

Nefret-Mut

IMPACT ID: IMP00002

Institution: Royal Ontario Museum

Designation: 910.5.3

Date of Acquisition: 1906-1907

Contact: No CLA

Image Modality: CT

KVP: 10

X-Ray Tube Current: 365

Acquisition Date: N/A

Manufacturer: GE Medical Systems

Manufacturer Model Name:

LightSpeed VCT

Country: Egypt

Site: Deir el-Bahari

Dynasty: 21st Dynasty

Date: 945 BC

Sex: Female

Background:

The original excavation that recovered Nefret-Mut took place in 1905-1906 and involved Charles Trick Currelly, the first Curator of the Royal Ontario Museum (Gibson, 2014). Charles Trick Currelly recovered these mummies for his museum. In 2007, three mummies were loaned from the Royal Ontario Museum for examination by Dr. Andrew J. Nelson at the University of Western Ontario (Nelson, 2008). This mummy was scanned on three separate occasions over an eight-month period (Nelson, 2008). Comparison of scans confirmed the bones were stable and not at risk of being disturbed (Nelson, 2008).

Identity Confusion:



Figure 1. Midsagittal view of ROM 910.5.3 (Nelson, 2008)



Gayle Gibson with Nefret-Mut Coffin (Gibson, 2014)

Until 2014, the name of this mummy was unknown, so she was nicknamed “Justine” by ROM staff (Gibson, 2014). In 2014, they were able to discover her true name through computer analysis of the images on her coffin. One of the images on the side of the coffin is of a male figure worshipping the goddess Hathor in the form of a cow (Gibson, 2014). However, the male figure is counteracted by three-pronged flower design in front of the figure’s face, this means it’s a female (Gibson, 2014). The other signs in front of the face are Nefer and Mut, meaning the name is Nefret-Mut (Gibson, 2014). More signs read “Chantress of Armun-Re”, giving the occupation of the person inside (Gibson, 2014).

Pathological Features:

All the organs were removed, including those from the abdomen, thorax, throat, and oral cavity (Nelson, 2008; Nelson et al., 2009). The evisceration was performed through the perineum by a turpentine enema, which is described by Herodotus, and finished with manual evisceration by connecting the anus and vagina (Nelson, 2008). Excerebration was not performed on the mummy as cranial bones are all intact and brain matter can be seen in the cranial cavity (Nelson, 2008; Nelson et al., 2009). Open voids between the wrappings and skin suggests she was not fully desiccated before being wrapped (Nelson et al., 2009). Each limb wrapped separately (Nelson, 2008). While looking at the skin, there is damage from insect activity around the throat and lower back (Nelson et al., 2009). The arms are extended with the hands meeting over the belly with fingers extended, but the arms are not crossed (Nelson, 2008).

The age estimate for this mummy is late-20s. Her 3rd molars have erupted, basi-sphenoid suture and medial clavicles are fused and there is no advanced wear on the skeleton (Nelson et al., 2009). However, one of her 3rd molars are impacted, causing significant pain during her life (Nelson, 2008; Nelson et al., 2009).

The sex of the mummy is opposite to what the coffin claims, which is male (Nelson, 2008). Examination of the pelvis confirms the mummy inside is female. The pelvic outlet, sciatic notch, and subpubic angle are all extremely wide, which indicates a female (Nelson, 2008).

There are four teeth missing from the mouth; left, mandibular premolars and left maxillary canine and first premolar (Nelson, 2008). The teeth were lost post-mortem though as one can be found inside the wrappings, one outside the wrappings, and two are in the abdominal cavity.

Since the mummification lacked artifacts, used perineal evisceration, and the wrappings were rushed before full desiccated it is likely the individual was of lower status in society. Most lower class people are labourers and have skeletal damage from their occupation. However, the chantress (singer) occupation agrees with the woman not having sufficient funds for a more expensive mummification as she was lower class, but performed no physical labour. The fact her tongue was removed in mummification is odd as the Egyptians believed that they needed their tongue to introduce them in the next life (Gibson, 2014).

References

Gibson G. 2014. Introducing Nefret-Mut. Royal Ontario Museum [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.rom.on.ca/en/blog/introducing-nefret-mut-0>

Nelson, A.J. 2008. Preliminary Report on the Radiographic Analysis of Three Egyptian Mummies. Report submitted to Royal Ontario Museum.

Nelson, A.J., Chhem, R., Cunningham, I.A., Friedman, S.N., Garvin., G., Gibson, G., Granton, P.V., Holdsworth, D.W., Holowka, S. Longstaffe, F., Lywood, V., Nguyen, N., Shaw, R., Trumpour, M., Wade, A.D., White, C.D. 2009. The ROM / UWO Mummy Project: A microcosm of progress in mummy research. Poster Presented to the 1st Bolzano Congress on Mummy Studies, Bolzano Italy, March 18-21, 2009.