. Therefore, she established that ancient Egyptian religious beliefs were still rooted and evident in those "portrait mummies." (Corcoran 1995, 64) She also perceived the use of Greek-style mummy portraits in an ancient Egyptian context of religious beliefs as evidence for the diverse culture of the Egyptians during the Roman Period.

Corcoran, like Parlasca before her, tackled the issue of regional styles. She provided a case study of a specific style of portrait mummy casing characterized by red shrouds and mummy portraits. Since this type of red shrouded portrait mummies is not common, Corcoran identified the possible provenances that might have produced this type by comparing the scenes depicted on red shrouds with known provenance with those that do not have a provenance (1995,
However, she did not focus on a specific period; rather her analysis included mummy portraits dating to different imperial eras. This created a weakness in her argument as different sites might have adopted the red shrouds at different periods.

She also discussed the possible regional differences of mummy portraits that were no longer associated with complete mummies. In this discussion, she relied on the stylistic categories that Parlasca drew in his *Mumienporträts und Verwandte Denkmäler* (Corcoran 1995, 44–46). Using Parlasca's categorization without revising them or addressing their exceptions is another weakness in Corcoran's argument. Nonetheless, Corcoran's methodology in her case study of red shrouded portrait mummies remains useful as to how to detect regional styles of mummy portraits.

The artistic style of mummy portraits was the subject of intense analysis by Euphrosyne Doxiadis. Her publication *The Mysterious Fayum Portraits* provided a comparison between the Egyptian mummy portraits and the later Byzantine icons (Borg 1995, 82–93). The book also dedicated a chapter to the discussion of the different painting techniques used by the artists. Doxiadis's own experiments with painting techniques were the basis for several observations made (Doxiadis 1995, 93-105). Among the most important of these was answering the question concerning the use of molten wax as opposed to cold emulsified wax. The experiments she performed, together with her artistic observations of the portraits, enabled her to decide that artists used both cold emulsified and molten wax (Doxiadis 1995, 95–98). The catalog of mummy portraits in her publication includes a description of the portraits from an artistic perspective such as the colors, shades, whether there are signs of use of hard tools, and the under-paintings. Although Doxiadis's publication was different in its art historical approach to the study of portraits, it did not discuss the stylistic differences between the different sites. Occasionally she would assign a provenance to one of the portraits based on stylistic similarities drawn in Parlasca's *Mumienporträts und Verwandte Denkmäler*. An example of this is Doxiadis's catalog number 62 (Egyptian Museum, CG 33219), to which she assigned the provenance of Hawara based on the round topped panel that, according to Parlasca, is characteristic of the site (Doxiadis 1995, 203). Also in CG 33226, Doxiadis assigned the provenance of Hawara based on the octagonal opening of the mummy wrappings around the face in the portrait (Doxiadis 1995, 207). Yet, an artistic analysis of the regional trends is still lacking from her study. Nonetheless,
Doxiadis's work is important for its stylistic observations, which are important criteria for the regional assignment of the portraits.

In 1996, a year after *The Mysterious Fayum Portraits* was published Barbara Borg published her *Mumienporträts: Chronologie und kultureller Kontext*, which was an adaptation of her dissertation. It was the most updated study on the subject, providing a complete coverage of the social and religious context of the portraits as well as a discussion of the techniques and the artists. The most significant contribution of Borg's work was her revision of the dates that Parlasca assigned to some portraits. She stressed the point that the hairstyles of the subjects of the portraits are not necessarily indicative of the date in terms of absolute chronology (Borg 1996, 27). Rather, this methodology can be used to place portraits in a chronological sequence. In addition, the publication discussed the social and economic status of the depicted individuals and the estimated cost of mummy portraits (Borg 1996, 150–175). One missing aspect from Borg's comprehensive technical analysis was a stylistic categorization of the portraits according to provenance to show fashion and styles at different sites within each period. This thesis places the portraits in a chronological sequence based on the hairstyles as identified in Borg's study rather than following Parlasca's dates, because Borg's work is more updated and is based on meticulous analysis of the hairstyles depicted in imperial and private statues from Rome, as well as the imperial coins.

In 1998, Borg published her second book *"Der zierlichste Anblick der Welt": Ägyptische Porträtmumie*. Although, this publication put emphasis on the archaeological discoveries of the portraits from a historical and contextual standpoint, it also raised some issues that Borg's earlier work *Mumienporträts* had already introduced. A discussion of the regional stylistic differences is also lacking from this book, just as it was lacking from her previous work.

In 1997, Susan Walker and Morris Bierbrier published their work *Ancient Faces: Mummy Portraits From Roman Egypt*. The first part of the publication is a collection of essays that address the art historical, social, and funerary contexts of mummy portraits. While the second part is a catalog of mummy portraits from different museums, as well as painted shrouds and plaster masks. The information regarding each mummy portrait presented in this catalog were added to the database entries in this study.

Additionally, *Living images: Egyptian Funerary Portraits in the Petrie Museum* is another work presented by Janet Picton, Stephen Quirk, and Paul Roberts, which is a catalog of
the mummy portrait collection in the Petrie Museum. This book also includes a series of essays concerning the British archaeological discoveries of mummy portraits, as well as a discussion of the conservation practices carried out on selected portraits. The catalog entries in this work serve as an additional source of information for the collected mummy portraits in the database of this thesis.

**Methodology**

Mummy portraits that have been selected for this study come from Hawara, Abusir el-Melek, Tebtunis, and Antinoopolis. The four sites were selected because they were excavated and each has produced seven portraits or more, the minimum number of images upon which one can base a typology. Other sites have yielded only one or two portraits, such as Deir el-Banat (Picton, Quirke, and Roberts 2007, 18–19), and Marina el-Alamein (Daszewski 2008, 452), which are insufficient to establish a pattern, and were thus excluded from this study. Also, this study excluded all portraits that were purchased, although they might have been assigned provenance in publications, such as the collection attributed to er-Rubayat (Picton, Quirke, and Roberts 2007, 14–16), el-Hibeh (Parlasca and Frenz 2004, 4:47, 50–51, No. 722, No. 720, No. 721), and Akhmim (Parlasca 1977, 2:43–44), because of the uncertainty of their provenance.

Hawara was excavated by Petrie in 1888-1889 and again in 1910-1911, where, during these two seasons, he found a total of 146 portraits (Petrie 1889; Petrie 1913). Abusir el-Melek was excavated by Otto Rubensohn for the Berlin Museum in 1904, yielding seven portraits (Parlasca 1969, 1:26,34,36,38–39,42–43). Grenfell and Hunt excavated Tebtunis in 1899-1900 and uncovered a minimum of 11 portraits (Bierbrier 1997b, 24), while Albert Gayet excavated the cemetery at Antinoopolis and uncovered a total of 14 portraits (Bierbrier 1997b, 24).

This thesis focuses on mummy portraits painted on wooden or linen panels. Mummy masks are not part of this study despite being often included alongside mummy portraits in scholarly works (Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 131–148), based on being three-dimensional individualized portraits. However, they require different workmanship from their two-dimensional painted counterparts and subsequently they have different stylistic attributes.

Scholars studying mummy portraits, such as Parlasca in his *Ritratti di Mummie* and Doxiadis in her *The Mysterious Fayum Portraits*, included a few examples of painted portraits from Roman Egypt that were not used to cover the faces of mummies. An example of such
Painted portraits is the "tondo of the two brothers," excavated by Gayet at Antinoopolis in 1898-1899, currently in the Egyptian Museum (CG 33267) with a diameter of 61 cm (Doxiadis 1995, 211; Parlasca 1969, 1:72). This is not a mummy portrait because it is too large to have been positioned within mummy wrappings. The framed portrait found by Petrie at Hawara, is another example. This portrait, currently in the British Museum (GRA 1889, 10-18.1), measures only 25.5×20.5 cm and was found lying next to a mummy without a portrait attached to it (Parlasca and Frenz 2004, 4:71–72; Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 121). Judging from its small size, it was never intended to cover the face of the deceased. Although the actual purpose of those examples is still debated, they should not be placed in the same category as mummy portraits, since they were not used to cover the faces of mummies.

Painted shrouds are another type of objects that previous scholars have rarely differentiated from mummy portraits. This study defines a shroud as a full-length linen sheet that portrays an individual in bust or in full length and that was used as the outer layer of the mummy wrappings. Linen portraits, on the other hand, have an average size of 43×30 cm, similar to the wooden panels. They do not represent the outer covering of the mummy, but rather they were inserted within the wrappings and functioned identically to the wooden panels. Shrouds are stylistically different from linen portraits and require a different set of variables for their analysis. Therefore, they were excluded from this study.

It was also necessary to exclude some portraits from the selected four sites, due to the inaccessibility of data relating to them. These include portraits in private collections, sold on the antiquities market, and those that are in museums with restricted access to their data. Although Parlasca recorded these portraits in his catalogs, the images he included are not of good enough quality for the use in this study, and his description lacks some details such as a description of the wrapping of portrait mummies. Thus, they were excluded. The poor preservation of some portraits was also a factor in selecting the sample; faded or broken images do not allow for a secure dating or a stylistic analysis to be drawn, and so they were not included in the study.

Based on these selection criteria, the thesis database consists of 150 portraits, divided by provenance into the following groups: seven portraits excavated at Abusir el-Melek, 14 portraits from Antinoopolis, 120 portraits excavated at Hawara, and ten portraits excavated at Tebtunis.

The corpus for each site is divided into two main categories: the first, mummy portraits that have been detached from their mummies, numbering 118 portraits. The second is those that
are still in situ, numbering 31. For every detached mummy portrait the database contains information regarding the material of the panel, painting technique used, shape of the panel, presence of gilding, place of gilding, presence of a frame, gender of the depicted individual, garments, jewelry, hairstyle, presence of inscription, and details of its acquisition. For every mummy portrait still in situ, the same data were collected, in addition to the wrappings decoration, and the shape of the wrapping opening around the inserted portrait.

In order to facilitate the analysis and identify the temporal changes of the variables, the 150 portraits were placed in chronological groups. The sequence is set by comparing the hairstyles depicted in mummy portraits with those of private and royal statues found in Rome. It should be noted that absolute dating cannot be assigned based on the hairstyle alone because of the possible time difference between the emergence of a hairstyle in Rome and its adoption in Egypt. In addition, hairstyles can continue on for a longer time than their imperial examples (Corcoran and Svoboda 2010, 41; Borg 1996, 27). Thus, the dates are general. Barbara Borg's analysis of hairstyles from imperial and private statuary as well as from coins, in *Mumienporträts: Chornologie und Kultureller Kontext*, forms the basis of the chronological groups used in this thesis.

After the revision of the dates, each chronological group of mummy portraits was analyzed in terms of:

1. The material used for panels (linen or wood)
2. Painting technique (encaustic, tempera, or combined)
3. The presence of gilding on the panels, as well as the areas being gilded
4. The posture of the subject (Front, proper left, proper right). The posture is identified by observing the length of the subject's shoulders. Unequal lengths of the painted shoulders suggest that the subject's upper body is turned to proper right or proper left, according to which shoulder is longer. If both shoulders are of equal lengths, then the subject is facing front.
5. The presence of frames as well as their forms

For the detached portraits (denoted by MP):

6. The panel shape (arched, rectangular, angled).

For the portraits still attached to their mummies (denoted by PM), also known as portrait mummies (Corcoran 1995), the following variables are analyzed:
7. The differently shaped opening (octagonal, oval, arched top and three-sided bottom) of the wrappings, which reveals the attached portrait.

8. The types of wrappings (8 types as illustrated in Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type No.</th>
<th>Decoration type</th>
<th>Colored pattern</th>
<th>gilded stucco studs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>Rhombic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>Rhombic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>Rhombic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>Rhombic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 5</td>
<td>red shrouded</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 6</td>
<td>gilded stucco casing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 7</td>
<td>red shrouded+ gilded stucco</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 8</td>
<td>painted shroud+ rhombic pattern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Types of Wrappings

The graphs and charts represent the set of variables and the results identify the most common features that uniquely characterize each site during each imperial reign. Thus, it shows the differences between sites, as well as continuity or change at a site across time.
Chapter 2: Hawara

Background of the Discovery

Hawara is located 10 km southeast of Madinet el-Fayum. It was a functioning cemetery since the Early Dynastic Period, but became significant in the Middle Kingdom when Amenmhat III built his pyramid and mortuary temple, known by classical authors as "The Labyrinth" (Bard and Shubert 1999, 436–437). The ancient Roman cemetery at Hawara grew up around the pyramid of Amenmhat III. W. M. Flinders Petrie first excavated at Hawara in 1887 and 1888 (Bard and Shubert 1999, 436–437; Baines and Malek 2005, 131; Petrie 1889; Petrie 1911). He uncovered 81 mummies with encaustic portraits placed over their wrapped faces and attached by linen bandages (Petrie 1911, 2). When he returned to work in Hawara in 1911, he uncovered 65 more portraits (Petrie 1911, 2). R. von Kaufmann also excavated the site in 1892, uncovering a tomb with eight mummies, three of which had attached portraits and are currently in the Neues Museum in Berlin (Germer 1997, 150–151; Borg 1998, 17–20; Parlasca 1969, 1:25, No.1, Pl. 1,1, 26–27, No. 5, Pl. 2,1, No. 6, Pl. 2,2).

In total, and according to both excavators' records, 154 mummy portraits were excavated at Hawara. Parlasca's four-volume catalog indicates that only 142 portraits were uncovered at Hawara (Parlasca 1969, 1:13; Parlasca 1977, 2:15; Parlasca 1980, 3:13; Parlasca and Frenz 2004, 4:3). The lower number given by Parlasca is due to inconsistencies between Petrie's published reports and his personal journals, which makes it difficult to identify the collection in his records with museums' collections (Roberts 1997, 20–21). Scholars, such as Paul Roberts, have attempted to identify some of the portraits in museums with those described in Petrie's personal journals and his published works (Roberts 1997; Roberts 2007, 45–56). Some of the portraits were identified, while others remain without any record in museums' collections or are yet to be identified. Furthermore, several portraits were stolen from Petrie's finds by local antiquities dealers (Roberts 1997, 19–20), which further confuses the issue. The number of Hawara portraits known today, thus, is less than the number Petrie mentions in his published works.

The 142 portraits published by Parlasca and identified with Petrie's published and personal records are used in this study. The database includes 120 portraits: 29 portrait mummies and 91 detached mummy portraits. From Parlasca's catalogs, 22 portraits were not included from
this database because they were either fragmentary, or their details were faded, or their current location is unknown, or they are in a private collection and thus unavailable for study.

**The Chronological Sequence:**

The portraits from Hawara are assigned to chronological groups based on comparing the hairstyles with the royal and private statues from Rome, with the caveat, as mentioned above, that it is possible that hairstyles in the provinces were more conservative and lagged behind Rome. Borg’s (1996) analysis of the hairstyles during each imperial reign forms the basis of the chronological sequence used in this thesis. A discussion of the hairstyles associated with each chronological group is followed by a discussion of the portraits that this author assigned a date that differs from that provided by earlier publications, and provides justification for the new date as revised by this author.

**Julio-Claudian (AD 14-68)**

The Julio-Claudian era (AD 14-68) spans the reigns of four emperors: Tiberius (AD 14-37), Caligula (AD 37-41), Claudius (AD 41-54), and Nero (AD 54-68), and thus includes three subgroups: Tiberian, Caligulan- Claudian, and Neronian. The overall number of portraits belonging to the Julio-Claudian group is 26 portrait, which are divided into 14 detached mummy portraits and 12 portrait mummies.

The hairstyle of men of the Julio-Claudian era remained the same throughout the period. They wore their hair short, and combed forward, the hairline stopping at the beginning of the forehead (Borg 1996, 69). Most of the examples of private and royal statues from Rome are beardless, while very few examples of these Roman statues were depicted with short beards, but no long beards (Borg 1996, 70). An example of a man sporting this hairstyle is a portrait mummy JE 42790, currently in the Egyptian Museum, depicting a man with a short hair cut, receding hairline at the temples, and his hair combed forward towards the forehead (Parlasca 1969, 1:67, No. 147 Pl. 35,3).

The women were generally depicted with a simple hairstyle with the hair centrally parted, and arranged in slight waves on either sides of the central division. Occasionally, the hair was enriched with loose curls at the temples (Borg 1996, 28). Examples of such portraits include the mummy of "Hermione Grammatike" at Girton College (PM 2.119) and the portrait ÄM 11411 of
"Aline" currently in Neues Museum (MP 2.3) (Parlasca 1969, 1:25–26, No. 1 pl. 1,1, No. 3 Pl. 1,3).

By the late Tiberian Period, the hair on either side of the central parting became curlier. In the three dimensional portraits of Agrippina Minor, Caligula's sister, the hair was centrally parted and enriched with several rows of curls on either side with two long spiral ringlets falling behind the ears (Borg 1996, 28–29). By the time of Nero (AD 54-68), the central parting disappeared completely with the rows of curls circling the entirety of the forehead similar to the style favored by Poppaea, Nero's wife (Borg 1996, 28–29).

**Tiberian (AD 14-37)**

The portraits of women belonging to the Tiberian group are MP 2.1 at the Egyptian Museum (Plate 1), MP 2.2 at the Kestner Museum (Plate 2), and PM 2.121(Plate 4, Plate 5) at Girton College. In the three examples, the women have their hair centrally parted, combed close to the head in slight natural waves. The portrait of a man, PM 2.120 at Leipzig, shows him with a very short haircut in typical fashion of that period.

MP 2.3, currently at the Neues Museum in Berlin, was dated to the Trajanic Period by Doxiadis (1995, 200–201), while Parlasca assigned this portrait to the Tiberian Period (1969, 1:25, No. 1, Pl. 1/1). In this study, MP 2.3 (Plate 3) is assigned to the Tiberian group rather than the Trajanic because the woman is depicted with the hair centrally parted, slightly wavy on both sides, and enriched with small round curls at the temples. Such a hairstyle is typically Tiberian, rather than Trajanic. In the Trajanic style, the hair is not centrally parted and it is enriched with several rows of curls framing the forehead (Borg 1996, 32).

The total number of portraits from Hawara dating to the Tiberian Period is five, divided into three detached mummy portraits and two portrait mummies. They can be analyzed as follows:

1. The most commonly used panel material in this group was linen as opposed to wood. Only one example is painted on wood.
2. Tempera was the dominant painting technique used, with only one example of encaustic.
3. Gilding was rare: only one example exhibits gilding on the jewelry.
Figure 5 (Tiberian) Percentages of gilded portraits

Figure 6 (Tiberian) Numbers of gilded portraits

4. The preferred posture is that of the body turned slightly towards the proper right and the head turned to face the viewer. There is only one example of the woman in MP 2.1 depicted in frontal posture (Plate 1).
5. No frames are present in this chronological group
6. The most common panel shape is the rectangular; this is the case with the two examples on linen MP 2.3 (Plate 3) and MP 2.1. The only arched panel is the one on wood MP 2.2 (Plate 2).
Figure 9 (Tiberian) Numbers of panel shapes

7. The wrapping opening that reveals the inserted portrait has two variations on the octagonal form. The total number of portrait mummies in this chronological group is only two. Each mummy exhibits one of the two shapes. One has an elongated octagonal opening with a narrow base; the other has a wide octagonal opening. Since the number of complete mummies in this group is small, it is difficult to determine the dominant shape of the opening.

Figure 10 (Tiberian) Numbers of opening shapes
8. The two Tiberian mummies' wrappings are the same; both are wrapped in several layers of linen bandages arranged in rhombic patterns. The wrapping is plain, without gilded stucco studs in the centers of the rhombic shapes, and the bandages are uniform in color. Thus, both mummies are Type1 decoration.

9. No chest bands are present in this group

10. No cartonnage foot cases appear in this group

Summary of the Tiberian Group

The Tiberian group is small, but exhibits the characteristic features of the earliest mummy portraits. Linen was the dominant material used for portraits. Tempera is used more often than encaustic. The results of this analysis also showed that a combined technique of both tempera and encaustic was used and probably represent the earliest experimentation with such technique, which was sometimes used on later Severan shrouds from Antinoopolis. Gilding occurs in only one example where it was applied over a layer of stucco to define the jewelry. The dominant posture is that of the subject turned to proper right. All the linen portrait panels are rectangular, the only arched panel is the one made of wood. Two forms of the octagonal opening are present in this group. One is the elongated octagonal shape with a narrow base, while the other is a wide octagonal shape. The plain Type 1 of the decoration schemes is. No chest bands, cartonnage foot cases, or frames are present in this corpus.

Caligulan-Claudian (AD 37-54)

The Caligulan and Claudian Periods are combined into one chronological group because the men and women's hairstyles remain the same throughout the two reigns. The men in PM 2.124 (Plate 13, Plate 14), PM 2.122 (Plate 6), MP 2.6, MP 2.7 (Plate 10) are all wearing their hair short, sometimes showing a receding natural hairline such as in the case of PM 2.124 and MP 2.7. The women in PM 2.123 (Plate 12), PM 2.121 (Plate 4, Plate 5), MP 2.5 (Plate 8) and MP 2.4 (Plate 7) are all depicted with the same hairstyle. The hair is centrally parted with several rows of curls on each side, or one row of small round curls circling the forehead as in the case of PM 2.121 (Plate 4), and two ringlets falling behind the ears on the sides of the neck.

Although Parlasca assigned MP 2.6 (Plate 9) to the Neronian or early Flavian Period (Parlasca 1969, 1:28, No. 42, Pl. 11.4), Borg assigned it to the Claudian Period based on the
short, simple hairstyle and the triangular face that resembles the physiognomy of Claudius (Borg 1996, 70). This study agrees with Borg's date and assigns the portrait to the Claudian group.

Parlasca dated PM 2.122 (Plate 6) to the early Hadrianic Period (Parlasca 1969, 1:40, No. 50, Pl 13/2). Despite the fact that the hairstyle cannot be securely identified with a specific Imperial fashion as it is obscured by the wreath, Borg assigned the short haircut, which is partly visible underneath the wreath, to the Julio-Claudian style (Borg 1996, 70). In terms of features, it resembles MP 2.6 (Plate 9) with the downward-turned mouth and the wide almond shaped eyes. Therefore, it was assigned in this study to the Caligulan-Claudian group.

Borg dated MP 2.7's hairstyle to the reign of Titus in the Flavian Period (Borg 1996, 72). However, the short hair with the sickle shaped curls combed towards the front are all features that are found in Julio-Claudian hairstyles. In addition, the downward-turned mouth and the wide almond shaped eyes can be directly compared with those in MP 2.6 (Plate 9) and PM 2.122. Therefore, it is more reasonable to place MP 2.7 (Plate 10) with the Julio-Claudian chronological group rather than the Flavian one.

PM 2.124 (Plate 13, Plate 14) is dated by Parlasca to the late Flavian Period (Parlasca 1969, 1:67, No. 147, Pl. 35/2). However, the typical hairstyles in the late Flavian are characterized by an increased volume of hair (Borg 1996, 71). Borg dated the portrait to the early Julio-Claudian years based on the man's short hair which is combed forward towards the forehead but stops at the edge of the hairline (Borg 1996, 70). This study follows Borg's date in this case, and places PM 2.124 specifically in the Claudian group. The presence of a chest band and gilded stucco studs at the centers of the rhombic shapes indicate a mid 1st century date (Corcoran 1995, 32).

PM 2.126 (Plate 16) and PM 2.127 (Plate 17) were found in the same tomb as MP 2.3 (Plate 3) and were dated by Doxiadis to the Flavian-early Trajanic Period (Doxiadis 1995, 200, No. 49, No. 50). However, the rows of small round curls framing the forehead and the absence of a bun in PM 2.126 are typically Claudian style. Although the hairstyle in PM 2.127 is different from the rows of curls of PM 2.126, it is assigned to the same chronological group based on the rendering of the big round eyes, the button nose, and the stylized full lips, which are similar in both portraits.
Doxiadis dated PM 2.125 (Plate 15) to the Tiberian Period (Doxiadis 1995, 208). However, it has been assigned to the Claudian group rather than the Tiberian one in this study based on two reasons. One is the wrapping decoration of this mummy, which includes a chest band, colored linen, and a row of gilded stucco studs above the feet. This decorative scheme does not correspond with the Type 1 decoration that was common in the Tiberian group. The second reason is that the stylistic rendering of the features that resemble those of PM 2.126 and PM 2.127. The three portraits share the same stylized, defined full lips; big round eyes; and a short button nose.

The group consists of twelve portraits, five of which are detached while the remaining seven are still attached to their mummies. The Claudian group is analyzed as follows:

1. Wooden panels became more frequently used while linen panels became less popular. However, there are a significant percentage of linen panels.

![Figure 11(Caligulan-Claudian) Percentages of panel materials](image_url)
2. Encaustic was the preferred painting technique as opposed to tempera. Tempera was still used to a considerable extent. There is only one example, MP 2.4, which shows the use of the combined technique of tempera and encaustic, the same technique that was used in the Tiberian portrait MP 2.2 (Plate 2).

Figure 12 Numbers panel materials

![Panel Material Chart]

Figure 13 (Caligulan-Claudian) Percentages of painting techniques

![Painting Technique Pie Chart]
There is a high tendency to use gilding on Claudian portraits. The gilded parts are mainly the wreath and the jewelry. However, some portraits exhibit gilding in unusual areas such as the dividing hairline in MP 2.4, lips, and clothes in MP 2.5.

Figure 14 Number of painting techniques

3. There is a high tendency to use gilding on Claudian portraits. The gilded parts are mainly the wreath and the jewelry. However, some portraits exhibit gilding in unusual areas such as the dividing hairline in MP 2.4, lips, and clothes in MP 2.5.

Figure 15(Caligulan-Claudian) Percentages of gilded portraits
The subjects of Claudian portraits are all depicted with their upper bodies turned to proper left or proper right; with the head turned to face the viewer. The proper right posture is slightly more common (seven portraits) than the proper left one (four portraits). However, the percentages of both postures are almost equal. Only one example of, MP 2.4, depicts a woman in frontal pose.
5. No frames are present in this group
6. In the detached portraits, the most common shape for the panels is the arched shape. There is only one rectangular panel and that is a linen panel.
7. In Claudian portrait mummies, the opening of the wrappings that surrounds the inserted portraits was always octagonal. Mostly they were either a wide octagonal or an elongated octagonal with a narrow base. Only one example exhibits a regular, even-sided octagonal opening with a top and base of equal lengths (PM 2.121; Plate 4).
The common decoration scheme is the rhombic pattern with colored linen forming decorative patterns and gilded stucco studs (Type 4). PM 2.125 (Plate 15) has a painted shroud wrapped over the rhombic wrappings, a Type 8 scheme, which is a unique feature unparalleled in any of the chronological groups. Two examples retained the plain rhombic pattern of Type 1 that was common in the
Tiberian Period. One example shows Type 2 with the rhombic pattern and colored linen, but without gilded stucco studs.

![Decoration Type](chart1)

**Figure 24 (Caligulan-Claudian) Percentages of types of wrappings**

![Decoration Type](chart2)

**Figure 25 (Caligulan-Claudian) Numbers of types of wrappings**

9. The number of mummies decorated with a chest band of gilded stucco studs is almost equal to the number of mummies that have no chest band, separated by only one portrait mummy.
10. Only PM 2.125 (Plate 15) exhibits a foot band of gilded stucco studs. This suggests that it was not a common style in the wrappings decoration.

11. No cartonnage foot cases are present in this chronological group

Summary of the Caligulan-Claudian Group

As the graphs above show, the number of wooden panels is inversely proportional to the linen ones. In addition, the painting technique became encaustic rather than tempera. The
deceased are mostly depicted with their upper bodies directed towards proper right or proper left while turning their heads frontally at the viewer. Gilding became very popular during the Claudian Period. The gilding is applied to areas such as lips, clothing, and hairline, along with the commonly gilded jewelry and wreaths. The wooden panels are all arched while the single linen panel is rectangular, in addition to one angled panel.

Although, the entire corpus of Claudian portrait mummies had octagonal openings, the proportions of the opening differed. The two most common octagonal shapes are the elongated octagonal with a narrow base, and the wide octagonal shape.

Gilded stucco studs and colored patterns made an appearance during the Claudian Period in Hawara. Some of the deceased preferred their wrappings to be decorated with a chest band of gilded stucco studs, although this was not uniformly the case. Four types of wrapping decoration are present in this corpus: Type 1 lingered on from the Tiberian group, Type 4 is more frequently adopted than the others, while Type 2 is represented by a single example. PM 2.125 is the only example of Type 8, not just in this group, but also across the other chronological groups. It is also the only mummy decorated with a foot band of gilded stucco studs. Although, it was found with the Tiberian portrait of a woman, MP 2.1, PM 2.125 is unique in style and does not correspond with the common features of this group. None of the portrait mummies of this group has accessories such as frames or cartonnage foot cases.

Neronian (AD 54-68)

The characteristic hairstyle for women in this group shows several rows of small, round curls framing the forehead with no central parting (Borg 1996, 28–29). The rows of round curls circling the head in the Neronian style are snug around the forehead, unlike the Flavian style of towering curls (Borg 1996, 31). The hairstyle at the back of the head is not visible except in the late Neronian portraits such as MP 2.14, and MP 2.15 (Plate 31). In those two examples, the hair is arranged in a braided nest at the back of the head, with only the upper edges of the nest visible behind the rows of curls. Borg pointed out that the visible transverse ridge of the bun in MP 2.14 (Plate 30) started in the Neronian era, but became more common in the Flavian Period (Borg 1996, 31). This places MP 2.14 in the transitional period between the Neronian and the Flavian groups.
MP 2.9 (Plate 25) depicts a woman with the entire front part covered in small round curls arranged in rows circling the forehead and the two ringlets falling behind the ears. Such a hairstyle is very similar to that of Poppea Sabina, Nero's wife (Borg 1996, 31).

The double ball golden earring is the most commonly worn earring in this corpus. Most of the women depicted in this corpus are wearing a simple golden chain with a lunula as a pendant, except for MP 2.10 (Plate 26), where the woman is wearing two necklaces: one is made of white pearl beads and the other is made of green emeralds beads. Another popular jewel that is frequently depicted in Neronian portraits is the diadem made of a simple chain and hanging small beads. Sometimes this type of diadem was replaced with a thin golden chain separating the frontal curls from the braided nest at the back of the head, such as in the case of MP 2.14 (Plate 30) and MP 2.15 (Plate 31).

The corpus belonging to the Neronian Period consists of nine portraits divided into eight detached portraits, and one portrait mummy. The features characteristic of the Hawara portraits of the Neronian group is:

1. The most common material used for panels is wood during the Neronian Period, with only one example of a linen panel (MP 2.11).

![Panel Material](image_url)

Figure 28 (Neronian) Percentages of panel materials
2. Encaustic became the only technique used by artists during the Neronian Period. The only attestation of tempera is on linen portrait MP 2.11 (Plate 27), where it was used in combination with encaustic. This makes MP 2.11 the third portrait that exhibits the use of the combined technique.
3. Gilding is only apparent in three portraits. In all three examples, the gilded parts are the jewelry. For two portraits, MP 2.14 (Plate 30) and MP 2.13, the gilding is applied over a layer of stucco.

Figure 32 (Neronian) Percentages of gilded portraits
4. The subjects are depicted facing proper right in seven portraits. MP 2.11 is the only portrait where the depicted woman is facing front (Plate 27). No portraits depict the subject facing proper left.
The most common panel shape is the angled with only two examples of arched portraits such as MP 2.15 (Plate 31), and MP 2.14. The single example of a rectangular panel is the linen panel MP 2.11.
6. Only one portrait mummy is present in the Neronian corpus, which does not allow for identification of the common decoration schemes of the period. However, from this single example, it can be deduced that the same elongated octagonal shaped opening with a narrow base continued from the Tiberian Period to the Neronian. It is a Type 3 decoration characterized by the rhombic wrappings, presence of gilded stucco studs decorating the centers of the rhombi, and absence of colored patterns.

7. The portrait mummy is decorated with a chest band.

8. The portrait mummy is decorated with an added gilded cartonnage foot case.

Summary of the Neronian Group

The Neronian style shows continuation in the choice of wood over linen for panels, causing a substantial decrease in the use of linen. Encaustic became the dominant technique used for portraits, while tempera was only used once in combination with encaustic. In most examples, the subjects were depicted with their upper bodies turned to proper right. Only one example depicted a frontal posture. The angled panel became the most common as opposed to arched panel that was popular in the Tiberian and Claudian groups. Although there is only one portrait mummy dated to Neronian Period, it shows a continuation in the use of chest bands, rhombic patterns, and gilded stucco studs, along with the octagonal opening. An added element that appears in the Neronian Period is the cartonnage foot case that is a separate element from the rest of the wrappings. The remains of the foot case on PM 2.130 (Plate 22) show evidence of
pink and lilac coloring and gilding on the right foot (Corcoran 1995, 92; Edgar 1905a, 84). Thus, according to the currently excavated corpus from Hawara, it represents the earliest use of foot cases.

**Flavian (AD 69-96)**

Male portraits in the Flavian style are characterized by a realistic physiognomy. The hairstyle of the emperor Titus consists of a receding hairline with the hair cut short and combed from the back to front in sickle shaped curls. The emperor Nerva's style is characterized by the same receding hairline at the temples, but the hair is curlier and has more volume than that of Titus. Baldness can be observed in several portraits of old men such as in that case of MP 2.27 (Plate 44). Younger men are often shown wearing their hair in a thick curly hairstyle such as that in MP 2.20 (Plate 37) and MP 2.18 (Plate 35) (Borg 1996, 71).

For the women, Julia Titi, the daughter of Titus, wore her hair with a tower of small round curls framing the head and a bun made of several rows of braids. The bun is small and situated at the back of the head. By the time of Domitia, wife of Domitius, the bun became larger and higher than that of Julia Titi (Borg 1996, 32).

MP 2.17, currently in the Egyptian Museum, is a portrait of a young girl (Plate 34). The wispy hair combed forward towards the forehead does not allow for a precise dating. However, it is dated to the Flavian group because it was excavated with MP 79, otherwise known as Demos (Parlasca 1969, 1:47). Demos's hairstyle is typical Flavian with the bun situated high on the crown of the head similar to the style of Domitia.

Parlasca and Doxiadis dated MP 2.29 (Plate 46) to the Antonine Period (Parlasca 1977, 2:57; Doxiadis 1995, 76). However, the short hairstyle, the sickle shaped curls, and the receding hairline at the temples show similarities with the hairstyle of Flavian portrait mummy PM 2.131 (Plate 23, Plate 24). Although the long beard is unusual for the Flavian Period, beards have been worn in some examples of private statues since Julio-Claudian times (Borg 1996, 71).

Parlasca dated MP 2.22 (Plate 39) to the third quarter of the 2nd century (Parlasca 1977, 2:39–40, No. 289, Pl. 60/4). Borg, on the other hand, dated the portrait to the Flavian Period, especially to the time of Nerva (Borg 1996, 72). The man in MP 2.22 (Plate 39) wears his hair in a wavy, thick, short hairstyle, such that the hair is combed forward to the forehead, but does not
fall so far on the forehead. Borg also drew parallels in terms of the physiognomy of the portrait with that of the emperor Nerva (Borg 1996, 72). Therefore, this study places MP 2.22 with the Flavian group.

MP 2.24 (Plate 41) is dated to the Trajanic Period by Doxiadis (Doxiadis 1995, 198). However, both Parlasca and Borg assigned the portrait to the late Flavian Period because of the size of the bun (Parlasca 1969, 1:51–52, No. 94, Pl. 22/2; Borg 1996, 34). Buns tended to increase in size in the transitional period between the Flavian and the early Trajanic eras (Borg 1996, 34). In this portrait, the bun is not as large as its Trajanic counterparts, yet it is slightly larger than the usual Flavian bun depicted in MP 2.25 (Plate 42), and therefore, it was assigned, in this study, to the late Flavian Period.

MP 2.26 (Plate 43) is another case that has been dated differently by other scholars. Parlasca dated this portrait to the early Antonine Period (1969, 1:47, No. 80, Pl. 19/3), while, Doxiadis dated it to AD 25-50 (Doxiadis 1995, 201). However, one of the characteristic features of the Antonine hairstyles is the central parting of the hair (Borg 1996, 48). This feature is absent in MP 2.26. Therefore, it cannot be assigned to the Antonine group. Considering the date given by Doxiadis, the rows of curls framing the forehead could be identified with the hairstyle of the Neronian group. However, the presence of a high bun situated diagonally at the crown of the head makes this portrait more similar to the early Flavian style rather than the Neronian. Therefore, this study assigns MP 2.26 to the Flavian group.

Walker and Bierbrier dated MP 2.30 (Plate 47) to the Trajanic Period (Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 59–60). The hairstyle is damaged and cannot be identified properly, though rows of curls framing the forehead are visible, as is a wide bun. Thus, the portrait can be assigned to either the late Flavian or the early Trajanic style. The rendering of the small, pursed lips, wide round eyes and short, round nose is very similar to MP 2.24 (Plate 41). Therefore, this portrait, along with MP 2.24, has been assigned to the transitional period between the late Flavian and the early Trajanic Period.

Parlasca dated PM 2.131 (Plate 23, Plate 24) to the late Trajanic-early Hadrianic Period (Parlasca 1969, 1:73, No. 170, Pl. 41/3). However, the hair in PM 2.131 is cut short with sickle-shaped curls and a receding hairline at the temples. This hairstyle is not similar to the Trajanic
haircut, which is characterized by a fringe of smooth hair falling on the forehead (Borg 1996, 73). It is also not similar to the Hadrianic hairstyle that is characterized by intense curls, movement, and volume (Borg 1996, 73–74). Rather, the hairstyle of PM 2.131 resembles the Flavian short haircut with its sickle shaped strands. Therefore, this study assigns PM 2.131 to the Flavian group in agreement with Borg's assigned date (Borg 1996, 72).

The Flavian group includes 19 portraits, divided into 17 detached portraits and only 2 portrait mummies. The style of the Flavian portraits can be analyzed as follows:

1. Wood is the sole material for portrait panels during the Flavian Period.

![Panel Material](image-url)

Figure 38 (Flavian) Numbers of panel materials
2. Encaustic technique dominates the portraits belonging to the Flavian Period. Only one example, MP 2.21, is painted in tempera on a wooden panel (Plate 38).

3. Gilding was rare during the Flavian Period with only one example of PM 2.132 (Plate 33) with a gilded wreath.
4. The number of portraits depicting the subject turned to proper right is larger than those depicting subjects to their proper left.
5. No frames are present on the portraits in this chronological group. Only PM 2.132 (Plate 33) has a frame of gilded diamond-shaped pattern applied on the wrappings but not on the portrait itself.
6. The most common panel shape is the angled shape. Arched panels are also frequent, but to a lesser extent. MP 2.23 is the only rectangular portrait (Plate 40).

![Panel Shape Diagram](image)

Figure 45 (Flavian) Percentages of panel shapes

![Panel Shape Bar Chart](image)

Figure 46 (Flavian) Numbers of panel shapes

7. The total number of portrait mummies in this corpus is only two; each mummy has a different opening shape. PM 2.131 (Plate 23, Plate 24) has an octagonal
opening shape while PM 2.132 (Plate 33) has an oval-shaped opening. Thus, it is difficult to identify a common opening shape during this period.

![Opening Shape]

**Figure 47 Numbers of opening shapes**

8. The decoration of the wrappings is different in both portrait mummies. Thus, a common scheme of wrappings decoration cannot be deduced from this very small corpus. PM 2.131 (Plate 24) is wrapped according to Type 3 with several layers of bandages arranged in rhombic pattern, gilded stucco studs at the centers of each rhombic shape, and no colored design. PM 2.132 (Plate 33) is the earliest red shrouded mummy at Hawara, which was wrapped according to Type 5 with a red-linen shroud that is decorated with gilded ancient Egyptian motifs. The motifs include two falcons facing each other flanking the bottom of the opening in the first register, Anubis standing near a bier with a mummy in the second register, a standing winged goddess in the third register, two gods facing each other in the final register, and gilded feet on the bottom of the shroud.

9. PM 2.131 is decorated with a chest band of gilded stucco studs inserted on a pink colored strip

10. PM 2.131 is decorated with a cartonnage foot case decorated with gilded modeled feet.
Summary of the Flavian Group

Wood became the sole material for panels with most of them cut in angled shape rather than arched. However, few arched portraits are very roughly cut. The preferred posture was that of the subject turned to proper right rather than proper left while the head is turned to face the viewer. Only one portrait has gilding applied on the wreath. Therefore, it can be concluded that gilding was not as common as it used to be in the Claudian and Neronian groups.

In terms of wrapping decorations, a common scheme of wrapping decoration cannot be identified. However, it can be deduced that Type 3 of the rhombic pattern with gilded stucco studs at the centers continued into the Flavian Period. Cartonnage foot cases and chest bands had already begun to be employed in the Claudian group and continued to be used in the Flavian group. Red shrouded mummies decorated with gilded ancient Egyptian scenes arranged in registers across the full length of the body started to appear in that group. It should be noted that Corcoran attributes the rise of red shrouded mummy decorations to the early 2nd century. She acknowledged that the hairstyle of PM 2.132 (Plate 33) is late Flavian in style. However, she believes that there must have been a time difference between when the portrait was painted and when the man died and the wrappings were decorated (Corcoran 1995, 18). Another possible explanation is that the man in PM 2.132 could have lived around the beginning of the 2nd century, but wore his hair in the old-fashioned style, perhaps that of his youth, of the Flavian Period.

PM 2.132 is similar in the decorative scheme to some portrait mummies that were excavated at el-Hibeh. The frame on PM 2.132 is composed of a series of gilded diamond shapes. The same type of framing can be found on portrait mummy E 63.1903 at the Fitzwilliam Museum and portrait mummy 91.AP.6 at the Getty Museum (known as Herakleides) (Error! Reference source not found., Plate 181). Both portraits, which were excavated from el-Hibeh, exhibit the same frame, as well as the red shrouded decoration, and the gilded ancient Egyptian motifs, with occasional difference in their order in the registers. It would seem then, that PM 2.132 was probably prepared by the same workshop responsible for the mummies found at el-Hibeh.

Trajanic (AD 98-117)

Men wore their hair short during the time of Trajan with the hair combed from back to front into a fringe leaving only a narrow strip of the forehead exposed. The hairstyles during that
period differ in terms of curviness of the hair strands and the splitting of the strands at the forehead to create a fork like form (Borg 1996, 73). Examples of this hairstyle include PM 2.134, and MP 2.41 (Plate 62). In terms of physiognomy, deep naso-labial folds were a common feature in this period (Borg 1996, 73). Two portraits, MP 2.40 (Plate 61) and MP 2.34 (Plate 55) are typical examples of Trajanic portraits with a long, pointed, and curved nose, deep naso-labial folds, thin mouth, and hairstyle combed forward into a smooth fringe above the forehead.

The Trajanic hairstyle of elite women followed the fashion of Marciana, Trajan's sister, and her daughter Matidia. The earlier style of Marciana is characterized by the same towering curls circling the forehead with a bun at the back situated diagonally and composed of circular plaits such as in MP 2.31 (Plate 48). Matidia's style is only different in positioning the bun more horizontally over the head rather than diagonally such as in the case of MP 2.42 (Plate 63) (Borg 1996, 32). By the late Trajanic Period, the bun becomes wider, as in the case of MP 2.38 (Plate 59) in the Royal Scottish Museum (Borg 1996, 34). Sometimes corkscrew curls circle the forehead and cover the ears such as in the cases of MP 2.35 (Plate 56) (Borg 1996, 35). In all variations of the hairstyle, the ears are almost completely covered (Borg 1996, 33).

MP 2.44 (Plate 65) and PM 2.136 (Plate 75) are two examples depicting children with hairstyles that are not typical of the Trajanic style. The hair in both examples is very short and simple, reminiscent of Julio-Claudian style. Both have the same rendering of the physical features with small almond-shaped eyes; long, thin nose rendered frontally showing the two nostrils; the same rendering of the philtrum; the thin mouth with defined upper lip, slightly extended on both sides; the large, round chin; and the face positioned slightly looking downward. This study assigns them to the Trajanic group because they share the same style of the eyes, nose, lips, and chin with MP 2.35 (Plate 56), which depicts a Trajanic hairstyle.

MP 2.42 (Plate 63) has been dated by Parlasca to early Flavian (1969, 1:56, No. 108, Pl. 25/6). However, according to Borg, this tangle of corkscrew curls falling on the forehead and covering the ears is reminiscent of the Trajanic style (1996, 35). Also, the Flavian style is characterized by a tower of small and round curls framing the forehead, which is not the case in this example. Therefore, this study assigns MP 2.42 to the Trajanic rather than the Flavian group.
Parlasca assigned MP 2.43 (Plate 64) to the Hadrianic Period (1969, 1:80, N. 199, Pl. 49/1). However, the man in this portrait has smooth hair that is combed to the front to form a fringe over the forehead. On the other hand, more curls and movement characterize the Hadrianic style. Also, in the Hadrianic style, the hair does not fall far down on the forehead as in the case of MP 2.43 (Borg 1996, 73–74). Therefore, this study assigns the portrait to the Trajanic group in agreement with Borg’s assigned date (1996, 74).

MP 2.47 is dated by Parlasca to the reign of Constantine, in the 4th century AD (1980, 3:34, No. 541, Pl. 131/2). However, the hair in this portrait is smooth, short, arranged in a fringe falling over the forehead. This hairstyle, along with the lack of a beard is reminiscent of the Trajanic style (Borg 1996, 73). Therefore, this study assigns MP 2.47 to the Trajanic group similar to the date assigned by Borg (1996, 75).

Parlasca assigned a date towards the middle of the 2nd century for PM 2.133 (Plate 71, Plate 70). He based his dating on the style of the portrait, which suggests a date towards the middle of the 3rd century. However, Parlasca noticed that horseshoe-shaped openings are not attested in Hawara later than the 2nd century. Therefore, he assigned his date accordingly (1977, 2:59, No. 366, Pl. 88/4). Corcoran dated it to the first quarter of the 2nd century because of the tight rhombic pattern, the colored bandages, gilt buttons, presence of a frame as well as a cartonnage foot case (1995, 121). This date corresponds with the Trajanic date assigned by Borg, who chose the date despite the short hair, based on the style of the smooth hair combed forward towards the forehead (Borg 1996, 74–75). According to the dates assigned by both Corcoran and Borg, this study assigns PM 2.133 to the Trajanic group.

The portraits belonging to the Trajanic group are 19 in number, divided into 15 detached and 4 portrait mummies. The corpus in this chronological group is characterized by the following:

1. Wood remains the sole panel material used in the Trajanic group.
2. Encaustic technique became the sole technique used by the artists at Hawara during the Trajanic Period. There are no examples of tempera technique.

3. The practice of gilding portraits in this group continued to be less popular than it was in the Julio-Claudian group. In the Trajanic corpus, only three portraits exhibit gilding. PM 2.146 (Plate 127) has a gilded wreath while PM 2.134 (Plate
72) and PM 2.133 (Plate 70) have a frame applied on the portrait in gold leaf with a carved vine motif.

Figure 50 (Trajanic) Percentages of gilded portraits

Figure 51 (Trajanic) Numbers of gilded portraits
4. The common posture is that of the subject's upper body turned to proper left rather than proper right, with the head turned to face the viewer. However, there are 8 portraits, out of 18 portraits, that depict the subjects with their upper bodies turned to proper right.
Figure 54 (Trajanic) Numbers of postures

4. Frames start to appear in the Trajanic group. The panel frames are horseshoe-shaped, gilded stucco frames with a vine pattern, while the opening frame is a braided linen herringbone pattern. Two examples show frames applied on the panel and another single example has a frame applied on the opening of the wrapping.

Figure 55 (Trajanic) frames shapes
5. There are equal numbers of arched and angled portraits in the Trajanic corpus. Only one portrait is rectangular, which does not signify a specific workshop.

Figure 56 (Trajanic) Percentages of panel shapes

Figure 57 (Trajanic) Numbers of panel shapes

6. The opening shape in the Trajanic corpus takes two forms. One is the usual octagonal shape, which is a continuation of the form that started in the Julio-Claudian Period. The second form is a new variation of the octagonal shape; it has
an arched top and the three-sided bottom of the octagonal shape. This form is more frequent than the usual octagonal one in this group and it usually corresponds with the presence of a frame.

**Figure 58 (Trajanic) Percentages of opening shapes**

**Figure 59 (Trajanic) Numbers of opening shapes**

7. There are three types of wrapping decorations represented in this corpus. PM 2.135 (Plate 74) exhibits Type 3 decoration scheme with the rhombic pattern, gilded stucco studs, and no colored pattern. Two portrait mummies, PM 2.136 (Plate 75)
and PM 2.133 (Plate 71), are Type 4, with rhombic, colored pattern, and gilded stucco studs. The red shroud scheme of Type 5 is represented by one example, PM 2.134 (Plate 73).

![Decoration Types](image1)

**Figure 60 (Trajanic) Percentages of wrappings decorations**

![Decoration Types](image2)

**Figure 61 (Trajanic) Numbers of decoration types**
8. Only one mummy is decorated with a chest band made of a row of gilded stucco studs on a colored linen band.

![Presence of a Chest Band](image1)

Figure 62 (Trajanic) Numbers of wrappings with chest bands

9. Two examples are decorated with cartonnage foot cases. This type of accessory started in the Neronian Period and continued to the Trajanic Period.

![Cartonnage Foot Cases](image2)

Figure 63 (Trajanic) Numbers of wrappings with cartonnage foot cases
Summary of the Trajanic Group

Wood remains the sole material used for portrait panels. No examples of the use of tempera are present in the Trajanic group, where every example is painted in encaustic. An almost equal number of arched and angled panels are present in this collection. There are more portraits depicting the subject turned to his proper left than proper right. This represents a change in the preferred posture from the proper right of the Julio-Claudian and Flavian groups to the proper left in the Trajanic group. No frontal postures have been depicted since the Julio-Claudian Period. Gilding remains less popular than it used to be in the Julio-Claudian group. It is mostly applied on frames, with only one example of a gilded wreath.

Frames started to be used for the first time during the Trajanic Period. The frames applied to the panels are horseshoe-shaped, made of gilded stucco, and carved with a vine pattern. Those applied to the wrapping opening are unique in shape. One example is the braided, colored, herringbone frame that occurred for the first time in the Trajanic group and was only repeated once more in the Hadrianic group. A new form of wrapping opening started to appear, usually in association with frames. This form has an arched top and three-sided bottom. The usual octagonal opening remained in use in this group along with the new form.

Three types represent the wrapping decoration. Type 3 is only represented by one example, two examples represent Type 4, and Type 5 is represented by one portrait mummy. Accordingly, the most common decoration scheme is Type 4. Accessories such as cartonnage foot cases continued to be used in the Trajanic Period. Only one example is decorated with a chest band.

Hadrianic (AD 117-138)

The men's hairstyle in that period is characterized by having more volume and curls than its Trajanic counterpart had. The hair no longer falls very far down on the forehead, as was the case in the Trajanic fashion. Short beards became very common in the Hadrianic Period. There are two types of hairstyles characterizing Hadrianic fashion: one is the curly, bouncing strands of hair falling at the forehead, the other is the thick curly hair cut long and extending onto the back of the neck (Borg 1996, 73–74).

In women's hairstyles, the turban style came in fashion; it consists of a large braided bun that contours the head like a turban. Two different turban styles existed during that period. One is
the turban behind a low tower of small round curls, such as portrait MP 2.56 (Plate 83) in the Petrie Museum, and the other dispenses with the curls altogether, and the hair is parted at the center (Borg 1996, 38). The women wearing their hair in the Hadrianic turban style are characterized by having their ears exposed with two spiral curls falling in front of the ears. Walker and Bierbrier attributed those two spiral curls in front of the ears to the early 2nd century without being more specific as to the date (Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 62–63). The early 2nd century could be either the reign of Trajan or that of Hadrian. However, the women depicted wearing the Trajanic wide bun do not have the two spiral curls in front of the ears. Therefore, it is a characteristic of the Hadrianic style rather than the Trajanic.

Two cases were dated in this study to the Hadrianic Period despite the different dates assigned to them by Petrie (Petrie 1911), Corcoran (Corcoran 1995), and Parlasca (Parlasca 1966). PM 2.140 (Plate 101) and PM 2.137 (Plate 96, Plate 97) are two portrait mummies that were found in the same tomb (Petrie 1911, 14). A papyrus, inserted between the portrait and the wrapping of PM 2.140, mentions events dated to AD 127. However, Petrie suggested that, even if the papyrus was written at the same year as the events it mentioned, it must have been inserted with the two mummies at a later date. He assigned the probable date of interment for PM 2.140 and the papyrus to the year AD 160, basing this date on the idea that mummies were kept at the house for some time prior to burial (Petrie 1911, 12,14; Corcoran 1995, 24). He also dated the portrait of PM 2.137 to the reign of Lucius Verus in AD 180 based on the similarity of the hairstyle to others of that period (Petrie 1911, 14).

Parlasca dated PM 2.140 to the Trajanic Period in his Mumienporträt und Verwandte Denkmäler (1966, 52) and dated PM 2.137 to the reign of Septimus Severus (1977, 2:63). However, in his Ritratti di Mummie he re-dated PM 2.140 to the Antonine Period (Parlasca 1969, 1:64) perhaps to narrow the gap between PM 2.140 and the Severan PM 2.137 (Corcoran 1995, 25).

Corcoran re-dated both portraits to the early 2nd century based on the mummy wrappings. In the case of PM 2.140, the gilt frame with inserted colored glass is similar to the chest band of portrait mummy CG 33222 at the Egyptian Museum. Since Parlasca assigned a Trajanic date to CG 33222, Corcoran attributed the same Trajanic date to PM 2.140 (1995, 26). As for mummy PM 2.137, it is wrapped with linen bandages arranged in rhombic patterns with colored patterns,
but no gilded stucco studs nor a chest band (Corcoran 1995, 25). Corcoran asserted that the absence of gilded stucco studs is reminiscent of the late 1st century mummies such as that of PM 2.128 at Ny Carlsberg Gliptothek. Therefore, she assigned a date for PM 2.137 towards the first half of the 2nd century (1995, 25).

Despite the dating and re-dating of those two portraits, the Hadrianic turban style with the centrally parted hair in PM 2.140 indicates that this portrait could not have belonged to the earlier Trajanic group. Considering that the hairstyle depicted in PM 2.140 is a turban style, it should be assigned to either the Hadrianic group or the later Antonine group, but not to an earlier date than that of Hadrian. Since the bun is wider than the later Antonine style (see below) and is contouring the head, with two strands of hair falling in front of the ears, it is more similar to the Hadrianic fashion than that of the Antonine group. Also, PM 2.137 shows a hairstyle with curly locks of hair falling on the forehead and a thick, curly beard that are typical of Hadrian's "Rollocken" style (Borg 1996, 75). By taking into consideration the papyrus listing events dated to AD 127 (Hadrian's reign), this study dates PM 2.140 and PM 2.137 to the Hadrianic group.

MP 2.57 (Plate 84) and MP 2.61 (Plate 88) are two portraits that have been dated by Parlasca to the Trajanic Period (Parlasca 1969, 1:58, No. 115, Pl. 27/5, No. 116, Pl. 27/6). However, the central parting of the hair and the wide bun contouring the head is a typical Hadrianic turban fashion. Therefore, this study assigns both portraits to the Hadrianic group rather than Trajanic, which agrees with the date assigned by Borg (Borg 1996, 41).

Doxiadis dated MP 2.63 (Plate 90) to the Flavian Period (Doxiadis 1995, 198, No. 41). Although the style of the hair at the back is not visible, the two spiral curls in front of the ears, and the central parting of the hair are reminiscent of the Hadrianic style rather than Flavian fashion. Therefore, it has been assigned to the Hadrianic group in this study.

Picton, Quirke, and Roberts dated MP 2.59 (Plate 86) to the early Antonine Period because of the square-trimmed beard (2007, 211). However, the hair is cut short, less confined, and not as curly and thick as the Antonine fashion. Therefore, this study places MP 2.59 in the Hadrianic group rather than the Antonine one.
Parlasca dated PM 2.138 (Plate 98) to the Trajanic Period because it has the same form of wrapping decoration as PM 2.136 (Plate 75) that was assigned to the reign of Trajan (Parlasca 1969, 1:63–64, No. 134, Pl. 32/2). However, the central parting of the hair, which is the case in this portrait, is not a characteristic of the Trajanic fashion. In addition, the bun contouring the head is typically Hadrianic in fashion, and therefore, PM 2.138 is assigned to the Hadrianic group.

The number of portraits exhibiting Hadrianic style is 25 portraits divided into 19 detached portraits and 6 portrait mummies. This corpus can be analyzed as follows:

1. Panel material in the Hadrianic Period remains to be exclusively wood rather than linen.

Figure 64 (Hadrianic) Numbers of panel materials
2. Painting technique continued to be encaustic rather than tempera.

![Chart showing painting technique with 82% encaustic and 18% tempera](image1)

**Figure 65 (Hadrianic) Numbers of painting technique**

3. Gilding appears on seven out of the 25 portraits belonging to the Hadrianic group. The gilding occurs on either the wreath such as in PM 2.139 (Plate 99), or the jewelry as in case of MP 2.65 (Plate 92), MP 2.57 (Plate 84), MP 2.58 (Plate 85), and PM 2.137 (Plate 96, Plate 97). PM 2.139 (Plate 100) is unique for the application of gilding all over the extensive jewelry as well as on the background.

![Chart showing presence of gilding with 32% gilded and 68% not gilded](image2)

**Figure 66 (Hadrianic) Percentages of gilded portraits**
Figure 67 (Hadrianic) Numbers of gilded portraits

Figure 68 (Hadrianic) Percentages of gilded areas
4. The dominant direction is that of the subjects’ upper body turned to proper left while the head is turned to face the viewer. There are ten portraits out of the 25 depicting the subjects turned to their proper right.
5. Frames continued to be used in the Hadrianic Period.

Figure 71 (Hadrianic) Numbers of postures

Figure 72 (Hadrianic) Numbers of framed portraits
6. Both arched and angled panels are found in the Hadrianic corpus in equal numbers. One portrait, MP 2.49 (Plate 76), is rectangular, but the two upper corners are unpainted, which could indicate the place to cut the panels.
7. The opening of the wrappings takes on two main shapes in this corpus. One is the usual octagonal shaped opening. The second is that with an arched top and three-sided bottom. Both shapes are represented with almost equal percentages. A third shape is the oval opening of PM 2.147 (Plate 102, Plate 103).
8. There are four types of wrapping decorations represented by the five portrait mummies in the Hadrianic group. One is Type 2, represented by PM 2.137 (Plate 96, Plate 97), with the loose rhombic pattern, colored bottom layer, and no gilded stucco studs. PM 2.138 (Plate 98) represents Type 4, which is characterized by the tightly woven rhombic pattern with the layers of each rhombic shape colored on one side, in a slanting pattern, in purple. It has stucco studs at the centers of the
rhombic shapes. The most striking feature of this example is the frame made of linen bandages in a herringbone pattern, colored in purple, white, and yellow. Type 3 of wrapping decoration is characterized by the tight rhombic pattern, the presence of gilded stucco studs at the centers of the rhombic shapes, but no colored linen bandages. PM 2.139 (Plate 100) and PM 2.140 (Plate 101), both fall into the Type 3 category. The shape of the opening is different in the two examples, but that could be attributed to the presence of a frame on the panel, which would force the opening to take on a shape with an arched top and a three-sided bottom. The last decoration type, Type 6, is represented only by PM 2.139 (Plate 100), which is the first occurrence of this decoration type. The mummy belonging to this category is covered by a gilded stucco mummy case with carved ancient Egyptian scenes along the body and inlaid colored glass to symbolize gems. A gilded stucco frame is incorporated within the mummy case, where it is also inlaid with colored glass. The introduction of semi-precious stones or colored glass is a feature that Corcoran dated to no earlier than the 2nd century (Corcoran 1995, 33). The only example of Type 7 is PM 2.147 (Plate 102, Plate 103), which combines a stucco casing of the upper body with gilded modeled hands and a red shroud covering the rest of the body.

![Types of Wrappings](image)

**Figure 79** (Hadrianic) Percentages of types of wrappings

68
9. Chest bands continued to occur in the Hadrianic group in two portrait mummies.

Figure 80 (Hadrianic) Numbers of types of wrappings

Figure 81 Number of chest bands
10. Cartonnage foot cases are present in only two examples, PM 2.140 (Plate 101) and PM 2.137 (Plate 96, Plate 97), which were buried together in the same tomb.

**Figure 82 Numbers of cartonnage foot cases**

**Summary of the Hadrianic Group**

The portraits in this chronological group are all painted in encaustic technique on wooden panels. The subjects are mostly depicted turned to proper left, similar to the Trajanic tradition. Gilding became more popular than in the previous Flavian and Trajanic groups. Most of the areas that were gilded, in this group, are frames and jewelry. In one case, the gilding was applied to the wreath, in another instance the hairline was gilded, and in another example the gilding was applied to the background. The gilded background in this group is considered the first and only occurrence in the Hawara corpus. There is a slight dominance of the angled panels as opposed to the arched ones, which was also the case in the Trajanic group.

The presence of frames that started in the Trajanic Period continued in the Hadrianic Period. The most common frame applied is a gilded stucco arched frame either carved with a vine pattern or inlaid with colored glass. Only in one case does the frame takes the shape of a herringbone pattern made of braided linen bandages and colored in purple, white, and yellow.

The wrapping opening either could be an even-sided octagonal or with an arched top and a three-sided base. The later form is always used when the portrait is surrounded by a frame. The wrapping decoration of this period is mostly that of Type 3, a tightly woven rhombic pattern with
gilded stucco studs and no colored linen. Other decorations represented in this corpus include Type 4, the tightly woven rhombic pattern colored purple in slanting patterns with stucco studs. Type 2 is represented by a single example where the rhombic pattern is colored, but is not decorated with gilded stucco studs. Type 6 is different and it sets the precedence for this type of wrappings. It is the gilded stucco mummy case, with modeled arms and hands, carved ancient Egyptian deities and scenes of Egyptian mythology, and with inlaid stones and colored glass for jewelry and general enhancements. Type 7 is also unique and it consists of a combination of a gilded stucco mummy casing of Type 6 and the red shroud of Type 5. Chest bands are present in the two Type 3 portrait mummies, while cartonnage foot cases are found in PM 2.140 (Plate 101) and PM 2.137 (Plate 96, Plate 97), representing Types 3 and 2 respectively.

**Antonine (AD 138-192)**

Men's hairstyle in the Antonine Period is a logical continuation of the Hadrianic style, with slightly thicker curls than the Hadrianic fashion. Increased volume at the temples and the less ordered hair are typical Antonine fashion. The beard changes from the Hadrianic short strands to longer wisps (Borg 1996, 76). Some examples of Antonine hairstyles resemble previous periods such as the Trajanic era. In those examples, the hair is smooth and combed forward to a fringe at the forehead. However, those types of revivals show Antonine influence in having less ordered strands of hair arranged in a casual manner around the head (Borg 1996, 78). Examples of such fashion revivals are MP 2.71 in Manchester Museum, which has an elaborate mass of hair at the back of the head, and MP 2.70 in Salford City Art Gallery (Plate 107), where the hair is arranged in a casual fashion that is typical of the Antonine style.

The women in the early Antonine era (AD 138) followed the fashion set by Faustina the Elder, wife of Antoninus Pius. She had her hair centrally parted and arranged in a bun that was different in size from the Hadrianic fashion. While the Hadrianic braided bun was wide and contoured the head in the turban style, the early Antonine bun was smaller and positioned horizontally on the head. The bun changed in form to become oval rather than circular and thus when viewed from the front it looks narrow and almost tower-like (Borg 1996, 48). Examples of such early Antonine style are portrait MP 2.69 (Plate 106) at Manchester Museum (Borg 1996, 49), and PM 2.144 (Plate 124, Plate 125) at the Egyptian Museum (Borg 1996, 51).
By the middle of the Antonine era, Faustina the Younger set another hairstyle. She kept the central parting of the hair, but changed the position of the bun from positioned horizontally on the crown to the nape of the neck. Lucilla, daughter of Faustina the Younger, wore her hair in the same manner as her mother with the only difference being that the size of the bun decreased. Crispina, the wife of Commodus, increased the width of the bun at the nape such that it almost covered the entire back of the head. In the front, the hair remains centrally parted and falling down on both sides over the ears, completely covering them, with the remainder collected at the nape to form the wide bun (Borg 1996, 52). Examples of such middle to late Antonine style are those depicted in MP 2.80 in the British Museum (Plate 117) (Borg 1996, 53), MP 2.82 in the Petrie Museum (Plate 119) (Borg 1996, 55), and MP 2.32 in the National Gallery of Canada (Plate 49).

Three portrait mummies- PM 2.146 (Plate 127) , PM 2.144 (Plate 124, Plate 125) and PM 2.145 (Plate 126) - were found in the same tomb No. 6 (Petrie 1889, 18). The three portrait mummies are red-shrouded with ancient Egyptian scenes applied in gilded stucco along the body with gilded stucco frames made of studs and wreath motif. The scenes are almost identical in the three mummies. Despite the dating of PM 2.146 to the Trajanic Period by Borg and Doxiadis (Borg 1996, 74; Doxiadis 1995, 202, No. 57–58), the long, strongly curved hair strands at the back of the head are similar to the style of the Antonine group, as in the case with MP 2.71 (Plate 108) (Borg 1996, 79). In addition, the application of a gilded wreath is not attested in the Trajanic corpus, but it does occur more frequently in the Hadrianic one. Therefore, both PM 2.146 (Plate 127) and MP 2.71 are assigned to the Antonine group.

In the case of PM 2.144 (Plate 124) and PM 2.145 (Plate 126), the faces are somewhat faded, but PM 2.144 shows the edges of a tower-like narrow bun at the crown of the head. In PM 2.145, the man has thick, curly hair that almost covers the ears and a thick, long beard. Corcoran dated PM 2.144 to the first quarter of the 2nd century based on the mummy wrappings (Corcoran 1995, 152), which Parlasca dates it to the middle of 2nd century (Parlasca 1977, 2:32). Parlasca dated PM 45 to the second quarter of the 2nd century (Parlasca and Frenz 2004, 4:105). Both Corcoran and Parlasca's dates agree with the dating assigned to those two portraits in this study.

MP 2.79 (Plate 116) has been dated by Parlasca to the Hadrianic-early Antonine Period (Parlasca 1969, 1:79, No. 194, Pl. 47/4). However, this study assigns it to the Antonine rather
than the Hadrianic group because of the curly strands extending from the edges of the head as well as the increased volume of the hair at the temples, which are both typical of the Antonine fashion (Borg 1996, 76).

Parlasca dated MP 2.83 (Plate 120) to the early Hadrianic Period (Parlasca 1969, 1:72, No. 165, Pl. 39/4). However, the strongly curved strands extending from the edges of the head and the hooded eyes are typical of the hairstyle and physiognomy of Marcus Aurelius.

The total number of portraits belonging to the Antonine group is 20. Only four portraits are still attached to their mummies, while 16 portraits have been detached. The common features of this corpus are analyzed as follows:

1. **Wood** is the sole material used for panels in the Antonine group.

   ![](figure83.png) **Panel Material**
   
   Figure 83 (Antonine) Numbers of panel material

2. **Encaustic technique** is the only painting technique used in the Antonine group.
3. Only four portraits have gilding applied to them. Two of the examples have the gilding applied on arched frames surrounding the portrait. Two examples, PM 2.146 (Plate 127) and PM 2.145 (Plate 126), show gilding of the wreath.
Figure 86 (Antonine) Numbers of gilded portraits

Figure 87 (Antonine) Numbers of gilded areas
4. This group features equal percentages of both postures: proper left and proper right.

![Pie chart showing 50% proper left and 50% proper right postures.]

Figure 88 (Antonine) Percentages of postures

![Bar chart showing numbers of postures, with both proper left and proper right having 10 frames.]

Figure 89 (Antonine) Numbers of postures

5. Frames continued to be used in this group, both on panels and around the wrapping opening.
Figure 90 (Antonine) Chart of framed portraits, type, and shape of the frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Frame</th>
<th>Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>horseshoe, gilded stucco, vine pattern</td>
<td>MP 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horseshoe, gilded stucco, vine pattern</td>
<td>MP 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oval, gilded, dotted string</td>
<td>PM 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horseshoe, gilded, wreath pattern</td>
<td>PM 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oval, gilded, wreath pattern</td>
<td>PM 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 91 (Antonine) Types of frame
Figure 92 (Antonine) Frame shapes

6. Angled panels are the most common in the Antonine group. There are only five arched portraits compared to 10 angled ones. Only one example, MP 2.70 (Plate 107), is rectangular.

Figure 93 (Antonine) Percentages of panel shapes
Figure 94 (Antonine) Numbers of panel shapes

7. There are only four examples of portrait mummies in this corpus. One example shows the regular octagonal form and the other three have oval shaped openings.

Figure 95 (Antonine) Percentages of opening shapes
As there are only four portrait mummies belonging to the Antonine group, it is difficult to establish a common style of wrapping decoration. The three identical, Type 5, red shrouded mummies represent the majority of the corpus. However, they are unique red-shrouded mummies that do not have any equivalents in any of the previous chronological groups. Therefore, they cannot represent the Antonine style of wrapping decoration. PM 2.143 (Plate 123) represents Type 4 decoration schemes with tightly woven rhombic, colored pattern with gilded stucco studs in the centers of the rhombic shapes.

Figure 96 (Antonine) Numbers of opening shapes
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Summary of the Antonine Group

Portraits exhibiting Antonine hairstyles are all painted on wooden panels in encaustic technique. Gilding continued to be applied on frames and wreaths, but to a lesser extent than the Hadrianic portraits. The number of portraits depicting the subjects turned to proper left is equal to...
to those turned to proper right. What differ from the previous Hadrianic and Trajanic portraits are the proper right posture and the higher number of angled portraits compared to arched ones.

There are five framed portraits; two of the frames are applied directly to the portrait. The remaining three portraits have the frames applied on the edges of the wrapping opening. The panel frames are always horseshoe-shaped, gilded, carved with a vine pattern. The opening frames show greater variation in terms of the shape and the pattern. One of them is horseshoe-shaped, while the other two are oval. The three examples are gilded, but one of them shows a dotted pattern, while the other two show a wreath-like pattern.

The small number of the portrait mummies in this corpus makes it difficult to identify a common opening shape and a decorative scheme. Three portrait mummies of Type 5 decoration, the red shrouds, are present in this group. This indicates that Type 5 continued to be used in the Antonine group. However, the decorative scenes applied in gilded stucco on these three red shrouded mummies are unique and do not occur in any of the other chronological groups, which suggests that they might have been painted at another site. The fourth portrait mummy in this corpus indicates the presence of another decoration scheme. This is the Type 4 decoration, with a tight rhombic, colored pattern and gilded stucco studs. No accessories, such as chest bands or cartonnage foot cases, are incorporated within the wrappings.

Severan (AD 193-235)

The men wore their hair in a fashion similar to the Antonine style. The hair is arranged in thick curls, with more uniformity around the head than the Antonine fashion and cut short close to the head. The beard is made up of small curls (Borg 1996, 80–81). This period is characterized by the realism of the portraits (Borg 1996, 82). Examples of such realistic portraits are MP 2.88 (Plate 131), which depicts a frowning man, and MP 2.89 (Plate 132), which depicts a man with deep horizontal wrinkles at the forehead (Kleiner 1992, 324, Fig. 286, Fig. 287).

Three main women's hairstyles were present in this period. The first is characterized by the central parting of the hair, falling steeply on both sides in natural waves, with the remainder being collected at the back of the neck in a small bun. The ears are completely uncovered as in the style of the empress Didia Clara, which is adopted by the woman in MP 2.85 (Plate 128). Another hairstyle is that of Julia Domna, wife of Septimus Severus, with the hair falling freely
from the central parting in natural waves with varying lengths (Borg 1996, 61). An example of the Julia Domna style is exhibited in MP 2.86 where the woman's hair is falling in curls and stopping at neck length.

Parlasca dated MP 2.89 (Plate 132) to the Hadrianic Period (Parlasca 1977, 2:32–33, No. 261, Pl. 63/6). Borg, however, dated the same portrait to the late Antonine-early Severan based on the extended, curly strands flying around the edges of the head (Borg 1996, 83). This study agrees with Borg's date and assigns MP 2.89 to the Severan group.

Five portraits exhibit hairstyles typical of the Severan Period. No portrait mummies survive in this group. Portraits such as MP 2.89 (Plate 132), MP 2.88 (Plate 131) fall within a time frame between late Antonine and early Severan Period (Borg 1996, 83). These portraits can be analyzed as follows:

1. Wood continues to be the only material used for panels

![Figure 99 (Severan) Numbers of panel material](image)

2. All portraits belonging to this period are painted in encaustic.
3. Only one portrait exhibits gilding of the wreath, jewelry, and the lips.

Figure 100 (Severan) Numbers of painting technique

Figure 101 (Severan) Percentages of gilded portraits
The dominant posture is that of the subject turned to proper left, and the head turned to face the viewer. Only MP 2.85 is depicted in frontal pose (Plate 128).
The only framed portrait is MP 2.85 (Plate 128) with only a darker colored border around the entire portrait.

The angled panel is more common. Two examples, MP 2.85 (Plate 128) and MP 2.89 (Plate 132), are rectangular.
Summary of the Severan Group

Wood continues to be the only material used for panels. Encaustic remains the only technique adopted by artists in the Severan Period. Gilding is uncommon with only MP 2.85 (Plate 128) exhibiting gilding on the wreath, jewelry, and lips. The common posture adopted by the artists of the Severan Period is that of the upper body turned slightly to proper left. The two
common panel shapes are either rectangular or angled with only one arched example. Frames are also uncommon except in the case of MP 2.85 (Plate 128).

MP 2.85 exhibits stylistic features that are different from the common style of the rest of the Severan group. MP 2.85 is the only portrait depicting the woman in frontal pose. It is also the only portrait with gilding and a frame. Therefore, this portrait could potentially belong to a different era. Walker and Bierbrier suggest a date towards the late Antonine-early Severan due to the frontal pose, the type of jewelry and the absence of a mantle (Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 76). However, neither the pose nor the jewelry is sufficient evidence for the Severan date. The frontal posture is not attested in any of the chronological groupings except in the Julio-Claudian portraits. The bar earring with three hanging pearls is not attested earlier than the Flavian Period. However, the central parting of the hair is only attested starting from the Hadrianic Period. The uncovered ears are not typical of the Antonine fashion, but they are often depicted uncovered in the Hadrianic and the Severan examples. Therefore, the placement of this portrait strictly in the late Antonine-early Severan category is not accurate. MP 2.85 (Plate 128) could belong to the Hadrianic, or the Severan group. However, since stylistically MP 2.85 does not resemble any of the common styles of those two chronological groups, it is quite possible that it was painted at a different site. Parlasca noted that it resembled the Hadrianic portraits recovered from Antinoopolis, because of the frontal posture that was popular in the Antinoopolis corpus (Parlasca 1969, 1:67).

**Trends of the Hawara corpus**

The portraits excavated at Hawara are among the earliest portraits found in Egypt. The corpus represents the portrait-making industry at Hawara from the reign of Tiberius (AD 14-37) until the reign of Septimius Severus (AD 193-235). Therefore, the results of the analysis show changes in the practices of the workshops over 200 years. Analysis of the panel material shows that the majority of mummy portraits dated to the Tiberian Period were painted on linen rather than wood. This confirms Edgar's assumption that the earliest portraits were painted on linen (1905b, 231). Within the Claudian group, the popularity of wooden panels started to increase at the expense of linen portraits. By the Neronian Period, linen portraits have decreased to only one example, while the number of wooden panels increased substantially. Starting from the Flavian
Period and until the demise of mummy portraits, wood was the sole material used for portrait panels, entirely replacing the more economical linen.

In terms of painting technique, tempera was used more often than encaustic in the Tiberian Period. After the extensive use of tempera in this era, it started to lose popularity to the encaustic technique in the Claudian Period. By the Neronian Period, the only technique used was encaustic except for one portrait, MP 2.11, which was painted in a combined technique of encaustic and tempera. That combined technique was used on only three portraits: the Tiberian MP 2.2, the Claudian MP 2.4, and the Neronian MP 2.11. After the Julio-Claudian Period, that technique was never used again. Encaustic became the dominant painting technique with no occurrences of tempera throughout the following groupings. This conclusion contradicts the assumption put forward by both Petrie (1911) and David Lowell Thompson (1982). Both scholars proposed that the encaustic technique was used on earlier portraits that were higher in quality, while the tempera technique was used on later examples that were lower in quality (Petrie 1911, 14; Thompson 1982, 6–7). However, the analysis of the painting technique across the 200 years of portrait production in Hawara shows that tempera was used on the earlier examples only and was never used later on, while encaustic was dominant from the Neronian until the Severan Period.

Gilding on portraits was not used in the early Tiberian portraits except once on the jewelry of MP 2.3, where it was applied on a layer of stucco (Plate 3). It started to appear more frequently in the Claudian Period, especially on portraits depicting women with only one example of a male portrait with a gilded wreath (PM 2.124; Plate 13, Plate 14). Wreaths and jewelry were the two most common areas where gilding was applied in the Claudian group. However, other areas received gilding, such as the central parting of the hair in MP 2.4 (Plate 7), the lips, and the clothes of the girl in MP 2.5. In all cases, but PM 2.122, the gilding was applied directly on the panel with no stucco layer.

In the Neronian group, gilding continued to occur, but less frequently than the previous groups. The gilding in this group was strictly confined to jewelry and was applied over a layer of stucco. Gilding stopped in the Flavian Period, but started to occur again in the Trajanic Period. The gilding in the Trajanic group was strictly confined to frames. The Hadrianic group exhibits several examples of gilding applied to jewelry, wreaths, lips, frames as well as an example of a gilded background. In all cases, it was applied directly on the panels without a layer of stucco.
The Antonine group shows gilding on frames as well as wreaths. MP 2.85 (Plate 128), which is assigned to the Severan group, is the only portrait from this group that shows gilding on the wreath and jewelry.

Thus, gilding was frequently found in the Julio-Claudian group, and mostly applied on a layer of stucco. A brief decline occurred in the Flavian and Trajanic groups when gilding was only applied on frames, but not on jewelry or wreaths. Then, the Hadrianic group showed resurgence in the application of gilding on jewelry, wreaths, lips, and frames. A second decline occurred in the Antonine group, when it was only applied on frames. The posture of the depicted individuals changed chronologically. Throughout the Julio-Claudian group, the preferred posture was that of the subject turned slightly to proper right and head turned to face the viewer. This continued through the Flavian Period. However, in the Trajanic and Hadrianic groups, the preferred posture changed to the proper left. Both postures in the Antonine group are represented by equal percentages. The Severan examples show the individual turned to proper left, similar to the Trajanic and Hadrianic groups. In general, the preferred posture is the proper right, except in the cases of the Trajanic, Hadrianic, and Severan groups. Thus, the posture should not be considered as the sole indicator for re-assigning dates or provenances.

The portraits from Hawara are the only portraits that have frames attached to their panels, or frames applied on the edges of the wrapping openings. Frames started to appear in the Flavian group with the red shrouded mummy, PM 2.132 (Plate 53), where the edges of the wrapping opening is decorated with a frame made of gilded diamond shaped pattern. Frames applied to panels started in the Trajanic era. Panel frames are strictly horseshoe-shaped, made of gilded stucco, and carved with a vine pattern. The frames on the wrapping opening show greater variation; they can be oval or horseshoe gilded or made of braided, colored linen bandages.

Panel shape was arched in the early Julio-Claudian examples except for the Neronian group, where the panels are mostly angled, not arched. The Flavian portraits were mostly angled as well. However, the Trajanic and Hadrianic groups showed an almost equal percentage of angled and arched portraits. The Antonine portraits were more dominantly angled than arched. The same angled panels continue in the Severan group. It should be noted that because of the

---

1 More on the possible reasons for this trend in gilding is discussed in Chapter 6
presence of both panel shapes in large percentages within the Hawara corpus, it is not a reliable indicator of provenance or date.

Corcoran proposed that arched panels indicate a Hawara provenance (1995, 47; Corcoran and Svoboda 2010, 42). However, according to this thesis, the number of arched panels found at Hawara is almost equal to the angled ones. In some chronological groups, such as the Antonine, the angled panels were represented by a higher percentage than the arched ones. In addition, arched panels were common at sites other than Hawara. For example, the portraits that are claimed to have been found at Akhmim are all arched (Doxiadis 1995, 218–219). Therefore, claiming that arched portraits indicate a style identified with Hawara is inaccurate.

The common shape of the wrapping opening is octagonal. Three main forms of octagonal openings are found in the Hawara corpus: elongated octagonal with a narrow base, wide octagonal, and an even-sided octagonal. These octagonal forms are typical of Hawara. The octagonal opening with a narrow base is abandoned in the Flavian time, giving way to the oval-shaped opening. Oval-shaped openings are associated with red shrouded mummies, such as PM 2.132 (Plate 53), PM 2.145 (Plate 126), and PM 2.144 (Plate 124, Plate 125). The oval shaped opening is not necessarily restricted to Hawara portrait mummies as it occurs on mummies found at other sites such as el-Hibeh-for example, mummy E 63.1903 at the Fitzwilliam Museum (Parlasca 1977, 2:51, No. 233, Pl. 80,3; Doxiadis 1995, 218, No. 100,102) (Error! Reference source not found., Plate 181). An opening with an arched top and a three-sided bottom started to appear in the Trajanic group for the first time. This type of opening is associated with the presence of frames.

Wrapping decorated in a rhombic pattern is characteristic of the Hawara portrait mummies. This type of wrapping decoration is not found only in Hawara but also at other sites such as Abusir el-Melek. However, when combined with a chest band, cartonnage foot case, or an octagonal opening, the rhombic pattern can be attributed to Hawara rather than other sites, as these do not have such a combination (see Chapter 3). Eight types of decorative schemes are represented in the Hawara corpus. The most represented types are Type 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Type 5 of the red shrouded type of wrappings started in Hawara from the Flavian Period and continued until the Antonine Period. Type 6, gilded stucco mummy wrapping, is another form that is unique to Hawara. The first example of such type of decoration belongs to the Hadrianic group.
However, due to the presence of only one example of such wrappings, it is difficult to ascertain how long they remained in practice.

Elements of decorations that are strictly associated with Hawara are the gilded stucco studs at the centers of the rhombic shapes, the chest band of gilded stucco studs, the cartonnage foot case, and the use of colored linen bandages to form a decorative pattern with plain bandages.

Figure 108 Decoration types in chronological groups

Figure 109 Trends of different decoration types across time
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2 Types 1, 2, and 6 do not show in the trend lines because they only occur once throughout the chronological periods
Figure 110 Chest bands and foot cases in chronological groups

Figure 111 Trends in the use of chest bands and foot cases
Figure 112 Presence of frames across chronological groups

Figure 113 Numbers of gilded portraits in chronological groups
Figure 114 Trend of using gilding across chronological groups

Figure 115 Numbers of panel shapes in chronological groups
Figure 116 Trend line of panel shapes across chronological groups
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Figure 118 Trend line of different postures across chronological groups

Figure 119 Numbers of different wrapping opening shapes
Portraits Re-assigned to Chronological Groups

In certain cases, the hairstyle is not visible or is difficult to attribute to a specific imperial fashion. Those portraits can be assigned to chronological groups based on comparing their unique features with the key characteristics of each group. Thus, the following cases represent Hawara portraits that have been re-dated according to the results of the previous analyses.

PM 2.128 (Plate 18, Plate 19) was dated by Parlasca to the early Flavian Period (Parlasca 1969, 1:37, No. 40, Pl. 11/2). Doxiadis, on the other hand, dated the portrait to AD 25-75 (Doxiadis 1995, 195, No. 32). The partly visible hairstyle is short and simple. The horseshoe shape of the wrapping opening is unique and does not have an equivalent. However, the wrappings follow a Type 1 decorative scheme of plain rhombic pattern with no colored patterns or gilded stucco studs. Type 1 decoration was popular in the Tiberian and Claudian groups. The Tiberian portraits are all characterized by a proper right posture, while the Claudian group includes some portraits depicting proper left posture. Since the man in PM 2.128 is turned to proper left, it can be assigned to the Claudian group. This dating corresponds with Corcoran’s dating of the portrait mummy to the middle of the 1st century (Corcoran 1995, 24).

PM 2.129 (Plate 20, Plate 21) was dated by Doxiadis to the 2nd century (Doxiadis 1995, 136–137, No. 66, 68), while Parlasca dates it to the 1st century (Parlasca 1969, 1:38, No. 43, Pl. 12/1). Corcoran dates it based on the wrappings to the middle-late 1st century (Corcoran 1995, 98). The child's hair cannot be identified with the style of any specific chronological group. The hair is short, strongly curved, and combed forward. The wrapping of PM 2.129 is a Type 2
decoration that occurred twice in the analyzed sample: once in the Claudian group and once again in the Hadrianic group. Therefore, this portrait mummy could belong to either the Claudian or the Hadrianic groups. However, the Hadrianic examples are characterized by loosely wrapped rhombic pattern with the colored part being the bottom layer of each rhombic shape. This colored pattern is different from that in PM 2.129. On the other hand, the Claudian example is characterized by a colored, stepped-triangular pattern in each rhombic shape, which is similar to the colored pattern of PM 2.129. Therefore, this portrait mummy probably belongs to the Claudian group rather than the Hadrianic one.

PM 2.142 (Plate 104, Plate 105) was dated to the middle of the 1st century (Parlasca 1969, 1:42–43, No. 62, Pl. 16/2). The boy’s hair is long, with curved wisps that are combed towards the back of the head, with long strands of hair falling at the back of the neck. This hairstyle cannot be identified with the style in any chronological group. However, several features can help identify the date of this portrait mummy. The gilded lips and jewelry are similar to the gilded lips that occurred once in the Claudian group and twice in the Hadrianic group. Considering the wrappings of the portrait mummy, it belongs to Type 3, which occurred for the first time in the Neronian group and continued in the Flavian, Trajanic, and Hadrianic groups. The posture in PM 2.142 is proper left, which is a dominant feature in the Hadrianic group, but not in the Claudian group. Therefore, this author thinks it is more reasonable to assign PM 2.142 to the Hadrianic group rather than the Claudian one.

MP 2.68 (Plate 95) is dated by Doxiadis to the 2nd century (Doxiadis 1995, 207, No. 40), Parlasca dated it to the early 3rd century (Parlasca 1977, 2:79, No. 442, Pl. 108/5), and Picton and Quirke dated it to the middle Antonine Period (Picton, Quirke, and Roberts 2007, 176). The hairstyle of the man in MP 2.68 (Plate 95) is thick, short, and curly, with curly strands falling on the forehead. This style could be attributed to either the Hadrianic or the Antonine style. The man in this portrait has a gilded wreath and gilded parting of the lips. These gilded areas occurred in the Hadrianic group, especially in case of PM 2.139 (Plate 99). The Antonine group does not include any examples of gilded wreaths, except for the three red shrouded mummies, and it does not include any examples of gilded parting of the lips. Therefore, based on the results of this thesis’ investigations, it is more likely that MP 2.68 belongs to the Hadrianic group rather than the Antonine one.
Chapter 3: Abusir el-Melek

Background on the Discovery

In 1904, Otto Rubensohn, the German classical archaeologist, excavated nine mummy portraits at Abusir el-Melek. The site is located 8 km south of the village of el-Hamam, near the village of el Haraga (Rubensohn and Knatz 1904, 1). It was a cemetery in the "Pre-dynastic Period, re-used in the Hyksos Period, Saite, and Greco-Roman" (Porter and Moss 1934, 4:105). The Roman portrait mummies uncovered were buried in simple pits in the sand (Parlasca 1966, 50), similar to the burials from Hawara that were recorded by Petrie (Petrie 1889, 20).

Two portraits excavated from the site were still attached to their mummies when they were placed on display in Heidelberg's Institute of Egyptology and the Martin von Wagner Museum in Wurzburg. Unfortunately, the portrait mummy in Wurzburg was destroyed in World War II (Parlasca 1969, 1:38); it is included in this study based on Parlasca's verbal description and the image he included (Parlasca 1969, 1:38).

Seven portraits from Abusir el-Melek are included in the database. The eighth portrait, published by Parlasca, was being sold at the antiquities market in Amsterdam (Parlasca 1977, 2:38, No. 285, Pl. 68/4), and was therefore excluded from the database. The mummy portrait in Hildesheim's Pelizaeus Museum (Inv. No. 1586) is broken, making it difficult to identify the hairstyle according to which it should be dated, and so it too was excluded from this study.

Chronological Sequence

The hairstyles depicted in this corpus all fall within the Julio-Claudian fashion. The men are characterized by a short haircut and smooth hair, which is combed forward towards the forehead, but stops at the beginning of the forehead leaving it exposed (Borg 1996, 69). The women are depicted with hairstyles typical of both the Tiberian simple fashion with a central parting and wavy hair, and the Claudian style with curly strands of hair falling on the neck (Borg 1996, 28–30).
Tiberian (AD 14-37)

A typical example of the Tiberian style is found in MP 3.90 (Plate 133), which Borg compared with that of the Tiberian Roman marble statue of Annius Rufus (Borg 1996, 70). The hair in this portrait is smooth, cut short, and combed towards the forehead.

In addition, among the Tiberian portraits is portrait MP 3.93 (Plate 135) of a woman with a centrally parted hair, wavy on both sides and combed close to the head with loose hair strands extending from the edges of the head. Parlasca dated this portrait to the middle of the 1st century, to the reign of Claudius (Parlasca 1969, 1:26, No. 4, Pl. 1/4). However, this hairstyle is similar to the fashion of Livia Drusilla, mother of Tiberius, and Tiberius's sister-in-law Antonia Minor (Fejfer 2008, 342, Fig. 261; Kleiner 1992, 139–140, Fig. 114). Therefore, MP 3.93 is similar to the Tiberian fashion rather than the Claudian. Accordingly, this study assigns the portrait to the Tiberian group

MP 3.92 (Plate 134) was dated by Parlasca to the Claudian Period (Parlasca 1969, 1:34, No. 30, Pl. 8/2), while Borg dated it to the Tiberian Period (Borg 1996, 70). However, this study agrees with Borg's date and assigns MP 3.92 to the Tiberian group, because the smooth, short hair combed forward is typically Tiberian (Borg 1996, 69–70)

There are three portraits belonging to the Tiberian group and no portrait mummies. Subsequently, variables regarding the shape of the wrapping opening, the wrapping decoration, presence of chest bands, foot bands, or cartonnage foot cases are all excluded from the following analyses.

1. Wood is mostly used in this group, with only one portrait painted on linen (MP 3.93).
2. Encaustic is the most used painting technique, except for the MP 3.93 (Plate 135) linen portrait, where tempera was used.
3. Gilding is not present on any of the portraits in the Tiberian group
4. All three portraits depict the subject turned slightly to proper right
5. No frames are present in the portraits of this group.
6. There is a variation in panel shapes of this group, with two rectangular portraits and one arched.
Late Claudian-early Neronian (AD 41-54)

One of the typical portraits exhibiting a late Claudian hairstyle is portrait MP 3.91 (Plate 136) which Parlasca dated to the period between the 1st and 2nd century (Parlasca 1969, 1:36–37, No. 38, Pl. 10/4). The woman in this portrait has her hair pulled back away from the face with a simple row of curls framing the forehead and long strands of hair falling on the neck behind her ears. The hair is not centrally parted as was usual in the Claudian fashion, but the long strands falling behind the ears is similar to the style of Agrippina Minor (Borg 1996, 28–29; Fejfer 2008, 340, Fig. 259; Kleiner 1992, 140, Fig. 114). The absence of the central parting could be paralleled with the Neronian fashion of Poppaea, where the entire forehead is framed by small round curls (Borg 1996, 29). Therefore, for a more precise dating than the one given by Parlasca, this portrait could be dated to the transitional period between the late Claudian and the early Neronian time.

PM 3.148 (Plate 138) and PM 3.149 (Plate 139) are two similarly rendered portraits of two boys with the same simple, short haircut reminiscent of the Julio-Claudian time, with some curls extending from the right edge of the head. Although the hairstyle itself cannot be clearly identified with Tiberian, Claudian, or Neronian fashion, the extended curls from the edges of the head can be found in portrait MP 3.91(Plate 136). Those curls are a unique feature that is not in other children portraits found elsewhere. Thus, they could be considered as the signature mark of

Figure 127 Numbers of panel shapes
the painter of those two portraits. Accordingly, the two portrait mummies could be assigned to the same group as MP 3.91 that is to the late Claudian-early Neronian group.

MP 3.94 (Plate 137) is a portrait of a bald man with deep naso-labial folds, which Doxiadis dated to the 1st century (Doxiadis 1995, 218, No. 95), and Parlasca dated it to the Claudian Period (Parlasca 1969, 1:34, No. 31, Pl. 8/3). The presence of deep naso-labial folds is typical of the Claudian portraits when realistic physiognomy started to be adopted by Claudius (Kleiner 1992, 131). Therefore, this study places MP 3.94 with the Claudian group in agreement with Parlasca's date.

Four mummy portraits belong to this group, two of which are mummy portraits and two are detached mummy portraits. The corpus can be analyzed as follows:

1. Wood and linen are used in equal number of portraits.
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*Figure 128 Percentages of panel material*
2. Encaustic and tempera were used in equal number of portraits

Figure 129 Numbers of panel materials

Figure 130 Percentages of painting technique
Gilding only appears on PM 3.149, which was destroyed. The gilding was applied on the wreath and it is not visible in the black and white image of the portrait in the *Ritratti di Mummie*. However, Parlasca described it in his catalog entry (Parlasca 1969, 1:38, No. 45, Pl. 12/3).

Figure 132 Percentages of gilded portraits
4. All portraits depict the subjects with their upper bodies turned slightly to proper right.

5. There are no frames present on the portraits of this group.

6. There is one angled panel and one arched panel in this corpus. Therefore, there is no dominant panel shape in this chronological group.
The opening shape that appears on the two portrait mummies of this corpus is a narrow octagonal shape that only shows the painted head of the deceased.
8. Wrappings are arranged in a rhombic pattern.
9. No occurrences of a chest band on the mummy wrappings.
10. Cartonnage foot cases are not present in the portrait mummies of this corpus.

Conclusions
Wood was the most used material for panels. However, the presence of linen portraits dating to such an early period suggests that the same practice that was adopted in Hawara during that time was also adopted in this site. Although there is only one Tiberian portrait and two Claudian linen portraits, this does not indicate that linen portraits increased in popularity from the Tiberian to the Claudian Period. The small size of the corpus and the lack of any portraits dated to later periods make it difficult to identify the trend in the use of linen portraits.

Encaustic was more dominant throughout the two periods, while tempera was mainly used for linen portraits. The use of tempera in some of the earliest examples of mummy portraits, especially linen portraits, is very similar to the situation in Hawara.

Gilding was not commonly applied, except in the case of PM 3.149, where it was applied on the wreath. Parlasca also remarked that the application of gilding on the wreath occurred before the portrait was inserted within the wrappings. He also pointed out that the wreath exhibited a pattern similar to the vine pattern carved on gilded frames from Hawara (Parlasca
Therefore, it is possible that gilding occurred at a workshop in Hawara.

The wrappings form a rhombic pattern with a narrow octagonal opening framing the portrait. Although the rhombic pattern is found at Hawara, this shape of the opening is not attested there (see Chapter 2). Therefore, it is a unique feature to the site of Abusir el-Melek. Frames, cartonnage foot cases, gilded stucco studs, and chest bands are not found in this corpus.

In terms of panel material, painting technique, posture, and panel shape, the portraits from Abusir el-Melek are similar to those belonging to the same chronological groups from Hawara. Considering that Abusir el-Melek is located around 30 km to the east of Hawara (Baines and Malek 2005, 121), it is possible that the artists at Hawara originally painted those portraits and then "exported" them to Abusir el-Melek, where they were found. If this theory is correct, then that practice died out after the Julio-Claudian Period for an unknown reason.

Doxiadis proposed another logical theory when she discussed the introduction of portrait painting in the Fayum. She proposed that the artists in Hellenistic Egypt travelled around in order to "ensure a constant supply of work" and that this is how the Alexandrian artists originally came to the Fayum (Doxiadis 1995, 89). This is a plausible assumption considering that artists occasionally moved from one place to another since ancient times. For example, Greek artists moved to Rome when it started to become the major political and economic center of the Roman Empire (Thompson 2007, 20). This practice continued also in the Renaissance when painters used to travel across Europe spreading their works and influencing other artists. Filippio Lippi, for example, travelled to Padua in AD 1434 and influenced the works of Andrea Mantegna, while Antonello da Messina travelled to Venice and influenced the works of Giovanni Bellini (Kuiper 2010, 70, 96). Both theories are valid, but proving which of the two theories is more reasonable is beyond the scope of this study. Other possible reasons are discussed in more details in the final chapter (see Chapter 6).
Chapter 4: Tebtunis

Background of the Discovery

Tebtunis is located 23 km south of Hawara in the Fayum, in the modern village of Umm el-Breigat (Bierbrier 1997a, 16). Grenfell and Hunt excavated the site in 1899-1900, where they uncovered at least eleven mummy portraits in cemeteries VII and VIII (Bierbrier 1997a, 16). Because Mrs. Phoebe Hearst funded the excavation, the eleven portraits were given to the Phoebe Hearst Museum in California. No excavation report was published for this season, and the only record of their provenance and acquisition comes from the museum's records (Picton, Quirke, and Roberts 2007, 20). The only other record of this collection is found in a brief preliminary report by Grenfell and Hunt, where they mention a group of portraits excavated at Tebtunis (Grenfell and Hunt 1901a, 377). In addition, the Egypt Exploration Society has one negative that recorded two of the mummy portraits from the site (MP 4.96 and MP 4.103), both of which are now in the Phoebe Hearst Museum (Bierbrier 1997a, 16).

Parlasca published the eleven portraits in volumes I and II of the Ritratti di Mummie and listed their provenance as Fag el-Gamus instead of Tebtunis (Parlasca 1977, 2:76–78, No. 428–437). However, Bierbrier identified those portraits with the finds from Tebtunis based on the records of the museum as well as the Egypt Exploration Society's archive of photographic negatives in the case of two of the portraits. Out of the eleven portraits found at the site, ten are included in this study. The eleventh portrait, 6-21381 at the Phoebe Hearst Museum, is faded, making it difficult to date and analyze, and so it was excluded from the database. Among the collection studied in this chapter is the unique preliminary drawing, MP 4.100 (Plate 145), which was found by Grenfell and Hunt in Tebtunis. Despite being an incomplete portrait, it is included in the database because it exhibits the hairstyle, panel shape, and posture clearly and therefore it is valid to consider it as part of the corpus.

Chronological Sequence

Two types of hairstyles are depicted in the Tebtunis portraits that help to establish dates for these pieces. The first is the typical early Antonine fashion, found mostly in portraits of
women. This hairstyle is characterized by the oval-shaped bun at the crown of the head, also known as the tower style, which is similar to the fashion of Faustina the Elder, (Borg 1996, 50; Fejfer 2008, 360, Fig. 294). Five portraits exhibit an early Antonine tower style: MP 431, MP 433, MP 434, and MP 435.

The second type of hairstyle is the late Antonine-early Severan, which could be found mostly in portraits of men. The men in MP 4.98 (Plate 143) and MP 4.97 (Plate 142) have the hair cropped close to the head cap with small round curls framing the head in a confined manner, and a slightly receding hairline at the temples. This is typical of the Type 5 style of Caracalla (Kleiner 1992, 324, Fig. 287). The young man's hair in MP 4.96 (Plate 141) is similar to the other two portraits except the hair is only slightly curved, but not curly, and it is shorter than the hair in the other two. This is typical of Type 4 portraits of Caracalla (Kleiner 1992, 324, Fig. 286).

Portrait MP 4.95 (Plate 140) depicts a man wearing his hair in Trajanic fashion with smooth hair combed forward into a fringe over the forehead (Parlasca 1969, 1:70, No. 159, Pl. 38/4). However, this portrait shares with the rest of the late Antonine-Severan portraits the rendering of the almond-shaped eyes, with the slight bags under them, the straight nose, and the small mouth with a full lower lip. Therefore, this study places the portrait among the late Antonine-early Severan group, as these features far outweigh the Trajanic. Indeed, the Trajanic hairstyle in this portrait could be explained as being a revival of the older fashion which is a practice witnessed in some examples of the Antonine Period (Borg 1996, 78). Examples of such revivals from Hawara are MP 112 and MP 194 where the hair is smooth, combed forward into a fringe, but in a casual manner (See chapter 2).

One portrait of a woman, MP 4.102 (Plate 147), depicts a hairstyle typical of mid-late Antonine fashion. The hair in this portrait is centrally parted, combed smoothly on either side such that it partially covers the ears, and collected at the nape of the neck into a loose bun. This hairstyle is very similar to that of Faustina the Younger (Borg 1996, 52; Kleiner 1992, 280, Fig. 247; Fejfer 2008, 354, Fig. 281). Therefore, this study places MP 4.102 among the late Antonine-early Severan group.
Five portraits exhibit early Antonine hairstyle, and another five with late Antonine-early Severan style. However, considering that both groups exhibit the same stylistic features, they are treated in this study as one chronological group dated to the Antonine-early Severan Period. There are no portrait mummies in this corpus. Accordingly, some variables such as the type of wrappings, the shape of the opening around the portraits, cartonnage foot cases, chest bands, and foot bands do not form a part of the following analysis.

1. Wood is the sole material used for panels in this corpus.

2. Encaustic is the only painting technique used, with no examples of tempera. MP 4.100 (Plate 145) is not included in this chart because it is an unpainted preliminary drawing.
3. Gilding occurs on three portraits of men (MP 4.95; Plate 140, MP 4.96; Plate 141, and MP 4.98) where it was applied on the wreath.

Figure 139 Percentages of gilded portraits
All portraits depict the subject turned to proper left, with the sole exception of MP 4.101 (Plate 146), which depicts a woman turned to her proper right.
There are no frames applied on any portrait in this corpus.

The most common panel shape is angled in shape. There are two variations in the form of the angled panels: small cut upper corners and large cut upper corners.

Figure 142 Numbers of postures

Figure 143 Numbers of panel shapes
Conclusions

The portraits from Tebtunis exhibit hairstyles typical of early Antonine and late Antonine-early Severan Periods. Therefore, it is plausible that the use of mummy portraits at Tebtunis did not start before the Antonine Period, which is much later than when it started in Hawara and Abusir el-Melek. This could be due to an accident of archaeology, poor preservation
of the earlier portraits, or the possibility that those portraits were painted when an artist(s) came and settled in the town during the Antonine Period. More theories regarding the presence of portraits at such late stage are presented in details in the final chapter (see Chapter 6).

All portraits are made of wood, and no examples of linen portraits. Encaustic is also the only painting technique used, which is also similar to the situation with the Antonine portraits from Hawara. The Tebtunis portraits are characterized by subtle brushstrokes, absence of defining lines in the rendering of the physical features, and absence of shadowing.

Gilding is found on three portraits out of the ten, and its presence is restricted to the wreath. It is noticeable that only the men wear gilded wreaths in the Tebtunis corpus. This is not a unique feature to Tebtunis because it is also uncommon for women in the Hawara portraits to be depicted with a golden wreath. Only three portraits of women out of the 130 from Hawara show the presence of gilded wreaths, two of which are young girls (see Chapter 2). The two examples of women from Abusir el-Melek are also shown without a gilded wreath (see Chapter 3); thus, it could be concluded that women are generally depicted without gilded wreaths in the portraits of Hawara, Abusir el-Melek, and Tebtunis.

The dominant posture in the Tebtunis portraits is that of the subject turned to proper left with only one example, MP 4.101 (Plate 146), of a woman turned to proper right. The dominant panel shape is angled. The Tebtunis angled panel can either be with small or large-cut upper corners. The majority of the panels are with small-cut upper corners, representing 60% of the entire corpus. This particular shape of the angled panel is only found in Tebtunis. Therefore, it is considered one of the unique features of the corpus from Tebtunis.
Chapter 5: Antinoopolis

Background of the Discovery

The ancient city of Antinoopolis, modern day Sheikh 'Ibada, is located in Middle Egypt, on the east bank of the Nile (Bard and Shubert 1999, 158). It is situated 300 km south of Cairo, across the river from the ancient settlement of Hermopolis Magna (Thompson 1972, 1). The city was founded by Hadrian around AD 130, in commemoration of the death of his favorite friend Antinous, who drowned in the Nile near the city (Bard and Shubert 1999, 158). Albert Gayet excavated the site between 1896-1912, where he uncovered several mummy portraits and painted funerary shrouds (Bard and Shubert 1999, 158; Thompson 1972, 8–15; Bierbrier 1997b, 24). The painted funerary shrouds were recorded in Gayet's preliminary reports and the Guimet Museum catalogs. However, most of the mummy portraits were not recorded, except for two in Les Portraits D'Antinoé Au Musée Guimet (Guimet 1912, 27). Eleven portraits from Antinoopolis, currently in the Musée des Beaux Arts in Dijon, were part of Gayet's private collection which the museum purchased from Gayet's successors after his death (Thompson 1972, 15).

Since Gayet made no record of the excavation of the mummy portraits, the only source of information is museum records. Fourteen portraits are listed in different museum records, such as Dijon's Museum des Beaux Arts, the Berlin Museum, and the Louvre Museum, as the products of Gayet's excavations at Antinoopolis. Additionally, another 29 portraits that have been purchased, not excavated, which have been assigned to Antinoopolis based on stylistic features. Those twenty-nine will not be included in this study. One complete portrait mummy attributed to Antinoopolis, AF 6882, in the Louvre Museum is recorded as possibly a part of Henry Salt's collection, who financed several excavations at different sites in the 19th century (Bierbrier 1997b, 23). This possibility might be true for it is recorded that one of Salt's agents, the antiquarian Giovanni Belzoni, visited the site in the early 19th century (Bierbrier 1997b, 23; Bard and Shubert 1999, 159). However, due to its uncertain provenance, it too was excluded from this study. Five poorly preserved portraits were excluded, along with another two that are currently in private collections. Thus, the total number of mummy portraits in this study consists of 14 detached portraits and no occurrences of complete portrait mummies.
**Chronological Sequence**

The earliest portrait from Antinoopolis could be dated to the reign of Hadrian. Most of the hairstyles depicted in the Antinoopolis portraits are variations of the official imperial styles, and not a direct copy of them. Thus, the dating of this corpus is based on comparing the hairstyles with their closest possible imperial counterparts. According to the following chronological division, the Antinoopolis portraits belong to either the Hadrianic or the Antonine group.

**Hadrianic (AD 117-138)**

Six portraits belong to the Hadrianic group. The most striking feature in the women's hairstyles is the absence of the central parting of the hair. Sabina, wife of Hadrian, had two hairstyles, the first of which was a large braided bun positioned at the back of the head behind rows of small round curls; usually the statues with this hairstyle are believed to have been carved during her life (Kleiner 1992, 241–242). The second style, usually found on posthumous statues assimilating her with the Greek goddesses, consists of a wide braided bun contouring the head in a turban fashion positioned close to the forehead, with the hair centrally parted (Borg 1996, 38; Kleiner 1992, 241–242). A variation of the first hairstyle is found in MP 5.118 (Plate 155), MP 5.113 (Plate 153), and MP 269. In those portraits, the hair is pulled back into a wide braided bun positioned at the back of the head. There are no examples of the second hairstyle in the Antinoopolis corpus.

Scholars differ in their dating of certain portraits. For example, Parlasca dated MP 5.115 (Plate 154) to the Trajanic Period based on the short haircut, with the hair combed forward towards the forehead (Parlasca 1969, 1:65, No. 138, Pl. 33/1). Coche de la Ferté compared the short haircut and receding hairline at the temples to the Severan fashion, similar to that worn by Severus Alexander (Coche de la Ferté 1954, 213–214). Thompson argued that the same painter painted this portrait and a woman's portrait in the Louvre (Inv. No. P 217), because both have the mouth painted in a cartoon-like schematic shape, the eyes in both portraits are placed at uneven levels, and both feature similar gentle transitions from light to shade (Thompson 1972, 52–58). Accordingly, the hairstyle in the Louvre portrait can be used to identify the date of MP 5.115 (Plate 154). The Louvre portrait depicts a woman with her hair not centrally parted, pulled back into a wide braided bun at the back of the head similar to the Hadrianic fashion of Sabina (Borg...
Since the same painter painted the Louvre portrait and MP 5.115, then MP 5.115 most probably belong to the Hadrianic group.

Parlasca dated MP 5.118 (Plate 155) and MP 5.113 (Plate 153) to the Trajanic Period, because they artistically resemble those of the Louvre portrait P 217 (Parlasca 1969, 1:65–67, NO. 140, Pl. 34/1, No. 144, Pl. 34/5). Thompson dated them to the late 2nd century because they lack the naturalism that Thompson believed was characteristic of the earlier periods. He attributed them to the same artist, whom he called Painter H (Thompson 1972, 85–91). However, both dates can be refuted based on the depiction of the hairstyle. Neither of the women has the central division of the hair that was a dominant feature in all portraits of Faustina the Elder, Faustina the Younger, and Julia Domna, all dating to the second half of the 2nd century (Kleiner 1992, 279, Fig. 246; Fejfer 2008, 354, Fig. 279, 360, Fig. 294, Fig. 296). Therefore, the absence of the central parting in MP 5.118 and MP 5.113 is not typical of the later 2nd century fashion. In addition, the two portraits depict the hair pulled back into a wide bun at the back of the head, which is different from the Trajanic fashion that is characterized by a high tower of curls (Fejfer 2008, 336, Fig. 253). Thus, it is unlikely that the two portraits date to the Trajanic Period as stated by Parlasca. However, their hairstyles could be directly linked to a variation of Sabina's first type of hairstyle, a date that is suggested by Borg (Borg 1996, 38).

In the case of MP 5.109 (Plate 150), Parlasca dated it to the end of the 2nd century (Parlasca 1969, 1:74–75, No. 174, Pl. 42/3), while Coche de la Ferté assigned the portrait to the Severan Period based on the short hairstyle (Coche de la Ferté, Charbonneaux, and Salles 1952, 16). Thompson attributed this portrait to the same Painter H as portraits MP 5.118 and MP 5.113 (Thompson 1972, 85–91). Therefore, a date for this portrait could be derived from the date assigned to the other two portraits painted by the same painter. Thompson identified that the rendering of the arched juncture line above the upper lids, the wide eyes, and the thin, small mouth with extended upper lip in MP 5.109 is similar to those in MP 5.118 (Thompson 1972, 89). Since MP 5.118 was dated to the Hadrianic Period, then this study assigns MP 5.109 to the Hadrianic group as well.

The analyses of the portraits belonging to the Hadrianic group are as follows:

1. Wood is the sole material used as panel material.
2. Encaustic is the only painting technique used in this corpus.

3. There are no gilded areas in the portraits of the Hadrianic group.
The dominant posture is that of the subject in a frontal pose. There are only two examples, MP 5.110 (Plate 151) and MP 5.111 (Plate 152), where the subject is depicted turned to the proper left.
There are no frames present in this corpus.

The dominant panel shape in this group is the stepped panel, where the panel is cut close to the head and widens at the shoulders. The shapes of the top the panel differ. The most dominant stepped panel shape in this group is that with a rectangular top, while another two examples, MP 5.109 (Plate 150) and MP 5.118 (Plate 155) have an arched top. There is only one example, MP 5.115 (Plate 154), with an angled top.
Antonine (AD 138-192)

Eight portraits were assigned to the Antonine group. The women's hairstyles in this group are characterized by the hair centrally parted and combed in waves on both sides, such as in the case of MP 5.107 (Plate 158) and MP 5.108 (Plate 159) (Parlasca 1969, 1:89, No. 232, Pl. 57/5, No. 233, Pl. 57/6).
MP 5.112 (Plate 160) was dated by Parlasca to the Hadrianic Period despite the presence of a central parting and wavy hair on both sides, which, according to Parlasca, does not justify a later date (Parlasca 1969, 1:89, No. 231, Pl. 57/4). However, the central parting and the waves on both sides are similar to the style of Faustina the Younger, rather than the style of Sabina (Kleiner 1992, 279–280, Fig. 246, Fig. 247). Therefore, this study assigns MP 5.112 to the Antonine group.

Parlasca dated MP 5.116 (Plate 162) to the Hadrianic Period as well (Parlasca 1969, 1:85, No. 219, Pl. 54/3), though Thompson attributed the painter responsible for this portrait to the second half of 2nd century (Thompson 1972, 84). The hairstyle in the portrait is centrally parted, combed into a wavy pattern on both sides such that it partially covers the ears, which is very similar to the style of Faustina the Younger (Fejfer 2008, 354, Fig. 281). Therefore, this study assigns MP 5.116 to the Antonine group keeping with Thompson's dating.

Portrait MP 5.107 (Plate 158) of a man was also dated to the early Hadrianic Period by Parlasca (Parlasca 1969, 1:78, No. 190, Pl. 46/2). However, Doxiadis attributed it to the Antonine Period (Doxiadis 1995, 213, No. 87). The man in MP 5.107 has the hair cut short, thick and curly with loose curly strands extending from the edges of the head, which are similar to the Antonine fashion (Borg 1996, 76). Thompson also attributed this portrait to the same painter F who painted MP 5.116, and he dated them to the second half of the 2nd century (Thompson 1972, 81–85). Therefore, this study agrees with both Thompson and Doxiadis in dating MP 5.107 to the Antonine group.

The analyses for the eight portraits belonging to this group are as follows:

1. All portraits in this corpus are made of wood, with no examples of linen portraits.
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2. Encaustic is the only painting technique used in these portraits.

3. Gilding is not present in any of the examples of this group, except in the case of MP 5.107 (Plate 158) where the man is depicted with a gilded wreath and a gilded background.
The two most dominant postures are the frontal and the proper left posture. Only two examples, MP 5.107 (Plate 158) and MP 5.117 (Plate 163), depict the subjects turned to proper right.
There are no frames present in the portraits of this group.

The stepped panel is the most common panel shape in this group. There is only one portrait, MP 5.116 (Plate 162), of an arched panel instead of stepped. Two portraits, MP 5.117 (Plate 163) and MP 5.107 (Plate 158), are angled not stepped. The stepped panels take on two different forms in terms of the shape of the panel top. The most dominant panel top for stepped panels is the arched top. There are
two stepped panels, MP 5.108 (Plate 159) and MP 5.112 (Plate 160), which have an arched top framing the head and neck making a horseshoe shape.

Figure 160 Percentages of panel shapes

Figure 161 Numbers of panel shapes
Conclusions

The Antinoopolis portraits belong to two chronological groups: the Hadrianic and the Antonine. All portraits are made of wood with no examples of linen panels. This is the same case with portraits dated to the same chronological groups from Hawara and Tebtunis. Encaustic is the only painting technique used in Antinoopolis, which is also similar to the portraits from
Hawara and Tebtunis. Gilding does not appear in any of the examples of the Hadrianic group. By the Antonine Period, gilding appears on only one example, particularly on the wreath and background. There are two dominant postures: the frontal and the proper left posture. Only two examples in the Antonine group depict the subjects turned to proper right.

The stepped shape of the panel is not found in any of the other three sites examined in this study. Although it is not the only panel shape found at Antinoopolis, it is still considered a unique feature. However, there are variations in the forms of the stepped panels' tops. The portraits that have the same shape of the panel top share the same stylistic rendering of the features. For example, in the Hadrianic group, the stepped panels with a rectangular top, MP 5.110 (Plate 151) and MP 5.111 (Plate 152), are attributed to the same painter B (Thompson 1972, 58–63). They share the same rendering of the narrow, almond-shaped eyes, the sharply arched eyebrows, and the shading on the left side of the nose (Thompson 1972, 60–62). In addition, Thompson attributed MP 5.113 (Plate 153) to the same painter as MP 254 and MP 5.118 (Plate 155), despite being stylistically different (1972, 85, 90). However, MP 5.113 shares similar physical features with MP 5.110 and MP 5.111, as well as the same stepped panel shape with a rectangular top, where MP 254 and MP 5.118 share the same stepped panel with an arched top, as well as similar rendering of the lips, the lines above the upper eye lid, and the thick arched eyebrows (Thompson 1972, 88–89).

Therefore, the two most important characteristic features of the Antinoopolis corpus are the stepped panel shape and the frontal posture that is not usually found at other sites, except for four portraits from Hawara. Accordingly, those two features are the decisive factors for assigning portraits to Antinoopolis.
Chapter 6: Discussion and Application

This study analyzed the portraits from the four sites that yielded the highest number of excavated portraits, they are: Hawara, Abusir el-Melek, Tebtunis, and Antinoopolis. The purpose was to identify a set of unique features that characterize each of the four sites from the early 1st century to the early 3rd century AD. Panel material, painting technique, presence of gilding, posture, presence of frames, panel shape, and, for the complete portrait mummies, the shape of wrapping opening and the wrapping decoration scheme were examined to determine if they could be used to identify one site from another. The results reached from the analysis provided a set of reference points against which unprovenanced portraits (for example, any of the 482 currently unprovenanced portraits in museum collections) could be compared to identify their origin. It should be noted that some of the unprovenanced portraits might have come from sites such as er-Rubayat, Akhmim, and el-Hibe, or indeed, other sites that have yielded few excavated portraits, and thus did not form a part of this study.

The portraits were grouped chronologically, following the system established in Chapter 1. Placement of mummy portraits in a sequence provided a context for the temporal changes in the features at each site, as well as a timeline for their adoption and decline in each area.

---

3 This number was calculated by the author based on the number of portraits in the four volumes of Klaus Parlasca's Ritrati di Mummie that are listed under the category of unknown provenance. In addition, the author included those listed under provenance "Fayum" because it does not specify the site of origin.

4 The portraits attributed to these sites were purchased and not excavated, thus their provenances is suspect (Borg 1998, 11-15, 26-28).
According to the chronological sequence of the excavated corpus, it can be concluded that the use of mummy portraits started first at Hawara and Abusir el-Melek, in the reign of Tiberius (AD 14-37). In Hawara, the latest portraits are dated to the Severan Period (AD 193-235), indicating that the practice continued until the beginning of the 3rd century, while the latest portraits found at Abusir el-Melek date to the Claudian Period (AD 41-54), indicating that the use of such portraits, in Abusir el-Melek was abandoned at that time. It is possible that the use of
portraits persisted after this time and their absence from the excavated corpus is attributed to poor preservation or an accident of archaeology.

There are two other possible reasons for abandoning the use of portraits at Abusir el-Melek. One is that the portraits might not have been painted at the site, but rather "imported" from Hawara, which is located 30 Km to the west (Baines and Malek 2005, 121), and the "importing" stopped after the Claudian Period, either because of economic reasons or because the practice simply died out at this site, although it remained popular elsewhere. A second possibility is that a travelling portrait-painting workshop came and settled at the site for some time and then moved on to a different site.

Mummy portraits were adopted in Antinoopolis shortly after its official foundation in the time of Hadrian (AD 117-138), in AD 130 (Bard and Shubert 1999, 158). They continued in use throughout the Antonine Period. However, in the Severan Period the site witnessed a development in the tradition. No longer was only the face of the deceased represented, but also a full length or bust length, clothed image. Those fuller forms were painted on full length linen shrouds that served as the outer layer of the mummy wrappings (Doxiadis 1995, 214–215, No. 88, No. 89, No. 90, No. 91,92, No. 93, 94). Other examples of painted shrouds occur at other sites such as Saqqara. However, they are much later than the Severan Period specifically dated to the reign of Gallienus based on their hairstyles (Doxiadis 1995, 187, No. 9,10, No. 11, 12). In addition, the Saqqara portraits, unlike those of Antinoopolis, do not seem to be a local development from the wooden panel tradition, because no wooden panels have been excavated from Saqqara. This study excluded painted funerary shrouds as they have different features from panel portraits ⁵, although they too should be studied using a similar methodology.

In Tebtunis, the earliest portraits date to the early Antonine Period and continued until the early Severan, as opposed to Hawara where the use of mummy portraits started much earlier, from the Tiberian Period to the Severan Period. According to the excavated corpus, the practice was not adopted there before the Antonine Period. However, the site was functioning long before the Antonine Period, from the 12th dynasty of the Middle Kingdom (Grenfell et al. 1900, 2). The absence of mummy portraits dating prior to the Antonine era is odd since Tebtunis lies only 23 km south of Hawara, a site that saw a flourishing in the Middle Kingdom and where the practice

⁵ For a discussion on the difference between painted shroud and linen portraits see Chapter 1
of using mummy portraits thrived since the time of Tiberius (Baines and Malek 2005, 131). The presence of portraits dated to no earlier than Antonine Period in Tebtunis might be because the earlier portraits remain unexcavated. Another possibility is that no resident artists were present at the site until the Antonine Period. The abandonment of the practice in the early Severan Period could be due to the economic instability of the time. In the 3rd century AD, members of the upper class, who were the patrons of mummy portraits (Montserrat 1993, 223; Borg 2000, 70–72), started to abandon the villages and move to the metropolises, after two centuries of living in the countryside (Borg 2000, 83–84).

The sudden rise and fall of using mummy portraits at some sites such as Tebtunis and Abusir el-Melek could be considered evidence for the presence of a travelling workshop. Such travelling workshops are attested across the Roman Empire. For example, the Aphrodisian artists travelled the empire in search for "lucrative commissions." In addition, there was the "Mausoleum Workshop", which was a travelling workshop responsible for a specific type of tower tombs erected in southern France (Kleiner 1992, 16). As noted above, the practice was also common with Renaissance painters such as Antonello da Messina, who travelled to Venice and influenced the works of Giovanni Bellini (Kuiper 2010, 70, 96). Thus, this common practice could explain the use of mummy portraits during one specific period at those sites. On the other hand, Hawara probably had a permanent workshop that functioned from the Tiberian to the Severan Period. Hawara was a large center for mummy portrait production because Arsinoe, the town that the Hawara cemetery served, was the hometown of the famous "6475 Arsinoite Katoikoi." These were the rich, elite Greek inhabitants who settled in the Fayum and were more privileged than the inhabitants of the other Fayum villages (Bagnall 1997, 8; Borg 2000, 69, 71). Thus, this area was more economically wealthy for a longer time than any other in the area was, and able to support an industry such as mummy portraits.

**Spatial Variations**

The following tables present the results of the analysis conducted in this study. The tables are categorized by period, and they compare the sites in terms of the selected variables. The comparisons are then followed by a discussion of the different variables and their changes across time.
### Tiberian (AD 14-37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/ Site</th>
<th>Hawara</th>
<th>Abusir el-Melek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel Material</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>Linen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting Technique</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Encaustic Tempera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tempera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encaustic+ Tempera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>Yes: Jewelry</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posture</td>
<td>Frontal</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frames</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel shape</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arched</td>
<td>Arched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping opening shape</td>
<td>Octagonal (narrow bottom side)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Octagonal (wide)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping decoration type</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest band</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartonnage foot case</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 Difference between Hawara and Abusir el-Melek in the Tiberian Period*

Portraits with Tiberian hairstyles are only found at Hawara and Abusir el-Melek. Panel material and panel shape are common at both sites. The presence of portraits with combined technique of encaustic and tempera is a characteristic feature of the Tiberian portraits from Hawara. The only other images that were painted using this technique are the Severan shrouds from Antinoopolis, such as Louvre shrouds AF 6486 and AF 6489 (Doxiadis 1995, 215–216, No. 8, No. 34.35; Parlasca 1977, 2:74, No. 421, Pl. 105/1, No. 423, Pl. 105/3). The frontal posture and the presence of gilding are also key features of the Hawara portraits. Tiberian portrait mummies are not found from Abusir el-Melek, and so variables related to mummy wrappings are not applied to its corpus.
Hawara and Abusir el-Melek are the only two sites that have portraits with Claudian hairstyles. The panel material is the same in both sites, as is the use of encaustic and tempera techniques. Therefore, these variables cannot be considered as indicators for either site. Similar to the Tiberian Period, the use of the combined painting technique is only found at Hawara. Thus, the use of the combined technique in Julio-Claudian portraits is a characteristic feature of Hawara.

Gilding is more common in Hawara where several portraits exhibit it on multiple areas including jewelry, lips, clothes, and wreaths. A single unique case from Abusir el-Melek exhibits gilding on the wreath (PM 3.149; Plate 139), but otherwise, gilding is not common there. This study suggests that the gilding of the wreath on PM 2.132 (Plate 33) was carried out at Hawara.
(see Chapter 3). This assumption is based on the vine pattern of the wreath, which is similar to those carved on the gilded stucco frames as noted by Parlasca in his description. Also, Parlasca noted that the gilding was applied prior to the wrapping of the body (1969, 1:38, No. 45, Pl. 12/3).

The common posture in both sites is the proper right, while front and proper left postures are only found at Hawara, which continues to show more variation than Abusir el-Melek. Arched panels are also common at both sites. However, rectangular linen panels are only found in Hawara and angled panels are unique to Abusir el-Melek. Although complete portrait mummies from both sites have an octagonal opening, the octagonal shape differs in dimensions between Hawara and Abusir el-Melek. The elongated shape with a narrow bottom side, the wide, and the even-sided octagonal shapes are found at Hawara, while the narrow octagonal is characteristic of Abusir el-Melek. Therefore, the shape of the wrapping opening is a key indicator in identifying a particular cemetery. Type 1 wrapping decoration is common in portrait mummies from both sites. Other types of wrapping decorations such as types 2, 4 and 8 are only characteristic of Hawara. Chest bands are also unique to Hawara, while cartonnage foot cases are not attested at either of the two sites.

Neronian (AD 54-68)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/ Site</th>
<th>Hawara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel Material</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting Technique</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encaustic + Tempera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frames</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posture</td>
<td>Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proper right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel shape</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping opening shape</td>
<td>Octagonal (narrow bottom side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping decoration type</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest band</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartonnage foot case</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Summary of Hawara's unique features in the Neronian Period

---

6 For a table with different types of wrappings see Table 1 in Chapter 1
Neronian portraits are only found at Hawara. The characteristics of this chronological group from Hawara are:

1. The presence of gilding
2. The proper right posture
3. The type of wrappings
4. The presence of chest bands
5. The presence of cartonnage foot cases

The panel material, painting technique, panel shape, and the shape of the wrapping opening are not unique to this chronological group as they are also found in portraits belonging to other eras such as the Tiberian, Claudian, and Flavian.

**Flavian (AD 69-96)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables/ Site</th>
<th>Hawara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel Material</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting Technique</td>
<td>Encaustic, Tempera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>Yes: Wreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frames</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posture</td>
<td>Proper right, Proper left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel shape</td>
<td>Rectangular, Arched, Angled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping opening shape</td>
<td>Octagonal (even sided), Oval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping decoration type</td>
<td>Type 3, Type 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest band</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartonnage foot case</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5 Summary of Hawara’s unique features in the Flavian Period*

The Flavian hairstyle is only depicted in portraits from Hawara. Wood and encaustic became dominant in Hawara starting from the Flavian Period. Arched and angled panels are found in equal numbers in Hawara and occur here in later periods. Therefore, having a unique
panel shape is no longer a key feature of Hawara at this time. Gilding is not common in that group and it only occurs once. The dominant posture is that of the subject turned to proper right, but there are also a substantial number of portraits with the subjects turned to proper left. Thus, both postures were common.

**Trajanic (AD 98-117)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables/ Site</th>
<th>Hawara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel Material</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting Technique</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frames</td>
<td>Yes: Panel frame, horseshoe shape, gilded stucco, carved vine pattern Opening frame, horseshoe shape, linen bandages, braided and colored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posture</td>
<td>Proper right Proper left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel shape</td>
<td>Arched Angled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping opening shape</td>
<td>Octagonal (even sided) Arched top, three-sided bottom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping decoration type</td>
<td>Type 3 Type 5 Type 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest band</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartonnage foot case</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6 Summary of Hawara's unique features in the Trajanic Period*

Hawara is the only site that has, among its corpus, portraits depicting Trajanic fashion. At this stage, several innovations started to appear, such as panel frames made of gilded stucco and carved with a vine pattern, as well as frames surrounding the wrapping opening, which was made of braided and colored linen bandages. Another innovation was the wrapping opening with an arched top and a three-sided bottom, which always occurred in the presence of frames such as in PM 2.133 (Plate 70, Plate 71), PM 2.134 (Plate 72, Plate 73), and PM 2.136 (Plate 75), and their use stopped by the Antonine era when frames stopped. Some other characteristics show
continuation from the Flavian Period, such as the types of wrappings and presence of chest bands and cartonnage foot cases.

**Hadrianic (AD 117-138)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables/ Site</th>
<th>Hawara</th>
<th>Antinoopolis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel Material</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting Technique</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>Yes: Jewelry, Wreath, Hairline, Lips, Background</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frames</td>
<td>Yes: Panel frame, horseshoe shape, gilded stucco, carved vine pattern</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posture</td>
<td>Proper right, Proper left</td>
<td>Front, Proper left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel shape</td>
<td>Arched, Angled</td>
<td>Stepped (rectangular top), Stepped (arched top), Stepped (angled top)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping opening shape</td>
<td>Octagonal (even sided), Arched top, three sided bottom</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping decoration type</td>
<td>Type 2, Type 3, Type 4, Type 6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest band</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartonnage foot case</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 7 Differences between Hawara and Antinoopolis in the Hadrianic Period |

Hadrianic portraits are found at Hawara and Antinoopolis, with both sites having similar panel materials and painting techniques. Panel shape, gilding, the presence of a frame, and posture differ between the two sites. Arched or angled panel shapes are both common at Hawara,
while the stepped panel is unique to Antinoopolis. Gilding and frames are features characteristic of Hawara. Complete portrait mummies dated to the Hadrianic Period are only found at Hawara. Therefore, the variables related to portrait mummies and their wrappings are no applicable to the corpus from Antinoopolis.

**Antonine (AD 138-192)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables/ Site</th>
<th>Hawara</th>
<th>Antinoopolis</th>
<th>Tebtunis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel Material</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting Technique</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>Yes: Wreath</td>
<td>Yes: Wreath Background</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frames</td>
<td>Yes: Panel frame, horseshoe shape, gilded stucco, carved vine pattern</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: Opening frame, oval, gilded stucco, dotted pattern</td>
<td>Opening frame, oval, gilded stucco, wreath pattern</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>Front Proper right</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posture</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>Front Proper right</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel shape</td>
<td>Arched</td>
<td>Stepped (arched top)</td>
<td>Angled (small cut corners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angled</td>
<td>Arched</td>
<td>Angled (large cur corners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping opening shape</td>
<td>Octagonal (even sided)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arched top, three sided bottom</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oval</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping decoration type</td>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type 5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest band</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartonnage foot case</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8 Differences between Hawara, Antinoopolis, and Tebtunis in the Antonine Period*

Antonine hairstyles are depicted in portraits from Hawara, Antinoopolis, and Tebtunis. The panel material and painting technique are not unique to any of the three sites and neither is the gilding of the wreath, as that is found in examples from Hawara and Antinoopolis. However,
the shape of the wreath differs between the two sites. While the wreaths at Hawara are made of diamond-shaped leaves that are widely spaced not attached to a string and with a gilded diamond shape at the centre, the wreath from Antinoopolis is made of thin, small diamond shaped leaves, closely spaced, and attached to a string that encircles the head with no central piece.

Although, the frontal posture is unique to Antinoopolis, the proper left and proper right postures cannot be used as the sole indicator of a site, as they are common in both Hawara and Tebtunis. The shape of the panel is a unique feature, because the stepped panel is only found in Antinoopolis, while the angled panel with small cut corners is unique to Tebtunis, neither of which is found at Hawara. Frames are unique to Hawara, and thus typical of the site. Portrait mummies dated to the Antonine Period are only found in Hawara, and so the variables related to portrait mummies, such as the type of wrappings, the wrapping accessories, and the shape of the opening, are not applied to the other two sites.

**Severan (AD 193-235)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables/Site</th>
<th>Hawara</th>
<th>Tebtunis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel material</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting Technique</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>Yes: Jewelry</td>
<td>Yes: Floral wreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wreath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frames</td>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panel frame,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>black border</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posture</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel shape</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>Angled (small cut corners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping opening shape</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapping decoration type</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest band</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartonnage foot case</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9 Difference between Hawara and Tebtunis in the Severan Period*

Only Hawara and Tebtunis include Severan hairstyles in their corpora. The main unique feature that differentiates the Severan portraits from Hawara and those from Tebtunis is the shape of the panel. The Tebtunis panels are angled with small cut upper corners, while the Hawara portraits could be arched, angled, or rectangular, a much greater diversity of shape.
Based on the previous comparisons, several conclusions could be drawn related to each feature and its importance as a key indicator of the site.

**Temporal Variations**

Panel material cannot be used to identify a site or a specific chronological group, since the wooden panels were used throughout all chronological groups and sites. An exception to the rule is linen portraits, which were only common in Hawara and Abusir el-Melek during the Tiberian, Claudian and which appear in one case from the Neronian Period (MP 2.11).

![Timeline of panel material usage](chart166.png)

**Figure 166 Timeline of panel material usage**

Similar to the panel material, painting technique also cannot be used to identify a site or a specific chronological group, since encaustic was used throughout time and space. However, it could be used as an indicator in cases of tempera technique, which was mostly used on linen during the Tiberian, Claudian, and Neronian Periods in Hawara and Abusir el-Melek. Chart 166 represents the number of linen and wooden portraits dated to the Julio-Claudian Period from Hawara and Abusir el-Melek in relation to the painting technique applied. It can be concluded from the diagram that tempera was only used on linen portraits, while wooden portraits were never painted in tempera, encaustic, or the combined technique. It is possible that the art of painting on linen using tempera technique died out in favor of the more popular encaustic
technique on wood. Encaustic tends to give a three-dimensional allusion of the face and therefore more realistic (Doxiadis 1995, 98).

Figure 167 Number of portraits with different painting techniques applied to linen and wooden portraits

Petrie and Thompson assumed that the earlier, better quality portraits were made in encaustic, while the latter, lower quality portraits were made in tempera (Petrie 1911, 14; Thompson 1982, 6–7). Their assumption was based on some portraits, attributed to er-Rubayat, which were made of wood and painted in tempera with a less naturalistic appearance than the encaustic ones. Those portraits are dated, based on the hairstyle, to the Antonine Period, such as British Museum portraits EA 63394 and EA 65344 (Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 97–98, No. 89, No. 90). However, the use of tempera in high quality portraits from the Julio-Claudian Period at Hawara and Abusir el-Melek disproves Petrie and Thompson's theory. Thus, it can be concluded that the use of tempera or encaustic is dependent on the choice and the artistic abilities of the workshop and not on the quality of the portraits or a strictly limited span of time.

Three Julio-Claudian examples from Hawara were painted in a compound technique of tempera and encaustic, two of which are on wooden panels and one on linen prepared with a heavy layer of stucco (Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 42, No. 16). Because they all date to the same period, it is possible that the same artist, who preferred to use this technique as opposed to any other, was responsible for the three portraits.
Gilding in the Claudian and Neronian Periods was only common in Hawara. During the Flavian and Trajanic Periods, gilding became less popular with only one example from Hawara during the Flavian Period (PM 2.132; Plate 53, Plate 54). Then, by the Hadrianic Period, it regained popularity. In the Antonine Period and later, gilding was abandoned again in Hawara. However, it was adopted, during that period at other sites, such as Tebtunis, where gilded wreaths occur in the early Severan portraits of men. Antinoopolis also includes among its corpus a single example of gilded background and wreath from the Antonine Period. Thus, it is clear that there were no universal standard ideals about the use of gilding in these portraits.

The rise and fall in the use of gilding might be related to economic reasons. The Flavian Dynasty came to power after a year of civil war (AD 68–69), which must have affected the economic prosperity of the empire. In addition, Domitian's depletion of the imperial treasury for military campaigns must have resulted in a decline of the economy (Kleiner 1992, 167–172). However, the absence of gilding during the Trajanic Period cannot be attributed to the economic conditions of the empire because the reign of Trajan was economically stable, and several public building projects were undertaken (Kleiner 1992, 207–208). Thus, the absence of the use of gold during this time is a conundrum; it might be a leftover of economic issues or due to style.

Another possible reason that might have contributed to the adoption or decline of gilding could be changes in the practices of a particular workshop. For example, the abandonment of the practice during the Antonine Period only occurred at Hawara, while at Tebtunis and
Antinoopolis, gilding of portraits was present. Therefore, the practice in this case was probably unrelated to the economic conditions of the country. However, it might be related to the workshops' practices, as it is attested since the Ptolemaic Period that painting and gilding of mummy masks were complementary and were carried out by the same workshop. An example of this tradition is P. Vindob 58, dated to the 2nd century BC, which was written by tax collectors granting two individuals, who worked as painters and goldsmiths, the right to exercise their profession in the whole nome as long as they pay a specific amount of taxes (Palme and Harrauer 2001, 67–68).

Wreaths and jewelry are the two most commonly gilded areas. In some instances lips, clothes, and hairline could be gilded as well, but those examples belong only to Hawara. Background gilding can be found at Antinoopolis, as well as at Akhmim and el-Hibeh. They are not included in this study because the portraits attributed to those two sites were not excavated there, and so there is uncertainty regarding their real provenance.

Wreaths were often found on male and female portraits. However, in the corpus of this study, 15 portraits depict the subjects with gilded wreaths. Only three of them are females. Several scholars have argued about the symbolism of funerary wreaths. Corcoran believed that the wreath is the crown of the sun god, with its gold and red colors: thus it symbolizes the rebirth of the deceased as a sun god (1995, 62). Montserrat, on the other hand, assumed that the presence of the wreath on young boys is similar to the ephebic garland which was worn in processions of ephebes and ritual ephebic dress (1993, 222). Steven Tuck identified the wreath with the Greek cult of Orpheus and associated it with life after death (2015, 61, 270). However, none of those interpretations explains the low number of wreathed female portraits in relation to male portraits, or the fact that both genders are shown wearing wreaths.
Postures are rarely considered key indicators that could define where a portrait originated. Usually it must be combined with another feature to firmly assign a portrait to a specific site. However, it should be pointed out that at this time, frontal postures are unique to Antinoopolis, proper right postures are dominant in the Julio-Claudian portraits from Hawara and Abusir el-Melek, and the proper left posture dominates the Tebtunis examples.

In terms of frames, they are found at Hawara starting from the Trajanic Period and until the Antonine Period. The main type of panel frames is horseshoe-shaped, made of gilded stucco,
and carved with a vine pattern. In one instance, it is adorned with colored glass (PM 2.140; Plate 101). Frames also occur at Hawara on the edges of the wrapping opening around the portrait. There are no frames attested elsewhere, except for the only two excavated portraits from er-Rubayat, which have a black border frame (Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 100–101, No. 93, No. 94). However, they are not part of this study because the presence of only two portraits does not enable the identification of patterns.

![Frames](image)

**Figure 171 Timeline for the usage of frames**

The panel shape is generally not a key indicator except in the case of Antinoopolis, with its characteristic stepped panel that can only be found at that site. In addition, Tebtunis panels are characterized by the angled panel with small cut upper corners. However, all other types of arched and angled panels are found in equal numbers of portraits from Hawara. In some chronological groups such as the Hadrianic group, the angled panels are even higher in numbers than the arched ones. In addition, arched panels could be found at other sites, such as Akhmim, which is not included in this study. Therefore, the results of the analysis disagree with Corcoran's attribution of arched panels to Hawara and angled panels to er-Rubayat (Corcoran 1995, 47; Corcoran and Svoboda 2010, 42).

---

7 For a discussion on the selection criteria for the sample in this study see Chapter 1
Since complete portrait mummies are only found at Hawara and Abusir el-Melek, the variables related to shape of the wrapping opening, type of wrappings, and presence of accessories are only applied to those two sites. However, it should be noted that the majority of the sample belongs to Hawara, while only two belong to Abusir el-Melek.

The wrapping opening takes on different shapes. The octagonal is dominant at Hawara, but the dimensions differed across chronological eras. The earliest octagonal form is the elongated shape with a narrow base, starting in the Tiberian and ending by the Neronian Period, when it is replaced by the even-sided octagonal, and the oval opening that is found on red shrouded mummies, starting from the Flavian Period. The arched-topped opening with a three-sided bottom started in the Trajanic Period and was associated with the presence of frames, while, the narrow octagonal shaped opening is only found in the two portrait mummies from Abusir el-Melek.
Appliquéd wrappings started in the earlier Julio-Claudian era with the simple form of Type 1 consisting of several layers of linen bandages arranged in rhombic pattern and not decorated with any gilded stucco studs or colored bandages. This type is present at Hawara, as well as Abusir el-Melek. It was popular in both sites specifically during the Tiberian and Claudian Periods. Type 2 was not frequently represented in Hawara, with only two examples of this type; one is dated to the Claudian Period and the other is dated to the Hadrianic era. Type 2 is characterized by several layers of linen bandages arranged in rhombic patterns and decorated with a colored pattern repeated within the rhombic shapes. Type 3 was adopted in the Neronian era and increased in popularity throughout the imperial reigns until the Hadrianic era. This type is characterized by a rhombic pattern that is decorated with gilded stucco studs. Type 4, which includes both colored designs and gilded stucco studs, was common from the Claudian Period, and then it gradually decreased in popularity until the Antonine era. Type 5, the red shrouds, started in the Flavian and increased sharply in the Antonine Period. Types 6, 7, and 8 occur in single instances, and so they do not form a specific pattern.
Chest bands were common only at Hawara, starting from the Claudian and lasting until the Hadrianic Period. Cartonnage foot cases were also common only at Hawara, where they lasted from the Neronian to the Hadrianic Period.

**Application of the Analysis**
Based on the previous discussion, it may be possible to employ the rubrics developed to determine whether unprovenanced portraits can be directly attributed to specific sites, as the following discussion of fifteen cases suggests.
Case Study 1: Portrait No. 531, Victoria and Albert Museum

One portrait in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London (Inv. No. 531) was published by Parlasca in volume III of his *Ritratti di Mummie*, where he stated that its presumed provenance is Illahun (Parlasca 1980, 3:43, No. 582, Pl. 140/1). This portrait was not excavated, rather it was purchased by the museum in 1891, and no record of the dealer or the place where it was purchased is indicated in the museum's records. In addition to the absence of any other mummy portrait from the claimed site of Illahun, the circumstances of its acquisition is questionable. Therefore, it is doubtful that this portrait was actually found at Illahun.

The woman depicted in the London portrait, Inv. No. 531, has her hair centrally parted, combed on both sides such that it partially covers the ears, and collected at the back in a bun at the nape. This is a hairstyle typical of the mid-late Antonine fashion of Faustina the Younger (Borg 1996, 52; Kleiner 1992, 280, Fig. 247; Fejfer 2008, 354, Fig. 281). Therefore, this portrait is dated to the late Antonine Period. Accordingly, it could be attributed to Hawara, Antinoopolis, or Tebtunis.

The portrait is painted in encaustic technique on a wooden panel, but these attributes were common in the three sites. The absence of gilding and the proper left posture are not sufficient to attribute the portrait to any of the site. However, the most striking feature is the angled panel shape with the characteristic small-cut upper corners, which is unique to the Tebtunis portraits.

To support the attribution of this portrait to the Tebtunis corpus, a visual comparison of the style and the physical features is necessary. The subtle brushstrokes, the absence of defining lines of the lips and the nose, and the absence of shadowing are all common features of the portraits from Tebtunis. Accordingly, the portrait in London most probably belongs to Tebtunis rather than Illahun.

Case Study 2: Portrait AF 6886, Louvre Museum

Portrait AF 6886 in the Louvre Museum was published by Parlasca in his second volume (Parlasca 1977, 2:42, No. 300, Pl. 71/4). The provenance is unknown and it has been suggested by Parlasca that it belongs to Antinoopolis. In order to confirm or deny Parlasca's assumption, the portrait must be assigned to a chronological group first.
The woman depicted in this portrait has the hair pulled back from the face, with the ears left uncovered and a curl is visible in front of the proper right ear. There is a small line identifying a central parting of the hair. This hairstyle is similar to the early Antonine portraits of Faustina the Elder (Kleiner 1992, 278, Fig. 245). Such dating corresponds with the date range provided by Parlasca and Doxiadis (Parlasca 1977, 2:42, No. 300, Pl. 71/4; Doxiadis 1995, 217, No. 37).

In the Antonine Period, the stepped panel is a characteristic feature of Antinoopolis. Traces of gilding on the neck are present in this portrait, which does not correspond with the gilded portraits from Hawara, where the gilding usually occurs on jewelry and wreaths. On the other hand, gilding is found around the neck and in the background in examples from Antinoopolis. Posture is not a striking feature that identifies this portrait with a specific site. However, considering the panel shape and the presence of gilding, the Louvre portrait could be attributed to Antinoopolis.

Case Study 3: Portrait CG 33247, Egyptian Museum

In some cases, it is challenging to assign the portrait to a specific chronological group based on the hairstyle. An example of such case is a portrait of a boy; its listed provenance is Fayum, and the portrait is currently in the Egyptian Museum (CG 33247). It was dated to the 2nd century by Doxiadis and to the end of the Flavian Period by Parlasca based on the overall style (Doxiadis 1995, 209, No. 77; Parlasca 1969, 1:36, No. 36, Pl 10/2). The hairstyle of the boy, with the side lock cannot be identified with a specific date. However, one unique feature of this portrait is the presence of gilding on the lips, the amulet, and the wreath.

The gilded lips and wreath could suggest that it belongs to the Claudian group from Hawara, but the common panel shape in that period is the arched panel, while the portrait in question is angled in shape. It could also be a part of the Claudian corpus from Abusir el-Melek, but the common posture in that corpus is proper right, which is different from the proper left posture of the Cairo portrait. Several parallels of gilded wreaths from Hawara belong to the Flavian, Hadrianic, and Antonine Periods. However, the shape of the wreath in those portraits is different from the wide floral leaves depicted on the Cairo portrait. However, the same form of wreath could be found in the Severan portraits from Tebtunis.
To support the attribution of the portrait to the Severan group from Tebtunis, a comparison of the stylistic rendering of the face is important. By comparing the portrait with portrait MP 4.96 (Plate 141), it could be observed that the same rendering of the nose with V-shaped nostrils is found in both portraits. In addition, the small, almond-shaped eyes with the short eyelashes, and the small mouth with a thicker lower lip are also the same in both portraits. Therefore, the Cairo portrait most probably belongs to Tebtunis.

**Case Study 4: Inv. No. 1966.88, Hannover, Kestner Museum**

Portrait 1966.88 (Plate 50) (given database number MP 2.33 in this thesis), was purchased by the Kestner Museum; thus it was not excavated. Parlasca proposed its provenance to be Hawara based on the red shrouded mummy wrappings, which is similar to other mummies excavated in Hawara (Parlasca 1969, 1:37-38). However, there is a debate about whether the mummy that was purchased along with the portrait originally belonged to it (Corcoran 1995, 11).

Parlasca dated the portrait to the end of the 1st century (1969, 1:37, No. 41, Pl. 11/3). The short, thick, sickle-shaped curls, and the absence of a beard are all reminiscent of the Flavian style (Borg 1996, 71). Therefore, Parlasca's date could be correct. However, the gilded wreath in combination with an oval-shaped gilded background did not occur in any of Hawara's chronological groups. On the other hand, the same type of gilded wreath and oval-shaped gilded background are similar to the portraits from el-Hibehe. Portrait mummies CG 33217 in the Egyptian Museum (Parlasca 1969, 1:54, No.101, Pl. 24/3) and E 63.1903, in the Fitzwilliam Museum (Parlasca 1977, 2:51, No.332, Pl.80/3) are the only two portrait mummies that have been excavated at el-Hibehe. These two portraits share with MP 2.33 the same gilded areas, proper left posture, and the oval wrapping opening that appears in MP 2.33 from the gilded edges (Plate 50). Thus, MP 2.33 could have been painted by the same workshop as the portraits from el-Hibehe.

**Case Study 5: Inv. No. CG 33214, Egyptian Museum**

Portrait mummy CG 33214 in the Egyptian Museum was first published in Edgar's catalog, then in Parlasca's second volume of the *Ritratti di Mumme*, and finally in Corcoran's

---

8 In this study it belongs to the Hawara database under MP number (MP 2.33), its features did not comply with the common features of Hawara and accordingly as assigned to another site.

9 El-Hibehe corpus was purchased not excavated except for only two portrait mummies. Thus, the site does not comply with the selection criteria set for this thesis. For the selection of this study's collection, see Methodology, Chapter 1.
study *Portrait Mummies from Roman Egypt (I-IV centuries A.D.*)*. In the three publications, the portrait mummy was assigned to Fayum provenance, with no specification of the exact site (Edgar 1905a, 68; Parlasca 1977, 2:31; Corcoran 1995, 82–84).

In order to identify the exact provenance of this portrait mummy, it should be assigned to a chronological group. However, similar to case study 3, the hairstyle of this portrait cannot be attributed to a specific date. The child is depicted in the portrait with faint wisps of hair that are not typical to any particular hairstyle. Therefore, one must turn to other features that may determine the provenance and the date.

The portrait is painted on a linen panel surrounded by a wide octagonal opening in the wrapping. The wrapping is decorated according to Type 3 decoration characterized by rhombic pattern, and gilded stucco studs at the centers of the rhomboids. Neither a foot case nor a chest band was added to this mummy.

The linen panel is one of the major features that have parallels in the examples from Hawara and Abusir el-Melek. However, the wide octagonal opening and the Type 3 decoration of the wrappings are found in Hawara, while the narrow octagonal opening and the Type 1 wrapping decoration characterize the mummies from Abusir el-Melek. Therefore, CG 33214 probably belongs to Hawara, as opposed to Abusir el-Melek.

Parlasca dated the portrait mummy to the second quarter of the 1st century AD because it resembled the portraits of the two children of Aline (PM 2.128, PM 2.129) (Parlasca 1977, 2:31). Corcoran dates it according to the mummy wrappings to the first half of the 1st century AD, which does not contradict with Parlasca’s date (Corcoran 1995, 82). The linen panel that was popular in Hawara during the Julio-Claudian Period further confirms the dates assigned by both scholars. It could be more specifically dated to the Claudian or early Neronian Period rather than the Tiberian Period, because the Type 3 wrapping is found in the Claudian corpus, while the dominant type of wrapping in the Tiberian mummies was Type 1.

**Case Study 6: CG 33222, Egyptian Museum**

Portrait mummy CG 33222, in the Egyptian Museum, was assigned to the Fayum in the museum’s register and by Edgar’s catalog (Edgar 1905a, 83). Parlasca and Corcoran also
published the portrait mummy and did not attempt to assign it to a specific site, but maintained the Fayum as its provenance (Parlasca 1977, 2:34).

The portrait is that of a woman wearing her hair in a large bun that almost contours the head and arranged at the front of the head in a knot. The hair is centrally parted with two spiral curls falling in front of the exposed ears, which is similar to the Hadrianic fashion (Borg 1996, 38). Although Parlasca dated the portrait mummy to the Trajanic Period (1977, 2:34), Borg's study indicated that the Trajanic hairstyle is characterized by rows of round curls framing the forehead, completely covered ears, and the absence of the central parting (1996, 32–33). Accordingly, the hairstyle of this portrait is more similar to the Hadrianic hairstyle than to that of the Trajanic Period. Therefore, this thesis assigns portrait mummy CG 33222 to the Hadrianic Period.

The opening surrounding the portrait is an even-sided octagonal shape, and the wrappings belong to the Type 3 decoration scheme with the rhombic pattern and the gilded stucco studs at the centers of the rhomboids. A chest band of inlaid gems and gilded stucco studs, as well as a cartonnage foot case were added. The opening shape, the Type 3 wrapping, and the added accessories are indicators that suggest that this portrait mummy probably belongs to Hawara.

To further support the argument, the analysis carried out on the Hadrianic portraits from Hawara showed that the most common decoration type is that of Type 3. In addition, there is another example of a Hadrianic portrait mummy with inlaid colored glass and/or gems (PM 2.140), which are similar to the ones found on the chest band of CG 33222. Cartonnage foot cases and chest bands also occur in several examples of the Hadrianic group from Hawara. Therefore, the results of the analysis support the attribution of this portrait mummy to Hawara and specifically to the Hadrianic chronological group.

Case Study 7: CG 33226, Egyptian Museum

This portrait mummy of a girl in the Egyptian Museum has been assigned to the Fayum in Edgar's catalog (Edgar 1905a, 86). It was published by Parlasca who assigned it to the Neronian Period based on the use of shading and light in the portrait, which suggest a Neronian date (Parlasca 1969, 1:30). Corcoran, on the other hand, dates the wrappings to the late 1st century AD (Corcoran 1995, 101).
The girl's hair is pulled back away from the face; a bun is not visible behind a row of small, round curls framing the forehead and a diadem with golden studs, and there is no central parting. The Neronian hairstyles are also characterized by the absence of a central parting, the presence of rows of curls framing the forehead, and the invisibility of the bun that is positioned towards the back of the head, especially in the early Neronian Period (Borg 1996, 28–29). Therefore, this portrait mummy probably belongs to the early Neronian Period, in agreement with Parlasca's date, but contradicting the date assigned by Corcoran.

The opening around the portrait is an even-sided octagonal, the wrapping is typical Type 4 with the rhombic pattern decorated with black and light red linen bandages forming colored designs as well as gilded stucco studs in the centers of the rhombic shapes. The mummy is decorated with a chest band of gilded stucco studs, but no cartonnage foot case is added.

The shape of the opening, the Type 4 wrapping, and the chest band indicate a Hawara provenance. Therefore, this thesis suggests that portrait mummy CG 33226 probably belongs to Hawara. This was also suggested by Corcoran mainly because of the octagonal opening around the portrait (Corcoran 1995, 101).

Case Study 8: Inv. No. 7311, Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria

The provenance of portrait mummy 7311 in the Greco-Roman Museum is unknown (Parlasca 1977, 2:61). It was published by Parlasca in the 2nd volume of his catalog, and also by Corcoran in her study of portrait mummies (1977, 2:61; 1995, 117–120). Although Parlasca did not attempt to provenance it, Corcoran suggested a Hawara provenance based on the octagonal opening (1995, 117). This case study will either confirm or refute Corcoran's suggested provenance.

Parlasca dated the portrait to the late Antonine Period based on the hairstyle (Parlasca 1977, 2:61). On the other hand, Corcoran dated the wrappings to the first quarter of the 2nd century AD, which contradicts the date assigned by Parlasca (Corcoran 1995, 117). The man has curly hair and a short beard, the hair strands of the curls are not thick as in the fashion of Marcus Aurelius, but are rather more orderly as in the fashion of Hadrian (Borg 1996, 73–74, 76). Therefore, this study assigns portrait mummy 7311 to the Hadrianic Period which is supported by the date that Corcoran assigned (Corcoran 1995, 117).
The opening around the portrait is an even-sided octagonal. The wrappings are Type 3 decoration with plain linen bandages that are arranged in a rhombic pattern and gilded stucco studs at the centers of the rhombic shapes. There are fragmentary remains of a cartonnage foot case that used to be painted. In addition, there is a chest band of gilded stucco studs: each is placed separately on a square piece of light red linen and attached to the rhombic pattern (Corcoran 1995, 118–120). These are all typical attributes of Hawara portrait mummies. Therefore, this study assigns portrait mummy 7311 to Hawara.

On examining the results of the analysis carried out in this study on the Hawara portraits, it is possible to further support the Hadrianic date assigned above. The Type 3 decoration occurs in the Flavian, Trajanic, and Hadrianic groups. However, it stopped in the Antonine Period when the decoration schemes adopted were those of Types 4 and 5. The Type 3 decoration reached its peak among the portrait mummies belonging to the Hadrianic group, where it was represented by 33% of the entire Hadrianic corpus. Therefore, this portrait could be assigned to the Hadrianic group rather than the Antonine one.

**Case Study 9: AF 6882, Louvre Museum**

Portrait mummy AF 6882 was purchased by the Louvre Museum in 1826. Its provenance is unknown, but it has been suggested by Walker and Bierbrier that it belongs to Antinoopolis (Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 106; Parlasca 1977, 2:35–36; Doxiadis 1995, 150,217). This case study will examine the features that characterize the wrapping and the portrait in order to confirm or refute Walker and Bierbrier's suggestion.

The hair of the woman in the portrait is not centrally parted, and it is pulled back away from the face into a wide braided bun, with short hair strands falling in front of the ears in a fashion typical of the Hadrianic hairstyles (Borg 1996, 38; Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 106). Thus, this study assigns this portrait mummy to the Hadrianic Period, which agrees with the date assigned by Parlasca, who dated it to the second quarter of the 2nd century (Parlasca 1977, 2:35–36), as well as Walker and Bierbrier's Hadrianic date (Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 106).

The opening of the wrapping in this portrait mummy is with a rectangular top and widening at the bottom. The wrapping is typical of Type 1 decoration where the mummy is wrapped in several layers of linen bandages arranged in rhombic patterns with no colored
designs or gilded stucco studs. The mummy wrapping is decorated with neither a chest band nor a cartonnage foot case.

In the Hadrianic Period, mummy portraits were popular in Hawara and Antinoopolis. The Hawara portrait mummies from the Hadrianic group are characterized by either an oval opening represented by 17%, or an arched top and three-sided bottom opening represented by 50%, or an even-sided octagonal represented by 33%. Therefore, the shape of the opening of this portrait mummy is not typically found in Hawara. This unique shape of the opening could be explained by the possible presence of a stepped panel underneath the wrapping. If this is the case, then the stepped panel is a unique feature of the Antinoopolis portraits. Additionally, the Type 1 decoration and the absence of chest bands and foot cases do not occur in the Hadrianic portrait mummies from Hawara. Therefore, a Hawara provenance is not probable in this case. It is more probable that this portrait mummy belongs to Antinoopolis, and thus this study confirms the provenance assigned by Walker and Bierbrier, as well as Parlasca.

**Case Study 10: 31161/32, Ägyptisches Museum, Berlin**

Mummy portrait 31161/32 was purchased from the Graf collection by the museum in 1928. Accordingly, it was assigned to er-Rubayat (Parlasca 1977, 2:43). However, it was only assigned to this provenance because Graf was the first to acquire it, and not because it shows any features that are unique to er-Rubayat.

The mummy portrait is that of a woman turned to proper right, and wearing her hair in a bun positioned at the crown of the head. The hair is centrally parted with a gilded ornament decorating the central parting. Strands of hair fall in front of the ears, in a fashion typical of the late Hadrianic Period (Borg 1996, 38). This is slightly different from the AD 140 date assigned by Parlasca (1977, 2:43).

On examining the features of the portrait, the most striking marker is the gilding at the central parting, which is an area that was frequently gilded in Hawara portraits, specifically in portraits from the Claudian and Hadrianic groups. According to the date assigned to this portrait and the presence of gilding at the hairline, this portrait could possibly belong to Hawara.
Case Study 11: AF 6883, Louvre Museum

Mummy portrait AF 6883 was purchased by the Louvre Museum, and so its provenance is unknown. However, Parlasca, Walker, and Bierbrier suggested that it might belong to Antinoopolis (Parlasca 1977, 2:42; Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 105). This case study serves to support or challenge the suggested provenance.

The man depicted has short hair, with receding hairline at the temples and a short, stubbly beard and moustache. The style is similar to that of the late Severan Period (Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 105). Thus, it restricts the options of probable provenances to either Hawara, Tebtunis, or Antinoopolis. The shape of the panel in this case is a stepped panel, which is a characteristic feature of Antinoopolis. The portraits from Tebtunis are characterized by angled panels with small-cut upper corners, while the portraits from Hawara are either arched or angled. Therefore, mummy portrait AF 6883 probably belongs to Antinoopolis, based on the panel shape.

Case Study 12: S 19483, Museo Egizio, Turin

Mummy portrait S 19483 was purchased by the Italian Ministry of Heritage in 2004 and is currently exhibited in the Museo Egizio in Turin, Italy. It has not been published, and therefore it has not been assigned to a specific provenance.

The man depicted in the portrait has a short, curly hair, with a few strands escaping at the edges of the head. This less orderly curly hair is characteristic of the Antonine style (Borg 1996, 76). Therefore, this study assigns the portrait to the Antonine Period.

The panel shape is angled with two small-cut upper corners, which is characteristic of the portraits from Tebtunis. The posture of the man further supports this suggestion, as he is depicted with his upper body turned slightly to proper left and the head is turned to face the viewer. The analysis of the portraits from Tebtunis indicates that the proper left posture in combination with this form of angled panels is unique to Tebtunis and do not occur in any other site. Therefore, this mummy portrait probably belongs to Tebtunis.
Case Study 13: CG 33224, Egyptian Museum

Portrait Mummy CG 33224 in the Egyptian has no record of the method of acquisition, and thus no record of provenance. Therefore, its provenance is unknown. It has been published by Edgar in his catalog of the mummy portraits in the Egyptian Museum, and by Parlasca in the first volume of his *Ritratti di Mummie* (Edgar 1905a, 85; Parlasca 1969, 1:76).

The man's hair is thick with curly bouncing strands falling over the forehead, similar to the Hadrianic fashion (Borg 1996, 73–74). Therefore, this study assigns portrait mummy CG 33224 to the Hadrianic Period, in agreement with Parlasca's date (Parlasca 1969, 1:76).

The portrait mummy has an even-sided octagonal opening surrounding the portrait. The wrapping is typical of Type 3 with rhombic pattern decorated with gilded stucco studs at the centers of the rhombic shapes. Although Edgar notices traces of black paint all over the wrapping and at the top part of the opening, he admits the black colors do not form a specific pattern or design. A chest band of gilded stucco studs was added across the mummy's chest, and the remains of a cartonnage foot case are observed (Edgar 1905a, 85). These features characterizing the wrapping of the portrait mummy are unique to Hawara. Furthermore, the analysis of the Hadrianic group of Hawara portraits shows that 33% of the corpus has even-sided octagonal openings and 33% has a Type 3 wrapping, which represent the highest percentage in the corpus. Therefore, portrait mummy CG 33224 could possibly belong to Hawara.

Case Study 14: EA 74719, British Museum

Mummy portrait EA 74719 was purchased by the British Museum from the Gayer Anderson collection in 1943. Its provenance is unknown and no attempt has been made to provenance it. Parlasca published it in his first volume of the *Ritratti di Mummie*, as well as by Walker and Bierbrier (Parlasca 1969, 1:33; Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 40).

The portrait is that of a girl turned to proper right. Her hair is centrally parted, with one row of small round curls framing the forehead, and a ringlet is falling on the side of the neck, behind her ears, which is typical of the Claudian fashion (Borg 1996, 28–29). Therefore, this study assigns mummy portrait EA 74719 to the Claudian Period, which agrees with the date assigned by Parlasca, Walker and Bierbrier (Parlasca 1969, 1:33; Walker and Bierbrier 1997, 40).

Portraits depicting Claudian hairstyles are found in both Hawara and Abusir el-Melek. The arched panel is not a decisive factor neither is the proper right posture. However, the gilded
wreath positioned on the girl's head is a unique feature that could help assign the portrait to one of the two sites. Although one of the portraits from Abusir el-Melek had a gilded wreath (PM 3.149), it is not a characteristic feature of the site. On the other hand, the Hawara portraits with Claudian hairstyles are characterized by the presence of gilding, with three examples depicting gilded wreaths (see Chapter 2). Therefore, it is more probable that EA 74719 belongs to Hawara as opposed to Abusir el-Melek.

Case Study 15: S 18177, Museo Egizio, Turin

The Museo Egizio in Turin purchased mummy portrait S 18177 from the antiquities market in Munich in 1974, and so its exact provenance is unknown. Parlasca published the portrait in the second volume of his Ritratti di Mummie, where he proposed that it might belong to Antinoopolis (Parlasca 1977, 2:86). This case study examines the evidence that either supports or rejects Parlasca's suggested provenance.

The portrait depicts a man with very short haircut with slightly receding hairline at the temples that resembles the hairstyle of Caracalla (Kleiner 1992, 324). Therefore, this portrait probably dates to the Severan Period, which contradicts Parlasca's Hadrianic date. The hairstyle depicted in this portrait does not resemble the curly, thick hair of the Hadrianic fashion (Borg 1996, 73–74). This study assigns the portrait to the Severan Period rather than the Hadrianic Period.

Portraits with Severan hairstyles are present in Hawara, Tebtunis, and Antinoopolis. However, the frontal posture of the man in S 18177 is a unique posture that only occurs in examples from Antinoopolis. The panel is rectangular, and is not similar to the dominant stepped panels of Antinoopolis. However, the garments that the man wears are similar to those worn by the woman with an ankh cross on Antinoopolis shroud (AF 6440) and the girl on the Antinoopolis shroud (AF 6486), both currently in the Louvre Museum (Doxiadis 1995, 215). Therefore, S 18177 probably belongs to Antinoopolis, rather than Hawara or Tebtunis.
Summary of the Case Studies

The fifteen case studies were presented to test the validity of the methodology adopted in this thesis. Each of the 15 portraits was tentatively assigned to a specific site based on the results of the statistical analysis carried out in this thesis. Thus, panel shape, posture, presence of gilding, areas where gilding was applied, panel material, shape of the wrapping opening, type of wrapping decorations, and presence of chest bands and cartonnage foot cases were used as indicators of specific provenances. In certain cases, the evidence for a specific provenance was further supported by stylistic comparisons of the form of wreath (case study 3), and the form of clothes (case study 15). The assigned provenances in these case studies are not conclusive, and further stylistic analysis and discussion should be carried out. However, the methodology of this thesis could be a stepping-stone for studies on the issue of provenance of mummy portraits.
Chapter 7: Conclusions

In this study, 120 portraits from Hawara, seven portraits from Abusir el-Melek, ten portraits from Tebtunis, and 14 portraits from Antinoopolis, were examined and analyzed for the following criteria: panel material, painting technique, posture, presence of gilding, areas gilded, presence of frames, and panel shape for detached portraits. For the portraits still in situ within mummy wrappings, the shape of the wrapping opening and the wrapping decoration were two additional criteria used in the analysis. The goal of the analysis was to identify regional variations in mummy portraits from four selected sites, which were chosen based on having the highest concentration of excavated portraits. The analysis has yielded a variety of results that allow for a preliminary identification of ‘fingerprints’ for these sites.

The study of the Hawara portraits showed that they cover a period of 200 years from the reign of Tiberius (AD 14-37) to that of Septimus Severus (AD 193-211). This time span was identified based on the varieties of hairstyles shown in the portraits (see Chapter 1 and 2 for discussion on hairstyles and dating), which mimicked the common hairstyles depicted in statues of the imperial family across the 200 years. Accordingly, the portraits were assigned to groups, based on the hairstyle, and then placed in a chronological sequence. The statistical analysis of each chronological group exhibited the most common features characterizing its portraits. Not only did the results identify the unique attributes of each chronological group, but they also revealed the changes in the practices of the Hawara workshop diachronically.

The portrait-painting workshop in Hawara during the Julio-Claudian Period was characterized by the use of tempera technique on linen, as well as the use of a combined painting technique of tempera and encaustic, which was adopted in Hawara only during that period. Panel frames as well as frames applied around the wrapping opening were also unique to Hawara. The presence of gilding was especially common in the Hawara portraits with Claudian and Hadrianic hairdos. In those portraits, gilding was applied generously to wreaths and jewelry, and particularly characteristic of Hawara is the gilding of the lips or the parting of the lips, hairline, as well as clothing in some instances. It should be noted that according to the overall number of studied portraits, the number of women wearing wreaths is only three as opposed to 12 portraits of wreathed men. This phenomenon has not been previously studied and scholars such as Riggs
have often regarded the wreath as a symbol of life after death as it appears on both males and females (2000, 130). However, the wreath might have other meanings, and as the numbers of male and female portraits are unequal, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions based on gender.

To view the portrait as part of the mummy is rather difficult, as most portraits were separated from their mummies and exhibited as works of art devoid of context. Thus, almost the entire present collection of portrait mummies is the product of Petrie's excavations in Hawara (Corcoran 1995, 4-5). According to the present sample, the decoration Types 2, 3, and 4 consisting of a rhombic pattern with colored designs and/or gilded stucco studs are found only in Hawara. Type 6 is characterized by a fully gilded stucco casing, which is unique to Hawara. On the other hand, Type 5, the painted red shrouds, is attested not only in portrait mummies from Hawara but also in those reported to have been found in el-Hibeh. Accessories such as chest bands and cartonnage foot cases were regularly added to the mummies from Hawara, where chest bands started as early as the Claudian Period, while foot cases were only adopted from the Neronian Period. These accessories are not found in Abusir el-Melek, which is the only other site where complete portrait mummies were discovered, and thus they are unique to Hawara. Arched and angled panels occur in almost equal number of portraits, which suggests that it is not a distinctive feature of that site. Neither is the posture, because both proper right and proper left postures are represented in a large number of portraits in Hawara. This was the case across most of the chronological groups, with the exception of the Julio-Claudian one, where the only depicted posture was almost consistently the proper right one. Yet it is still not a unique indicator to Hawara.

The entire collection from Abusir el-Melek dates exclusively to the Julio-Claudian Period. It is not particularly distinctive from that of Hawara, as it shares with it the same general features of the Julio-Claudian portraits. These include the use of tempera technique on linen panels as well as the use of Type 1 decoration of the mummy wrappings, which consists of a plain rhombic pattern without decoration of gilded stucco studs or colored patterns. Gilding was applied on one portrait only, and cannot be regarded as a common feature of this collection. The proper right posture dominates the corpus from this site, as well as the Julio-Claudian portraits from Hawara, and so this feature is not exclusive to Abusir el-Melek. Neither is the panel shape,
today as it varies between angled and arched. However, the one feature that differentiates Abusir el-Melek from Hawara is the narrow octagonal opening shape that is unique to the former.

The lack of distinctive characteristics in the corpus of Abusir el-Melek and the limited number of portraits, all dating to one chronological period, could suggest that the portraits found at Abusir el-Melek were manufactured in Hawara and then brought to Abusir el-Melek. Another possibility is that the same workshop or artist that worked in Hawara travelled to Abusir el-Melek for a limited period, producing a small number of portraits.

According to the hairstyles, the portraits from Tebtunis are all from the Antonine and Severan Periods. After analyzing this corpus within the parameters of the previously set variables, the most distinctive features of these portraits were identified to be the angled panel shape with small-cut upper corners combined with a proper left posture. Gilding of wreaths was very popular and exclusively found in men's portraits. The wooden panels and encaustic technique that dominates the Tebtunis portraits are not particularly unique as they occur in other sites. Thus, the only distinctive features of the Tebtunis corpus are the panel shape and posture.

Mummy portraits in Antinoopolis started shortly after the foundation of the city in the time of Hadrian and continued to be used until the early Severan Period. According to the analyses, the stepped panel and the frontal posture characterize this site. In the Antinoopolis group, gilding was applied around the neck and on the background; neither areas were ever gilded in the Hawara or Tebtunis examples that are contemporaneous, and thus this trait is particular to Antinoopolis. The wooden panels and encaustic technique that dominated the portraits from Antinoopolis were also found at the other three examined sites, and are thus not unique to this particular site. The Antinoopolis portraits are only unique in the frontal posture, the stepped panel, and the presence of gilding on the neck or the background.

This study addressed the regional variations in the production of mummy portraits using a quantitative methodology, for the first time. Previous scholars have addressed minor variations across sites based on personal observations that often resulted in inaccurate conclusions. Examples of such observations include Corcoran's discussion of arched panels as indicators of a Hawara provenance as opposed to the angled panels from er-Rubayat (1995, 47; Corcoran and Svoboda 2010, 42). However, this thesis has proven that arched panels do not necessarily
indicate a Hawara provenance and angled panels were also extensively found in Hawara and thus the panel shape is not a unique marker of Hawara, or indeed of a specific period.

Petrie and Thompson attributed tempera portraits to later periods by observing the tempera portraits attributed to er-Rubayat (1911, 14; 1982, 6–7), which has been proven to be untrue due to the use of tempera in portraits that are clearly dated to the Julio-Claudian period, as can be seen in examples from Hawara (Chapter 2). Tempera was also used along with encaustic in a combined technique that was used in Julio-Claudian portraits from Hawara.

Edgar suggested that the earliest mummy portraits were painted on linen (1905b, 231). The analysis of the panel material of the Julio-Claudian portraits from Hawara and Abusir el-Melek proved that linen was extensively used during the Tiberian Period, at both sites, and then gradually decreased in numbers as wooden panels became more common. Thus, this thesis presented a re-examination of previous scholarly observations by using quantitative analyses to test the theories that have previously been taken at face value.

When portraits from each site were placed into a chronological sequence, a timeline was developed to show the rise and decline in the use of mummy portraits across the four sites. According to the studied portraits, the practice started in the Tiberian Period in Hawara and Abusir el-Melek. The use of mummy portraits was abandoned in Abusir el-Melek after the Claudian Period, while continued in Hawara throughout the Neronian, Flavian, and Trajanic, with the number of portraits increasing gradually during these periods. Then, an overall increase in their use occurred in Hawara and Antinoopolis in the Hadrianic Period, such that the use of mummy portraits reached its peak in this period. The Antonine Period witnessed the launching of this practice in Tebtunis, and so the practice remained highly popular during the Antonine Period, which was followed by a decline in the Severan Period. In the Severan Period, mummy portraits that were painted on wooden panels started to decline in favor of linen shrouds painted with an image of the deceased in frontal posture, such as those found in Antinoopolis (Guimet 1912, 36, Pl. XLIII–XLIV). This is perhaps due to the civil war that erupted in the Roman Empire after the assassination of Commodus, the last emperor of the Antonine Dynasty, which ended with Septimus Severus rise to power (Tuck 2015, 274–275). The civil war probably affected the economic and political stability of the Roman world in general, and Egypt in particular, such that the use of portrait panels that were made of imported wood dramatically
declined, in favor of the more economic linen shrouds. In addition, the Severan Dynasty adopted a form of art that is quite different from the Classicizing Greek style, and thus setting the precedence for the Late Antique style characterized by abstraction, frontal postures, and big eyes (Tuck 2015, 275–276). Therefore, it is also possible that this new form of art was the reason behind the decline of the traditional style of mummy portraits and the rise of painted funerary shrouds in their new abstract form.

This timeline presented above exhibited two interesting cases: Tebtunis and Abusir el-Melek. In both sites, the rise and fall of mummy portraits does not take on a curve; rather the practice abruptly became popular during one specific period (the Julio-Claudian Period in case of Abusir el-Melek and the Antonine-early Severan Period in case of Tebtunis), and then died out by the end of that period.

What occurs at these two sites could be attributed to a chance of survival where the portraits dating to other periods did not survive or remain to be excavated. Another possible reason is the presence a travelling workshop or artist that was only present, at Abusir el-Melek and Tebtunis, during one specific period. Travelling workshops are attested since the Ptolemaic Period, as seen in the P. Vindob 58 (Palme and Harrauer 2001, 67–68), when the painters and gold smiths could work anywhere across the nome (see Chapter 6). This theory could be tested using stylistic analysis of the physical features from excavated portraits, which will prove or refute the idea of travelling workshops or artists.

As opposed to Tebtunis and Abusir el-Melek, mummy portraits were continuously used from the Julio-Claudian time until the Severan Period at Hawara, while Antinoopolis also had an unbroken use of these portraits from its inception until the time when the use of these panel portraits fell out of fashion. Therefore, it is possible that a permanent portrait-painting workshop was present at each of the two sites. If this was the case, then the existence of a resident workshop could be due to the thriving economy and the presence of large number of elite individuals in Hawara and Antinoopolis, thus providing a stable customer base for the production of the workshop (see Chapter 6). It is beyond the scope of this thesis to examine the possible reasons for the distribution of mummy portraits across different sites. However, further work should be carried out on the social and economic history of the different sites to see why certain
places maintained the tradition of mummy portraits longer than others, such as Hawara as opposed to Tebtunis.

The results of the analyses presented in this thesis can be applied, as shown in Chapter 6, to some portraits with unknown or uncertain provenances. Fifteen portraits were ascribed tentative provenances using the criteria established in this thesis, and they were also assigned to chronological groups based on the hairstyle. Some portraits had an unknown provenance, such as those in case studies 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15. Other portraits, such as those in the Egyptian Museum, were assigned to the Fayum in the museum's registers without specifying the exact site within the Fayum. In case studies 1, 4, and 10, the portraits were purchased and were attributed to uncertain provenances. These portraits were re-assigned to specific sites based on the developed rubric of unique indicators for each site. For example, portraits in case studies 9, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 14 were assigned to Antinoopolis and Hawara, respectively, based on the shape of the opening and the type of wrapping decoration. Panel shape and posture were the decisive factors for the portraits in case studies 1, 3, and 12, which were assigned to Tebtunis. The presence of gilding and the areas gilded were the indicators used to assign the portrait from case studies 2, 4, and 10 to Antinoopolis, el-Hibeh, and Hawara respectively. The assigned provenances in the fifteen case studies are, by no means, incontrovertible. Rather, they are a starting point for further investigation and discussion. Only with future discoveries of portrait mummies that are well excavated can one move ahead in the study of this genre of object.

This thesis has successfully established the 'fingerprints' of the four sites that yielded the highest concentration of excavated mummy portraits. Thus, it provides a rubric for potentially re-assigning mummy portraits with uncertain provenance to specific sites, as well as attributing unprovenanced portraits to their sites of origin (as shown in the 15 case studies). This is only a first step that should be supported by stylistic analysis of the physical features of the depicted subjects, similar to Thompson's study. In the past, scholars have accepted at face value certain attributes as indicators to specific sites or dates without quantitative analysis, such as arched panels being unique to Hawara or the use of tempera technique in later portraits only. The methodology established in this thesis was based on quantitative analysis to provide a more rigorous technique for determining identifiers that are specific to each site, and which can be used to provide provenances for hitherto unprovenanced portraits. Furthermore, the results of this
study could form the basis for further studies in the field of mummy portraits. Examples include, but are not limited to, the possible presence of travelling workshops/artists, as seen through history; the importation of mummy portraits from nearby sites; the socio-economic factors that might affect the adoption and decline of the use of mummy portraits at specific sites; and the iconographic studies that might decode possible symbolism and gendered meaning of the use of wreaths. Such studies have wider implications for the study of Roman Egypt, shedding light not only on the dynamics related to the production of mummy portraits, but also on issues of gender, ethnicity, and economy. In any case, these mummy portraits do not only bear an artistic value, they also offer an insight into the religious, economic, and cultural life of the residents of Roman Egypt.
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Appendix 1: Excel Database

Hawara Database

Tiberian Portraits

Detached Mummy Portraits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prev.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.1</td>
<td>D 36; P 2</td>
<td>CG 33268</td>
<td>Egyptian museum</td>
<td>Hawara</td>
<td>Tiberian (14-37)</td>
<td>Tiberian (14-37)</td>
<td>Parlasca; late Tiberian-early Claudian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.2</td>
<td>P 9</td>
<td>1966.89</td>
<td>Hannover, Kestner Museum</td>
<td>Hawara</td>
<td>Tiberian (14-37)</td>
<td>Tiberian (AD 14-37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.3</td>
<td>D 51; P 1</td>
<td>AM 11411</td>
<td>Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum</td>
<td>Hawara</td>
<td>Tiberian (late)</td>
<td>Tranjic (AD 98-11)</td>
<td>Parlasca: Tiberian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.1</td>
<td>D 36; P 2</td>
<td>CG 33268</td>
<td>Tempera</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>40.5 x 33 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.2</td>
<td>P 9</td>
<td>1966.89</td>
<td>Tempera</td>
<td>Canvas Wood unknown</td>
<td>38.4 x 17.7 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.3</td>
<td>D 51; P 1</td>
<td>AM 11411</td>
<td>Tempera</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>42.5 x 32 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Necklac gold leaf over stucco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portrait Mummies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prev.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.121</td>
<td>D 33; WB 11; P 3</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Cambridge, Girton College</td>
<td>Hawara</td>
<td>Tiberian (14-37)</td>
<td>Tiberian (14-37)</td>
<td>Parlasca: Tiberian/EB AD 45-50 (early Claudian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.122</td>
<td>P 29</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Leipzig, Egyptian Museum of the University</td>
<td>Hawara</td>
<td>Claudian (AD 41-5); Tiberian (14-37)</td>
<td>Tiberian (14-37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.121</td>
<td>D 33; WB 11; P 3</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Encrustae Linen</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>1 of mummy 155 cm; L. portrait 31.5 x 20.6 W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.122</td>
<td>P 29</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Tempera Linen</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>1 of mummy 155 cm; portrait is 29.5 cm M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claudian

Detached Mummy Portraits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prev.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.8</td>
<td>P 1201</td>
<td>1695-1888</td>
<td>London, Victoria and Albert Museum</td>
<td>Hawara</td>
<td>Claudian (AD 41-54)</td>
<td>Parlasca: 1st century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Wrappings Frame</th>
<th>Opening Shape</th>
<th>Type of Wrappings</th>
<th>Chest Rand/Carrotage Foot case</th>
<th>Found with</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.121</td>
<td>D 33; WB 11; P 3</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Doxiadis E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>excavated by Petrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.122</td>
<td>P 29</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Parlasca 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>bought in 1907 from the Berlin museum where it held number (11753)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs’ No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.4</td>
<td>D 47; P 584; WB 15</td>
<td>EA24709</td>
<td>Encasement</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>45.75 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.5</td>
<td>P 249; D 55</td>
<td>71 137</td>
<td>Encasement</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>46*18.4 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.6</td>
<td>D 37; P 42</td>
<td>AM 19722</td>
<td>Encasement</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>43*22.4 cm; thick 3.4 mm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.7</td>
<td>D 40; P 49; Petrie Ai; WB 35A 34118</td>
<td>Encasement</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>36.5*58 cm; thick 3 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.8</td>
<td>P 814</td>
<td>1665-1868; Encasement</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>25.8*12.5 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Portrait Mummies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogs’ No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Panel Frame</th>
<th>Panel Shape Found with</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.23</td>
<td>P 26</td>
<td>1911.44</td>
<td>Octagonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.24</td>
<td>P 30</td>
<td>11 139</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.25</td>
<td>P 11</td>
<td>AM 11752</td>
<td>Octagonal (narrow base)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.26</td>
<td>P 147</td>
<td>JE 42790</td>
<td>Octagonal (narrow base)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.27</td>
<td>D 32; Petrie FF; WB 12; P</td>
<td>EA 21809</td>
<td>Octagonal (narrow base)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.28</td>
<td>D 40; P 5</td>
<td>11 132</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.29</td>
<td>D 50; P 6</td>
<td>AM 11423</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.30</td>
<td>D 32; P 40</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.31</td>
<td>D 66; right; 68; P 43</td>
<td>CG 33225</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

10 The green highlighted data are the portrait mummies that have been re-assigned to this chronological group based on matching the unique features they exhibit with those characteristic of the Claudian group.
Neronian

Detached Mummy Portraits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalog No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prev.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.9</td>
<td>D 48; WB 17; P 13; Petrie 58</td>
<td>EA 74716</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>Neronian</td>
<td>Dosiadis: Neronian (54-68)</td>
<td>Paralasa: First half of 1st century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.10</td>
<td>D 53; P 70</td>
<td>CG 32241</td>
<td>Egypt Museum</td>
<td>Neronian</td>
<td>Dosiadis: Neronian (54-68)</td>
<td>Paralasa: First half of 1st century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.11</td>
<td>WB 36; Petrie 31; P 71</td>
<td>1913.522</td>
<td>Oxford, Ashmolean Museum</td>
<td>Neronian</td>
<td>Dosiadis: Neronian (54-68)</td>
<td>Paralasa: First half of 1st century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.12</td>
<td>WB 122; Petrie BC; P 698</td>
<td>UC 18060</td>
<td>University College London, Mummy Museum</td>
<td>Neronian</td>
<td>Dosiadis: Neronian (54-68)</td>
<td>Paralasa: First half of 1st century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.13</td>
<td>D 52; WB 19; Petrie DD; P 68</td>
<td>UC 1961</td>
<td>University College London, Mummy Museum</td>
<td>Neronian</td>
<td>Dosiadis: Neronian (54-68)</td>
<td>Paralasa: First half of 1st century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.15</td>
<td>P 697; Petrie 55</td>
<td>UC 18059</td>
<td>University College London, Mummy Museum</td>
<td>Neronian</td>
<td>Dosiadis: Neronian (54-68)</td>
<td>Paralasa: First half of 1st century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.16</td>
<td>D 67; WB 14; P 163</td>
<td>UC 19613</td>
<td>University College London, Mummy Museum</td>
<td>Neronian</td>
<td>Dosiadis: Neronian (54-68)</td>
<td>Paralasa: First half of 1st century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs’ No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.9</td>
<td>D 48; WB 17; P 13; Petrie 58</td>
<td>EA 74716</td>
<td>Encasistic</td>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>22×19 cm and thickness 2.5 mm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>14 No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.10</td>
<td>D 53; P 70</td>
<td>CG 32241</td>
<td>Encasistic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>15×21.5 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.11</td>
<td>WB 16; Petrie 31; P 71</td>
<td>1913.522</td>
<td>Tempera+encasistic</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>6.5×7 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.12</td>
<td>WB 122; Petrie BC; P 698</td>
<td>UC 18060</td>
<td>Encasistic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>32×19.5 cm and thickness of 0.15 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.13</td>
<td>D 52; WB 19; Petrie DD; P 68</td>
<td>UC 19611</td>
<td>Encasistic+stucco+gold leaf</td>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>19.2×19.6 cm and thickness 0.2 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jewelry (earring and necklace)</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.14</td>
<td>P 67</td>
<td>AM 10974</td>
<td>Encasistic+stucco+gold leaf</td>
<td>Wood Unknown</td>
<td>22.1×21.8 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jewelry, arm ring</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.15</td>
<td>P 697; Petrie 55</td>
<td>UC 18059</td>
<td>Encasistic</td>
<td>Cedar</td>
<td>11.1×19.8 cm and thickness of 2 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jewelry</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.16</td>
<td>D 67; WB 14; P 163</td>
<td>UC 19613</td>
<td>Encasistic+stucco+gold leaf</td>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>41.6×25.7 cm and thickness 3 mm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Wreath</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portraits Mummies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogs’ No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prev.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.132</td>
<td>D 46; P 14</td>
<td>CG 33223</td>
<td>Eseptian Museum</td>
<td>Neronian</td>
<td>Dosiadis: Claudius-cum-daughter</td>
<td>Paralasa: AD 60-70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogs’ No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.132</td>
<td>D 46; P 14</td>
<td>CG 33223</td>
<td>Encasistic</td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>L of mummy 155 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogs’ No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Wrappings Frame</th>
<th>Opening Shape</th>
<th>Type of Wrappings</th>
<th>Chest Band</th>
<th>Cartouche Foot Case</th>
<th>Found with</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.132</td>
<td>D 46; P 14</td>
<td>CG 33223</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elongated octagonal (narrow base)</td>
<td>Type 3: thomisic, no colored design, gilded stucco design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dosiadis E: Edgar; Paralasa V.1</td>
<td>Excavated probably at Hawara and acquired by museum in 1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Flavian

#### Detached Mummy Portraits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalog# No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 218</td>
<td>D 52</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>Baltimore, Walters Art Museum</td>
<td>Hawara, Flavian (69–96)</td>
<td>Domains: Flavian (AD 69–96)</td>
<td>Parkins: Flavian (AD 69–96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 221</td>
<td>P 96</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Koshniki, Okhurov, Giappone, Otsu Art Gallery</td>
<td>Hawara, Flavian (Later)</td>
<td>Domains: Late Flavian-Trajanic (AD 81–117)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 223</td>
<td>D 38, P 57</td>
<td>2263</td>
<td>Manchester, Manchester Museum</td>
<td>Hawara, Flavian (69–96)</td>
<td>Domains: late 1st century</td>
<td>Parkins: Flavian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 225</td>
<td>D 40, P 79</td>
<td>CG 33237</td>
<td>Egyptian Museum</td>
<td>Hawara, Flavian (69–96)</td>
<td>Domains: 2nd quarter of the 1st century</td>
<td>Parkins: Flavian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 232</td>
<td>P 255</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>Ottawa, National Gallery of Canada</td>
<td>Hawara, early Flavian</td>
<td>Domains: 2nd century of the 1st century</td>
<td>Parkins: Flavian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

11 The red highlighted data is the portrait that might not have belonged to Hawara instead it resembles more el-Hibe portraits as argued in case study 4 in Chapter 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Found with</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.17</td>
<td>D 60; P 78</td>
<td>CG 3240</td>
<td>Demos 260</td>
<td>Diodoros E, Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.18</td>
<td>P 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchased by Henry Walters in 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.19</td>
<td>D 44; P 251</td>
<td>EAP 199</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parlasca V.2, Thompson-Grey portraits</td>
<td>Purchased in 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.20</td>
<td>D 45; Petrie CG, WB 24, P 51</td>
<td>EA74711</td>
<td>labeled but badly damaged mummy of Diosorus (no 238, 239)</td>
<td>Diodoros E, Parlasca V.1, Walker and Bierbrier</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.21</td>
<td>P 96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.22</td>
<td>P 289</td>
<td>E 4588</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parlasca V.2</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.23</td>
<td>D 38; P 57</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diodore E, Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.24</td>
<td>D 42; WB 64; Petrie 1; P 94</td>
<td>EA74712</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diodoros E, Walker and Bierbrier, Parlasca</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.25</td>
<td>D 40; P 79</td>
<td>CG 33237</td>
<td>D 39</td>
<td>Diodoros E, Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.26</td>
<td>D 54; P 80, WB 18; Petrie IC</td>
<td>EA74713</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diodoros E, Walker and Bierbrier, Parlasca</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.27</td>
<td>WB 20; Petrie 52, P 32</td>
<td>UC 19068</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walker and Bierbrier, Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.28</td>
<td>P 909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parlasca V.2</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.29</td>
<td>D 6; P 359</td>
<td>CG 33236</td>
<td>Diodoros E, Edgar</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.30</td>
<td>WB 35; Petrie 46, P 92</td>
<td>1911 1354</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walker and Bierbrier, Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.31</td>
<td>P 77</td>
<td>E 102 3353</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.32</td>
<td>P 255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parlasca V.2</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.33</td>
<td>P 41</td>
<td>1911 484</td>
<td>with two mummies unidentifed which it belongs to</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Purchased from P.P.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Portrait Mummies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.131</td>
<td>D 10.78; WB 22, Petrie 3; P</td>
<td>1911 210.1</td>
<td>Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Museum</td>
<td>Flavian (Novia) (AD 96-98)</td>
<td>Diodoros, 2nd century</td>
<td>WB: AD 80-100; Parlasca: late Trajanic-early Hadrianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.132</td>
<td>D 56; P 34</td>
<td>1160.0</td>
<td>Brooklyn Museum</td>
<td>Flavian (Novia) (AD 96-98)</td>
<td>Diodoros, late 1st century</td>
<td>Parlasca: late Flavian as well-matured; AD 95-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>MUWC</th>
<th>Gridding/Gilded Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.131</td>
<td>D 10.78; WB 22, Petrie 3; P</td>
<td>1911 210.1</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>L. of mummy 175 cm; 25x16 cm M</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prope right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.132</td>
<td>D 56; P 34</td>
<td>1160.0 B</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>37.5*20.5 cm, thick 2 mm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proper right</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Wrappings Frame</th>
<th>Opening Shape</th>
<th>Type of Wrappings</th>
<th>Chest Band</th>
<th>Cartonnage Foot case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.131</td>
<td>D 10.78; WB 22, Petrie 3; P</td>
<td>1911 210.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.132</td>
<td>D 56; P 34</td>
<td>1160.0 B</td>
<td>Yes (diagonal shapes)</td>
<td>Oval</td>
<td>Type 4: red shrouded</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Found with</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.131</td>
<td>D 10.78; WB 22, Petrie 3, P</td>
<td>1911 210.1</td>
<td>Petrie 2 (E 11.139) and Petrie 4 now in Seattle Western Theological Seminary: A gilded bust, a plain wrapped mummy by a wall incorporating the inscribed stone of Kapshoem</td>
<td>Diodoros E, Walker and Bierbrier, Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.132</td>
<td>D 56; P 34</td>
<td>1160.0 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diodoros E, Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Trajanic

### Detached Mummy Portraits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.34</td>
<td>D 15, WB 26; Petrie J; P 148</td>
<td>EA 74708</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>28.5x38 cm, thick 2-4 mm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.35</td>
<td>P 109</td>
<td>918.21.1</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>41.5x21 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.36</td>
<td>P 195</td>
<td>5300</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>33.35x2 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.37</td>
<td>P 267</td>
<td>75.4P.72</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>47.5x1 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.38</td>
<td>D 15, WB 26; Petrie J; P 148</td>
<td>1951.18</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>41.5x24 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.39</td>
<td>D 49; P 107</td>
<td>5308(b)</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>43.5x2.5 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.40</td>
<td>WB 25, Petrie J; P 149</td>
<td>EA 74715</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>43.12x2 cm, thick of 0.1 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.41</td>
<td>WB 25</td>
<td>UC 33091</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>48x21 cm, thick of 0.4 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.42</td>
<td>P 108</td>
<td>2264</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>38x21 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.43</td>
<td>P 199</td>
<td>36.4.158</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>30.15x8 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.44</td>
<td>WB 31, Petrie A; P 64</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>43.2x26.1 cm</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.45</td>
<td>WB 120; Petrie B; P 762</td>
<td>UC 33048</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>35x20.5 cm, thick of 0.15 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.46</td>
<td>P 453</td>
<td>36.4.512</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>42x18 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.47</td>
<td>P 541</td>
<td>AEIN 1473</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>38 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.48</td>
<td>P 441; WB 30; Petrie J; P 48</td>
<td>UC 19067</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>38x42 cm, thick of 0.4 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Portrait Mummies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C, Gilding</th>
<th>Gabled Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Panel Frame</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.13</td>
<td>P 368</td>
<td>7312</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>L of mummy 152 cm; portrait 26x17.78 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.14</td>
<td>D 62; P 164</td>
<td>CG 33219</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>L of mummy 180 cm; portrait 22.9x17.1 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.15</td>
<td>D 46; WB 20; Petrie All; P 47</td>
<td>EA 15959</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>L of mummy 133 cm; 24x16.5 cm</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.16</td>
<td>P 58</td>
<td>CG 33227</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>L of mummy 122 cm</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hadrianc

#### Detached Mummy Portraits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogs No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Found with</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.133</td>
<td>P 366</td>
<td>7312</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>Parlasca V.2; Corcoran no. 11</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.134</td>
<td>D 62; P 164</td>
<td>CG 33219</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>Diodadis E.; Edgar; Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.135</td>
<td>D 46; WB 29; Petrie All.; P 47</td>
<td>EA 13595</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>Diodadis E.; Parlasca V.1; Walker and Bierbrier</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888, acquired by museum in 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.136</td>
<td>P 58</td>
<td>CG 33227</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1; Corcoran; Edgar</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogs No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Found with</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.19</td>
<td>D 90; WB 40; Petrie All.; P 529</td>
<td>EA 74419</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.50</td>
<td>D 63; P 132</td>
<td>5336</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.21</td>
<td>D 69; P 39</td>
<td>5070</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.22</td>
<td>D 68; WB 44; Petrie All.; P 56</td>
<td>UC 66689</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.23</td>
<td>D 95; WB 49; Petrie B. P. 21</td>
<td>UC 68197</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.24</td>
<td>D 44; WB 41; Petrie All.; P 709</td>
<td>UC 66688</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.25</td>
<td>P 274</td>
<td>H 2187</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.26</td>
<td>WB 15; P 708</td>
<td>UC 57830</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.27</td>
<td>P 115</td>
<td>5272</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.28</td>
<td>P 104; Petrie All.; P 53</td>
<td>UC 56946</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.29</td>
<td>WB 12; Petrie All.; P 17</td>
<td>UC 57830</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.30</td>
<td>D 75; P 196</td>
<td>5331(a)</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.31</td>
<td>P 116</td>
<td>5137</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.32</td>
<td>WB 36; Petrie B. P. 33; P 103</td>
<td>5376</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.33</td>
<td>D 45; WB 41; Petrie All.; P 54</td>
<td>EA 10034</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.34</td>
<td>P 46</td>
<td>E 4122</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.35</td>
<td>WB 30; Petrie All.; P 116</td>
<td>UC 56947</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.36</td>
<td>D 43; WB 42; Petrie All.; P 704</td>
<td>UC 57830</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.37</td>
<td>P 49</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.38</td>
<td>D 43; WB 42; Petrie All.; P 704</td>
<td>UC 56947</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<p>| PM No. | Catalogs No. | Inv. No. | Technique | Mineral | Dimensions | MVWC Gilded/Gilded Areas | Dimension | Panel Frames | Panel Shape |
|--------|--------------|---------|-----------|---------|------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| PM 2.19 | D 60; WB 44; Petrie All.; P 529 | EA 74419 | Encrusted | Limestone | 37&quot; x 42&quot; x 2&quot; | V | _ | Proper left | No | Rectangular |
| PM 2.50 | D 63; P 132 | 5336 | Encrusted | Velinknown | 30&quot; x 42&quot; | V | _ | Proper left | No | Arched |
| PM 2.21 | D 69; P 39 | 5070 | Encrusted | Velinknown | 37&quot; x 42&quot; | H | _ | Proper left | No | Arched |
| PM 2.22 | D 68; WB 44; Petrie All.; P 56 | UC 66689 | Encrusted | Limestone | 37&quot; x 42&quot; x 2&quot; | M | _ | Proper right | No | Arched |
| PM 2.23 | D 95; WB 49; Petrie B. P. 21 | UC 68197 | Encrusted | Limestone | 33&quot; x 37&quot; x 2&quot; | M | _ | Proper right | No | Arched |
| PM 2.24 | D 44; WB 41; Petrie All.; P 709 | UC 66688 | Encrusted | Limestone | 33&quot; x 37&quot; x 2&quot; | M | _ | Proper right | No | Arched |
| PM 2.25 | P 274 | H 2187 | Encrusted | Velinknown | 37&quot; x 42&quot; | V | _ | Proper left | No | Arched |
| PM 2.26 | WB 15; P 708 | UC 57830 | Encrusted | Velinknown | 37&quot; x 42&quot; | V | _ | Proper left | No | Arched |
| PM 2.27 | P 115 | 5272 | Encrusted | Velinknown | 37&quot; x 42&quot; | V | _ | Proper left | No | Arched |
| PM 2.28 | P 104; Petrie All.; P 53 | UC 56946 | Encrusted | Limestone | 37&quot; x 42&quot; x 2&quot; | M | _ | Proper right | No | Arched |
| PM 2.29 | WB 12; Petrie All.; P 17 | UC 57830 | Encrusted | Limestone | 33&quot; x 37&quot; x 2&quot; | M | _ | Proper right | No | Arched |
| PM 2.30 | D 75; P 196 | 5331(a) | Encrusted | Velinknown | 37&quot; x 42&quot; | M | _ | Proper right | No | Arched |
| PM 2.31 | P 116 | 5137 | Encrusted | Velinknown | 37&quot; x 42&quot; | M | _ | Proper right | No | Arched |
| PM 2.32 | WB 36; Petrie B. P. 33; P 103 | 5376 | Encrusted | Velinknown | 37&quot; x 42&quot; | M | _ | Proper right | No | Arched |
| PM 2.33 | D 45; WB 41; Petrie All.; P 54 | EA 10034 | Encrusted | Limestone | 37&quot; x 42&quot; x 2&quot; | M | _ | Proper right | No | Arched |
| PM 2.34 | P 46 | E 4122 | Encrusted | Velinknown | 37&quot; x 42&quot; | C | _ | Proper left | No | Arched |
| PM 2.35 | WB 30; Petrie All.; P 116 | UC 56947 | Encrusted | Limestone | 37&quot; x 42&quot; x 2&quot; | V | _ | Proper left | No | Arched |
| PM 2.36 | D 43; WB 42; Petrie All.; P 704 | UC 57830 | Encrusted | Limestone | 37&quot; x 42&quot; x 2&quot; | C | _ | Proper left | No | Arched |
| PM 2.37 | P 49 | _ | Encrusted | Velinknown | 37&quot; x 42&quot; | M | _ | Proper left | No | Arched |
| PM 2.38 | D 43; WB 42; Petrie All.; P 704 | UC 57830 | Encrusted | Limestone | 37&quot; x 42&quot; x 2&quot; | C | _ | Proper left | No | Arched |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Found with</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 249</td>
<td>D 88, J.B.</td>
<td>A.47054</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Parlasca V.3</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 250</td>
<td>D 63, P. 132</td>
<td>47059</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 251</td>
<td>D 63, P. 159</td>
<td>47059</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 252</td>
<td>D 88, J.B.</td>
<td>UC 45509</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 253</td>
<td>D 270, J.B.</td>
<td>UC 24867</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 254</td>
<td>D 244, J.B.</td>
<td>UC 30808</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 255</td>
<td>P. 214</td>
<td>H 2570</td>
<td>Parlasca V.2</td>
<td>Parlasca V.2</td>
<td>Purchased by Saff. Purchased later in 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 256</td>
<td>W 251, P. 708</td>
<td>UC 20809</td>
<td>Parlasca V.3</td>
<td>Parlasca V.3</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 257</td>
<td>P. 159</td>
<td>2912</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 258</td>
<td>P. 134, Petrie xx</td>
<td>UC 31879</td>
<td>Parlasca V.4</td>
<td>Parlasca V.4</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 259</td>
<td>W 83, Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>UC 31879</td>
<td>Parlasca V.4</td>
<td>Parlasca V.4</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 260</td>
<td>D 56, P. 16</td>
<td>47059</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 261</td>
<td>D 29, P. 35</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 262</td>
<td>P. 711, Petrie 83, P. 109</td>
<td>47059</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 263</td>
<td>D 47, P. 218, P. 37, Petrie 14</td>
<td>UC 31879</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 264</td>
<td>P. 47</td>
<td>UC 31879</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 265</td>
<td>W 251, Petrie 44, P. 706</td>
<td>UC 30808</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1888-1891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Portrait Mummies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prov.</th>
<th>Revised Date</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 137</td>
<td>P. 334</td>
<td>112293</td>
<td>Broder Museum of Fine Arts</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>&quot;Hybrid&quot; (AD 177-178)</td>
<td>Parlasca AD 229</td>
<td>museum: AD 150-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 138</td>
<td>P. 134</td>
<td>218832</td>
<td>Ashmolean Museum</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>&quot;Hybrid&quot; (AD 177-178)</td>
<td>Parlasca AD 229</td>
<td>museum: AD 150-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 139</td>
<td>P. 160</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Manchester, Manchester Museum</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>&quot;Hybrid&quot;</td>
<td>Parlasca AD 229</td>
<td>museum: AD 150-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 139</td>
<td>D. 59, P. 83</td>
<td>CO 33216</td>
<td>Egyptian Museum</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>&quot;Hybrid&quot;</td>
<td>Parlasca AD 229</td>
<td>museum: AD 150-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 140</td>
<td>D. 59, P. 83</td>
<td>CO 33216</td>
<td>Egyptian Museum</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>&quot;Hybrid&quot;</td>
<td>Parlasca AD 229</td>
<td>museum: AD 150-175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Portrait Wrappings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Wrappings Frame</th>
<th>Opening Shape</th>
<th>Type of Wrapping</th>
<th>Cartouche and/or Incised Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 137</td>
<td>P. 334</td>
<td>112293</td>
<td>&quot;Hybrid&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Hybrid&quot;</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 138</td>
<td>P. 134</td>
<td>218832</td>
<td>&quot;Hybrid&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Hybrid&quot;</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 139</td>
<td>P. 160</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>&quot;Hybrid&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Hybrid&quot;</td>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 139</td>
<td>D. 59, P. 83</td>
<td>CO 33216</td>
<td>&quot;Hybrid&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Hybrid&quot;</td>
<td>Type 5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Antonine

### Detached Mummy Portraits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalog No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prov.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 64</td>
<td>P 238</td>
<td>11307</td>
<td>Manchester, Manchester Museum</td>
<td>Hawara</td>
<td>early Antonine</td>
<td>181-185 AD</td>
<td>Petraea: AD 140-160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 66</td>
<td>P 245</td>
<td>35243</td>
<td>Egyptian Museum</td>
<td>Hawara</td>
<td>early Antonine</td>
<td>186-187 AD</td>
<td>Petraea: AD 160-180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 65</td>
<td>P 137</td>
<td>2266</td>
<td>Manchester, Manchester Museum</td>
<td>Hawara</td>
<td>Detached Antonine (AD 161-180)</td>
<td>Petraea: AD 140-160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 145</td>
<td></td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>Chicago, Oriental Institute</td>
<td>Hawara</td>
<td>Antonine (Marcus Aurelius)</td>
<td>AD 150-160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 43</td>
<td>P 196</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>Hawara</td>
<td>Detached Antonine (AD 188-189)</td>
<td>Petraea: AD 150-160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 43</td>
<td>P 276</td>
<td>11390</td>
<td>Manchester, Manchester Museum</td>
<td>University College London, Petrie Museum</td>
<td>Detached Middle Antonine (AD 161-180)</td>
<td>Petraea: AD 140-160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 165</td>
<td></td>
<td>7371</td>
<td>Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum</td>
<td>Hawara</td>
<td>Detached Middle Antonine (AD 161-180)</td>
<td>Petraea: AD 140-160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalog No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>MW/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Panel Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 66</td>
<td>P 238</td>
<td>11307</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>30.5x18 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prop left</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 67</td>
<td>P 137</td>
<td>2266</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>42.5x21.2 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prop right</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 145</td>
<td></td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>41.5x23.5 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prop right</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 43</td>
<td>P 196</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>39.4x24 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Prop left</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 43</td>
<td>P 276</td>
<td>11390</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>42.2x21 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prop right</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 43</td>
<td>P 276</td>
<td>11390</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>42.2x21 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prop right</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 43</td>
<td>P 276</td>
<td>11390</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>42.5x22.2 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prop right</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 43</td>
<td>P 276</td>
<td>11390</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>38.3x22.8 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prop right</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 43</td>
<td>P 276</td>
<td>11390</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>36.5x18 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prop left</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 43</td>
<td>P 276</td>
<td>11390</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>38.2x18 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prop left</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 43</td>
<td>P 276</td>
<td>11390</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>36.5x20.5 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prop right</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 43</td>
<td>P 276</td>
<td>11390</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>32x20 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Prop right</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note

- Gilded stucco frame border and decorated with carved vine pattern
- Detached middle to late Antonine (AD 161-192)
- Detached middle to late Antonine (AD 188-189)
Portrait Mummies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prov.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.143 D 3 DW; P 204</td>
<td>AM 11673</td>
<td>Berlin, Egyptian Museum</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>early Antonine</td>
<td>Decisive AD 115-165</td>
<td>African: late Hadriano-monna</td>
<td>Exterior: early Antonine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.144 P 260</td>
<td>CG 33221</td>
<td>Egyptian Museum</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>Middle Antonine</td>
<td>Ptolemaic middle of 2nd century</td>
<td>Consecrates dates the wrapping to first quarter of 2nd century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.145 P 582</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Manchester, Manchester Museum</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>Antonine</td>
<td>Ptolemaic: second quarter of 2nd century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.146 D 57.58; WB 32; P 162</td>
<td>EA 21810</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>Antonine</td>
<td>Decisive Antonine (AD 94-117)</td>
<td>Ptolemaic: early Hadriano-monna; early 2nd century</td>
<td>Exterior: early Antonine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM. No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.143 D 3 DW; P 204</td>
<td>AM 11673</td>
<td>Encrusted</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>L. of mummy 168 cm; portrait 30.3*21 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.144 P 260</td>
<td>CG 33221</td>
<td>Encrusted</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>L. of mummy 163</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.145 P 582</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Encrusted</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>L. of mummy 3 m 765 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frame, wreath</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.146 D 57.58; WB 32; P 162</td>
<td>EA 21810</td>
<td>Encrusted</td>
<td>Lace</td>
<td>L. of mummy 167 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frame, wreath</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Wrapping</th>
<th>Wrapping Frame</th>
<th>Opening Shape</th>
<th>Type of Wrapping</th>
<th>Chest Band</th>
<th>Cartonnage Front case</th>
<th>Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.143 D 3 DW; P 204</td>
<td>AM 11673</td>
<td>Rectangular series of gilded stucco slabs and wreath</td>
<td>Oval</td>
<td>Type 5 red shroud</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excavated by Breschi in 1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.144 P 260</td>
<td>CG 33221</td>
<td>Oval gilded stucco slabs</td>
<td>Oval</td>
<td>Type 5 red shroud</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.145 P 582</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Oval gilded stucco slabs</td>
<td>Oval</td>
<td>Type 5 red shroud</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.146 D 57.58; WB 32; P 162</td>
<td>EA 21810</td>
<td>Oval gilded stucco wreath motif</td>
<td>Arching top, three more below</td>
<td>Type 5 red shroud</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excavated by Petrie in 1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Found with</th>
<th>Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.143 D 3 DW; P 204</td>
<td>AM 11673</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Diodato E., Parlasca V.1, Parlasca V.2, Edgar Consonno no. 10, Excavated by Breschi in 1892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.144 P 260</td>
<td>CG 33221</td>
<td>Younger man also named Antinou (in British Museum EA 21810) and a young woman named Theramathiite (in Egyptian Museum CG 33223)</td>
<td>Parlasca V.4, Excavated by Petrie in 1899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.145 P 582</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Old man also named Antinou (in Manchester Museum 1775) and a young woman named Theramathiite (in Egyptian Museum CG 33223) assumed to belong to the family</td>
<td>Diodato E., Walker and Bierbrier 565-57, Consonno, Parlasca V.1, Excavated by Petrie in 1899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Severan

Detached Mummy Portraits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prov.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.85 WB 53; Petrie 23; P 145</td>
<td>EA 7417</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>Severan (AD 193-235)</td>
<td>WB AD 190-220</td>
<td>Ptolemaic: Severan (AD 193-235) museum: AD 190-220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.86 D 79; P 408; WB 52; Petrie QQA</td>
<td>£ 74703</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>University College London, Perrin Museum</td>
<td>Severan (AD 193-235)</td>
<td>WB AD 175-200</td>
<td>Ptolemaic: Severan (AD 193-235) museum: AD 190-220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.87 WB 126</td>
<td>UC 38062</td>
<td>Egyptian Museum</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>Late Antonine-early Severan (AD 180-241)</td>
<td>WB AD 180-211</td>
<td>Ptolemaic: Severan (AD 180-211) museum: AD 180-211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.88 D 5; P 188</td>
<td>CG 33259</td>
<td>Egyptian Museum</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>Late Antonine-early Severan (AD 180-211)</td>
<td>WB AD 180-211</td>
<td>Ptolemaic: Severan (AD 180-211) museum: AD 180-211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.89 P 193</td>
<td>R 137</td>
<td>British, Art Gallery and Mus-Hawara</td>
<td>Col.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Panel Frame</th>
<th>Panel Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.85 WB 53; Petrie 23; P 145</td>
<td>EA 7417</td>
<td>Encrusted</td>
<td>Fir</td>
<td>32.9*22.7 cm, thick of 1.5 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Black borders rectangle</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.86 D 79; P 408; WB 52; Petrie QQA</td>
<td>£ 74703</td>
<td>Encrusted</td>
<td>Lace</td>
<td>27.13 cm, thick 2.5 mm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.87 WB 126</td>
<td>UC 38062</td>
<td>Encrusted</td>
<td>Lace</td>
<td>43.7*21.5 cm, thick of 2.0 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.88 D 5; P 188</td>
<td>CG 33259</td>
<td>Encrusted</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>43.9*22 cm, thick 1.5-2 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.89 P 193</td>
<td>R 137</td>
<td>Encrusted</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>37.5*22 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.85 WB 53; Petrie 23; P 145</td>
<td>EA 7417</td>
<td>Underneath Petrie 22 which is still unidentified</td>
<td>Walker and Bierbrier: Parlasca V.1, Excavated by Petrie in 1911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.86 D 79; P 408; WB 52; Petrie QQA</td>
<td>£ 74703</td>
<td>Badly rotted portrait of a girl Petrie jf</td>
<td>Diodato E., Walker and Bierbrier, Parlasca V.2 Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.87 WB 126</td>
<td>UC 38062</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Walker and Bierbrier Excavated by Petrie in 1911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.88 D 5; P 188</td>
<td>CG 33259</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Diodato E., Parlasca V.1 Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2.89 P 193</td>
<td>R 137</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1 Excavated by Petrie in 1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abusir el-Melek

Tiberian

Detached Mummy Portraits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prov.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.90</td>
<td>P 60</td>
<td>AM 17072</td>
<td>Berlin Museum, Ägyptische Museum</td>
<td>Abusir El-Melek</td>
<td>Tiberian</td>
<td>Parlasca: Claudian-Neronian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.92</td>
<td>P 30</td>
<td>JE 39896</td>
<td>Egyptian Museum</td>
<td>Abusir El-Melek</td>
<td>Tiberian</td>
<td>Parlasca: Claudian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.93</td>
<td>P 4</td>
<td>AM 17073</td>
<td>Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum</td>
<td>Abusir El-Melek</td>
<td>Tiberian</td>
<td>Parlasca: middle 1st century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Panel Frame</th>
<th>Panel Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.90</td>
<td>P 60</td>
<td>AM 17072</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>31.5*19.2 cm M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rectangle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.92</td>
<td>P 30</td>
<td>JE 39896</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Arched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.93</td>
<td>P 4</td>
<td>AM 17073</td>
<td>Tempera</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>43.5*26 cm W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rectangle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Found with</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.90</td>
<td>P 60</td>
<td>AM 17072</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by the Berlin Museum in 1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.92</td>
<td>P 30</td>
<td>JE 39896</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by the Berlin Museum in 1908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.93</td>
<td>P 4</td>
<td>AM 17073</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated in 1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claudian

Detached Mummy Portraits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prov.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.91</td>
<td>P 38</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>Greifswald, The University</td>
<td>Abusir El-Melek</td>
<td>Claudian-Neronian</td>
<td>Parlasca: 1st or 2nd century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.94</td>
<td>D 95; P 31</td>
<td>JE36802</td>
<td>Archaeological Institute</td>
<td>Abusir El-Melek</td>
<td>Claudian-Neronian</td>
<td>Doinadia: 1st century</td>
<td>Parlasca: Claudian (AD 41-54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Panel Frame</th>
<th>Panel Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.91</td>
<td>P 38</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>30*17.5 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.94</td>
<td>D 95; P 31</td>
<td>JE36802</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Arched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Found with</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.91</td>
<td>P 38</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by the Berlin Museum in 1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 3.94</td>
<td>D 95; P 31</td>
<td>JE36802</td>
<td>Doinadia E.; Edgar; Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Berlin Museum Excavation in 1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portrait Mummies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prov.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 3.148</td>
<td>P 44</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>Heidelberg, Institute of Egyptology</td>
<td>Abusir el-Melek</td>
<td>Claudian-Neronian</td>
<td>Parlasca: second half of 1st century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 3.149</td>
<td>P 45</td>
<td>H 3112</td>
<td>Wurzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum</td>
<td>Abusir el-Melek</td>
<td>Claudian-Neronian</td>
<td>Parlasca: second half of 1st century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 3.148</td>
<td>P 44</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>Tempera</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>L. of mummy 83 cm, portrait is 17*12 cm</td>
<td>C boy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 3.149</td>
<td>P 45</td>
<td>H 3112</td>
<td>Tempera</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>L. of mummy 1m, 12 cm</td>
<td>C boy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wreath</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Wrappings Frame</th>
<th>Opening Shape</th>
<th>Type of Wrappings</th>
<th>Chest Band</th>
<th>Cartoonage Foot case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 3.148</td>
<td>P 44</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Octagonal (narrow)</td>
<td>Type 1: rhombic, no colored design, no gilded stucco studs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 3.149</td>
<td>P 45</td>
<td>H 3112</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Octagonal (narrow)</td>
<td>Type 1: Rhombic, no colored design, no gilded stucco studs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Found with</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 3.148</td>
<td>P 44</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by the Berlin Museum in 1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 3.149</td>
<td>P 45</td>
<td>H 3112</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by the Berlin Museum in 1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tebtunis

### Detached Mummy Portraits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prov.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.95</td>
<td>P 159</td>
<td>621380</td>
<td>Berkeley, Phoebe Hearst Museum</td>
<td>Tebtunis</td>
<td>Late Antonine-early Severan</td>
<td>Parlasca: Trajanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.96</td>
<td>P 428</td>
<td>621377</td>
<td>Berkeley, Phoebe Hearst Museum</td>
<td>Tebtunis</td>
<td>Late Antonine-early Severan</td>
<td>Parlasca: first quarter of III century/Severan (193-235)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.98</td>
<td>P 430</td>
<td>621378</td>
<td>Berkeley, Phoebe Hearst Museum</td>
<td>Tebtunis</td>
<td>Late Antonine-early Severan</td>
<td>Parlasca: second quarter of III century/Severan (193-235)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.99</td>
<td>P 431</td>
<td>621382</td>
<td>Berkeley, Phoebe Hearst Museum</td>
<td>Tebtunis</td>
<td>Early Antonine</td>
<td>Parlasca: middle II century/ Mid Antonine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.100</td>
<td>P 432, WB 118</td>
<td>621378 a</td>
<td>Berkeley, Phoebe Hearst Museum</td>
<td>Tebtunis</td>
<td>Early Antonine</td>
<td>Parlasca: Antonine (138-161)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.101</td>
<td>P 435</td>
<td>621374</td>
<td>Berkeley, Phoebe Hearst Museum</td>
<td>Tebtunis</td>
<td>Early Antonine</td>
<td>Parlasca: middle II century/ Mid Antonine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.102</td>
<td>P 436</td>
<td>621383</td>
<td>Berkeley, Phoebe Hearst Museum</td>
<td>Tebtunis</td>
<td>Mid-late Antonine</td>
<td>Parlasca: beginning of III century/Severan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.103</td>
<td>P 433</td>
<td>621376</td>
<td>Berkeley, Phoebe Hearst Museum</td>
<td>Tebtunis</td>
<td>Early Antonine</td>
<td>Parlasca: middle II century/ Mid Antonine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.104</td>
<td>P 434</td>
<td>621375</td>
<td>Berkeley, Phoebe Hearst Museum</td>
<td>Tebtunis</td>
<td>Early Antonine</td>
<td>Parlasca: early Antonine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Technical Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Panel Frame</th>
<th>Panel Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.95</td>
<td>P 159</td>
<td>621380</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Background, wreath</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angled (large angled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.96</td>
<td>P 428</td>
<td>621377</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>30.3*19.3 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wreath</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angled (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.97</td>
<td>P 429</td>
<td>621379</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>33.7*21.6 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angled (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.98</td>
<td>P 430</td>
<td>621378</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>34.7*22 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wreath</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angled (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.99</td>
<td>P 431</td>
<td>621382</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>35.7*21.6 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angled (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.100</td>
<td>P 432, WB 118</td>
<td>621378 a</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>36*24 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angled (small)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.101</td>
<td>P 435</td>
<td>621374</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>34*25 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angled (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.102</td>
<td>P 436</td>
<td>621383</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>34.8*23.4 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angled (large angled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.103</td>
<td>P 433</td>
<td>621376</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>30.5*22.9 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angled (large angled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.104</td>
<td>P 434</td>
<td>621375</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>28.6*19 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angled (large angled)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Found with Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs' No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Found with</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.95</td>
<td>P 159</td>
<td>621380</td>
<td>Parlasca</td>
<td>V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Grenfell and Hunt in 1899-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.96</td>
<td>P 428</td>
<td>621377</td>
<td>Parlasca</td>
<td>V.2</td>
<td>Excavated by Grenfell and Hunt in 1899/1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.97</td>
<td>P 429</td>
<td>621379</td>
<td>Parlasca</td>
<td>V.2</td>
<td>Excavated by Grenfell and Hunt in 1899/1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.98</td>
<td>P 430</td>
<td>621378</td>
<td>Parlasca</td>
<td>V.2</td>
<td>Excavated by Grenfell and Hunt in 1899/1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.99</td>
<td>P 431</td>
<td>621382</td>
<td>Parlasca</td>
<td>V.2</td>
<td>Excavated by Grenfell and Hunt in 1899/1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.100</td>
<td>P 432, WB 118</td>
<td>621378 a</td>
<td>Parlasca</td>
<td>V.2; Walker and Bierbrier</td>
<td>Excavated by Grenfell and Hunt in 1899/1900 in cemetery VII or VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.101</td>
<td>P 435</td>
<td>621374</td>
<td>Parlasca</td>
<td>V.2</td>
<td>Excavated by Grenfell and Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.102</td>
<td>P 436</td>
<td>621383</td>
<td>Parlasca</td>
<td>V.2</td>
<td>Excavated by Grenfell and Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.103</td>
<td>P 433</td>
<td>621376</td>
<td>Parlasca</td>
<td>V.2</td>
<td>Excavated by Grenfell and Hunt in 1899/1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4.104</td>
<td>P 434</td>
<td>621375</td>
<td>Parlasca</td>
<td>V.2</td>
<td>Excavated by Grenfell and Hunt in 1899/1900 in cemetery VII and VIII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Antinoopolis

Detached Mummy Portraits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs’ No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prov.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.110 P 171</td>
<td>GA2</td>
<td>Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts</td>
<td>Antinoopolis Hadrianic (117-138)</td>
<td>Parlasca: Hadrianic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.111 P 209</td>
<td>GA4</td>
<td>Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts</td>
<td>Antinoopolis Hadrianic (117-138)</td>
<td>Parlasca: Hadrianic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.115 P 144</td>
<td>GA9</td>
<td>Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts</td>
<td>Antinoopolis Hadrianic (117-138)</td>
<td>Parlasca: Hadrianic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.115 P 138</td>
<td>GA1</td>
<td>Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts</td>
<td>Antinoopolis Hadrianic (117-138)</td>
<td>Parlasca: Hadrianic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.118 P 140</td>
<td>GA10</td>
<td>Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts</td>
<td>Antinoopolis Hadrianic (117-138)</td>
<td>Parlasca: Hadrianic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hadrianic

**Detached Mummy Portraits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs’ No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Panel Frame</th>
<th>Panel Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.109 P 174</td>
<td>P 213</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>29.5*17 cm</td>
<td>C boy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Stepped arched top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.110 P 171</td>
<td>GA2</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>40.5*25 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>Stepped rectangle top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.111 P 209</td>
<td>GA4</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>40*25 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>Stepped rectangle top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.115 P 144</td>
<td>GA9</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>46.5*25 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Stepped rectangle top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.115 P 138</td>
<td>GA1</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>40.5*25 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Stepped angled top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.118 P 140</td>
<td>GA10</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>41*25 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Stepped arched top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Publications

- MP 5.109 P 174: Parlasca V.1 Excavated by Gayet in 1904-1905
- MP 5.110 P 171: Parlasca V.1 Excavated by Gayet
- MP 5.111 P 209: Parlasca V.1 Excavated by Gayet
- MP 5.113 P 144: Parlasca V.1 Excavated by Gayet
- MP 5.115 P 138: Parlasca V.1 Excavated by Gayet
- MP 5.118 P 140: Parlasca V.1

### Antonine

**Detached Mummy Portraits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs’ No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Prov.</th>
<th>Reviewed Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other Suggested Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.105 P 175</td>
<td>GA3</td>
<td>Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts</td>
<td>Antinoopolis Antonine</td>
<td>Parlasca: Antonine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.106 P 232</td>
<td>GA6</td>
<td>Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts</td>
<td>Antinoopolis Antonine</td>
<td>Parlasca: Antonine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.107 D 87; P. AM 17900</td>
<td>GA7</td>
<td>Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts</td>
<td>Antinoopolis Antonine</td>
<td>Parlasca: early Antonine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.108 P 233</td>
<td>GA8</td>
<td>Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts</td>
<td>Antinoopolis Antonine</td>
<td>Parlasca: Hadrianic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.112 P 231</td>
<td>GA8</td>
<td>Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts</td>
<td>Antinoopolis Antonine</td>
<td>Parlasca: Hadrianic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.114 D 21; P.AF 8844</td>
<td>E 1269 (P 214)</td>
<td>Louvre Museum, Antiquités Egyptiennes</td>
<td>Antinoopolis Late Antonine (Crispina)</td>
<td>Antonine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.116 P 219</td>
<td>E 12569 (P 214)</td>
<td>Louvre Museum, Antiquités Egyptiennes</td>
<td>Antinoopolis Antonine</td>
<td>Parlasca: Hadrianic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.117 D 94; P.GA5</td>
<td>Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts</td>
<td>Antinoopolis Antonine</td>
<td>Parlasca: early Antonine (117-161)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Publications

- MP 5.105 P 175: Parlasca: Antonine
- MP 5.106 P 232: Parlasca: Antonine
- MP 5.107 D 87; P. AM 17900: Parlasca: early Antonine
- MP 5.108 P 233: Parlasca: early Antonine
- MP 5.112 P 231: Parlasca: Hadrianic
- MP 5.114 D 21; P.AF 8844: Parlasca: second quarter of the 2nd century
- MP 5.116 P 219: Parlasca: second quarter of the 2nd century
- MP 5.117 D 94; P.GA5: Parlasca: the third three decades of 2nd century

### Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP No.</th>
<th>Catalogs’ No.</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M/W/C</th>
<th>Gilding</th>
<th>Gilded Areas</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Panel Frame</th>
<th>Panel Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.105 P 175</td>
<td>GA3</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>40*25 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Frontal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Stepped-arched top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.106 P 232</td>
<td>GA6</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>41*24.5 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Frontal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Stepped-arched top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.107 D 87; P. AM 17900</td>
<td>GA7</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>41*20.2 cm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Wreath, background</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.108 P 233</td>
<td>GA8</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>38*20 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Frontal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Stepped-arched top (horseshoe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.112 P 231</td>
<td>GA8</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>39*24 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Stepped-arched top (horseshoe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.114 D 21; P.AF 8844</td>
<td>GA9</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>32*18 cm</td>
<td>C girl</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Stepped-arched top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.116 P 219</td>
<td>E 12569 (P 214)</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>36.8*17 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Arched</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.117 D 94; P.GA5</td>
<td>Encaustic</td>
<td>Wood unknown</td>
<td>37*16.5 cm</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proper right</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Arched</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP No.</td>
<td>Catalogs Inv. No.</td>
<td>Found with Publications</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.105 P 175</td>
<td>GA3</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Gayet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.106 P 232</td>
<td>GA6</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Gayet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.107 D 87; P AM 17900</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doxiadis E.; Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated Gayet 1906-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.108 P 233</td>
<td>GA7</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Gayet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.112 P 231</td>
<td>GA8</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Gayet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.114 D 21; P AF6884</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doxiadis E.; Parlasca V.2; Walker and Bierbrier</td>
<td>Excavated by Gayet in 1904-1905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.116 P 219</td>
<td>E 12569 (P 214)</td>
<td>Parlasca V.1</td>
<td>Excavated by Gayet. Museum entry 1905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 5.117 D 94; P GA5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doxiadis E.; Parlasca V.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Plates

Hawara

Plate 1 MP 2.1, Courtesy of the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt

Plate 2 MP 2.2, Courtesy of Kestner Museum, Hannover, Germany
Plate 3 MP 2.3 Courtesy of Neues Museum, Berlin

Plate 4 PM 2.121(a) Courtesy of Girton College, Cambridge, UK

Plate 5 PM 2.121 (b) Courtesy of Girton College, Cambridge, UK
Plate 8 MP 2.5 Courtesy of Cleveland Museum of Art, Ohio, USA

Plate 9 MP 2.6 Courtesy of Ägyptisches Museum, Berlin, Germany
Plate 10 MP 2.7 © Trustees of the British Museum

Plate 11 MP 2.8 Courtesy of Victoria and Albert Museum, London, UK
Plate 12 PM 2.123 Courtesy of National Museum of Ireland, Dublin, Ireland

Plate 13 PM 2.124 (a) Courtesy of Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, USA

Plate 14 PM 2.124 (b) Courtesy of Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, USA
Plate 15 PM 2.125 Courtesy of Ägyptisches Museum, Berlin, Germany

Plate 16 PM 2.126 Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt
Plate 17 PM 2.127 © Trustees of the British Museum

Plate 18 PM 2.128 (a) Courtesy of Neues Museum, Berlin, Germany

Plate 19 PM 2.128 (b) Courtesy of Neues Museum, Berlin, Germany
Plate 20 PM 2.129 (a) Courtesy of Neues Museum, Berlin, Germany

Plate 21 PM 2.129 (b) Courtesy of Neues Museum, Berlin, Germany

Plate 22 PM 2.130 courtesy of Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, photo Ole Haupt.
Plate 23 PM 2.131 (a) Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt

Plate 24 PM 2.131 (b) Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt
Plate 25 MP 2.9 © Trustees of the British Museum

Plate 26 MP 2.10 Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt
Plate 29 MP 2.13 UC 19611 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL

Plate 30 MP 2.14 Courtesy of Ägyptisches Museum, Berlin, Germany
Plate 31 MP 2.15 UC 38059 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL

Plate 32 MP 2.16 UC 19613 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL

Plate 33 PM 2.132 Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt
Plate 34 MP 2.17 Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt

Plate 35 MP 2.18 Courtesy of Walters Art Museum, Baltimore, USA
Plate 36 MP 2.19 Digital image courtesy of the Getty’s Open Content Program.

Plate 37 MP 2.20 © Trustees of the British Museum
Plate 38 MP 2.21 Courtesy of Ohara Art Gallery, Japan

Plate 39 MP 2.22 Courtesy of Royal Museum of Art and History, Brussels, Belgium

Plate 40 MP 2.23 Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Manchester, UK
Plate 41 MP 2.24 © Trustees of the British Museum

Plate 42 MP 2.25 Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt
Plate 43 MP 2.26 © Trustees of the British Museum

Plate 44 MP 2.27 UC 19608 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL
Plate 45 MP 2.28 Courtesy of Central Museum of Art and Art Gallery, Blackburn, UK

Plate 46 MP 2.29 Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt
Plate 47 MP 2.30 © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford

Plate 48 MP 2.31 © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.
Plate 49 MP 2.32 Courtesy of National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, Canada

 Plate 50 MP 2.33 Courtesy of Kestner Museum, Hannover, Germany

Plate 51 PM 2.131 (a) Courtesy of Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, Scotland
Plate 52 PM 2.131 (b) Courtesy of Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, Scotland

Plate 53 PM 2.132 (a) Courtesy of Brooklyn Museum, New York, USA
Plate 54 PM 2.132 (b) Courtesy of Brooklyn Museum, New York, USA

Plate 55 MP 2.34 © Trustees of the British Museum
Plate 56 MP 2.35 Courtesy of Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, Canada

Plate 57 MP 2.36 Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Manchester, UK
Plate 58 MP 2.37 Digital image courtesy of the Getty's Open Content Program

Plate 59 MP 2.38 Courtesy of Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, Scotland
Plate 60 MP 2.39 Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Manchester, UK

Plate 61 MP 2.40 © Trustees of the British Museum
Plate 62 MP 2.41 UC 33971 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL

Plate 63 MP 2.42 Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Manchester, UK
Plate 64 MP 2.43 Courtesy of Ägyptisches Museum, Berlin, Germany

Plate 65 MP 2.44 Courtesy of Sainsbury Center of Visual Arts, University of East Anglia, Norwich, England
Plate 66 MP 2.45 UC 36348 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL

Plate 67 MP 2.46 Courtesy of Kelvin grove Art Gallery and Museum, Glasgow, Scotland
Plate 68 MP 2.47 courtesy of Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, photo Ole Haupt.

Plate 69 MP 2.48 UC 19607 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL
Plate 70 PM 2.133 (a) Courtesy of Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria, Egypt

Plate 71 PM 2.133 (b) Courtesy of Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria, Egypt
Plate 72 PM 2.134 (a) Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Egypt

Plate 73 PM 2.134 (b) Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt
Plate 74 PM 2.135 © Trustees of the British Museum

Plate 75 PM 2.136 Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt
Plate 76 MP 2.49 © Trustees of the British Museum

Plate 77 MP 2.50 Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Manchester, UK
Plate 78 MP 2.51 Courtesy of Antikensammlung, Munich, Germany

Plate 79 MP 2.52 UC 19609 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL
Plate 80 MP 2.53 UC 19610 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL

Plate 81 MP 2.54 UC 30088 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL
Plate 82 MP 2.55 Courtesy of Martin von Wagner Museum, Würzburg, Germany

Plate 83 MP 2.56 UC 38103 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL
Plate 84 MP 2.57 Courtesy of Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst, Munich, Germany

Plate 85 MP 2.58 UC 38314 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL
Plate 86 MP 2.59 UC 38768 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL

Plate 87 MP 2.60 Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Manchester, UK
Plate 88 MP 2.61 Courtesy of Chicago oriental Institute, Chicago, USA

Plate 89 MP 2.62 Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Manchester, UK
Plate 90 MP 2.63 © Trustees of the British Museum

Plate 91 MP 2.64 Courtesy of Philadelphia University Museum, Philadelphia, USA
Plate 92 MP 2.65 UC 30081 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL

Plate 93 MP 2.66 UC 36215 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL
Plate 94 MP 2.67 Courtesy of Philadelphia University Museum, Philadelphia, USA

Plate 95 MP 2.68 UC 19612 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL
Plate 96 PM 2.137 (a) Courtesy of Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, USA

Plate 97 PM 2.137 (b) Courtesy of Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, USA
Plate 98 PM 2.138 © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford

Plate 99 Pm 2.139 Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Manchester, UK
Plate 100 PM 2.139 Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt

Plate 101 PM 2.140 Courtesy of Museum of Art and History, Brussels, Belgium
Plate 102 PM 2.147 (a) Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Manchester, UK

Plate 103 PM 2.147 (b) Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Manchester, UK
Plate 104 PM 2.142 (a) Courtesy of Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, USA

Plate 105 PM 2.142 (b) Courtesy of Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, USA
Plate 106 MP 2.69 Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Manchester, UK

Plate 107 MP 2.70 Courtesy of Salford City Art Gallery, Manchester, UK
Plate 108 MP 2.71 Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Manchester, UK

Plate 109 MP 2.72 Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt
Plate 110 MP 2.73 Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Cairo, Egypt

Plate 111 MP 2.74 Courtesy of Chicago Oriental Institute, Chicago, USA
Plate 112 MP 2.75 © Trustees of the British Museum

Plate 113 MP 2.76 Courtesy of Glasgow Museum and Art Gallery, Scotland
Plate 114 MP 2.77 © Trustees of the British Museum

Plate 115 MP 2.78 © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.
Plate 119 MP 2.82 UC 14692, Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL

Plate 120 MP 2.83 Courtesy of Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria, Egypt
Plate 121 MP 2.84 Courtesy of Nottingham Museum and Art Gallery, UK

Plate 122 PM 2.143 (a) Courtesy of Ägyptisches Museum, Berlin, Germany
Plate 123 PM 2.143 (b) Courtesy of Ägyptisches Museum, Berlin, Germany

Plate 124 PM 2.144 (a) Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt
Plate 125 PM 2.144 (b) Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt

Plate 126 PM 2.145 Courtesy of Manchester Museum, Manchester, UK
Plate 127 PM 2.146 © Trustees of the British Museum

Plate 128 MP 2.85 © Trustees of the British Museum
Plate 129 MP 2.86 © Trustees of the British Museum

Plate 130 MP 2.87 UC 38062 Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL
Plate 131 MP 2.88 Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt

Plate 132 MP 2.89 Courtesy of Brighton Art Gallery and Museum, UK
Abusir el-Melek

Plate 133 MP 3.90 Courtesy of Ägyptisches Museum, Berlin, Germany

Plate 134 MP 3.92 Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt
Plate 135 MP 3.93 Courtesy of Ägyptisches Museum, Berlin, Germany

Plate 136 MP 3.91 Courtesy of Greifswald University Archaeological Institute, Germany
Plate 137 MP 3.94 Courtesy of Egyptian Museum, Cairo, Egypt

Plate 138 PM 3.148 Courtesy of Heidelberg Institute of Egyptology, Germany
Plate 139 PM 3.149 Courtesy of Martin von Wagner Museum, Würzburg, Germany
Tebtunis

Plate 140 MP 4.95 Courtesy of Phoebe Hearst Museum, California, USA

Plate 141 MP 4.96 Courtesy of Phoebe Hearst Museum, California, USA
Plate 142 MP 4.97 Courtesy of Phoebe Hearst Museum, California, USA

Plate 143 MP 4.98 Courtesy of Phoebe Hearst Museum, California, USA
Plate 144 MP 4.99 Courtesy of Phoebe Hearst Museum, California, USA

Plate 145 MP 4.100 Courtesy of Phoebe Hearst Museum, California, USA
Plate 146 MP 4.101 Courtesy of Phoebe Hearst Museum, California, USA

Plate 147 MP 4.102 Courtesy of Phoebe Hearst Museum, California, USA
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