A Shabti of “Tjehebu the Great:” Tjainhebu (Tȝy-n-ḥbw) and Related Names from Middle Kingdom to Late Period

Lloyd D. Graham

Section 1 of this paper describes a pottery shabti of the Third Intermediate Period and recounts the early stages of the project to understand the name of its owner. Sections 2-7 describe the outcome of the analysis. This covers both the name itself (its variants, orthographies and possible meanings) and a survey of those individuals who bore it in ancient Egypt, ordered by time-period. Tȝy-n-ḥbw seems to be a variant of the name Tȝ-n-ḥb and to denote “Tjainhebu the Great;” Tȝ(y)-n-ḥb.w may originally have meant something like “the man of the festivals.” The earliest known Tjainhebu dates to the Middle Kingdom and was probably called “the Great” to reflect his physical size. Precedents are discussed for the unusual orthography of the name on the shabti and its cognates. Some later names of similar form employ different types of h and therefore differ in meaning; for example, the name of Tjainehebu, Overseer of the King’s Ships in the 26th Dynasty, may have meant “Descendant of the ibis.” In the Late Period, both male and female forms of the name are known and seem to relate strongly to Lower Egypt: for men, to Memphis; for women, to Behbeit el-Hagar and Khemmis of the Delta. Faces can be put to two of the men, leading to a discussion of the verisimilitude of ancient Egyptian likenesses. Overall, the article presents an unpublished shabti with six known parallels that imply at least three moulds. The analysis triggered by the unusual name of its owner encompasses philology, onomastics, biography and portraiture, fields that are not usually considered together. It reprises in English earlier research (including much published in other languages) while collating and updating it with recent developments, including the possible need to amend pronunciation of the name to Tehabu/Tainhabu. One outcome of the study is a challenge to the published assignation of this owner’s shabtis as female.
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1. Origins of the project

1.1 The shabti

In the culture of ancient Egypt, shabtis were funerary statuettes designed to substitute for their owner in the less pleasant duties of the afterlife. Usually male mumiform figurines of faience, pottery or stone bearing a hieroglyphic inscription naming the deceased, these spirit-doubles or otherworldly assistants were buried with their owners from the Middle Kingdom to the end of the Ptolemaic Period. Many shabtis survive today, and the European custom of individuals collecting shabtis is itself an ancient tradition that probably dates back to Greco-Roman times. Modern understanding of the shabti concept continues to develop and deepen. Recently, it has been proposed that a shabti’s labour was mandated by a legal contract, the work being provided in exchange for the life bestowed upon the statuette by the craftsman who fashioned it.

The impetus for this paper was an Egyptian shabti of the Third Intermediate Period (TIP) (Fig. 1a-g), which is currently in a private collection in Australia. Its short inscription, of which one glyph had evidently been erased, captured my interest in June, 2015, because the name of the deceased stubbornly defied my attempts to identify it. The documentation associated with the shabti’s purchase from Helios Gallery Antiquities (Wiltshire, U.K.) indicated that it was believed to date to the 21st or 22nd Dynasty and was probably discovered near Thebes. In the late 20th century, it was in the collection of Julian Bird, having been acquired in Bristol in 1977. Starting in the 1970’s, Bird formed an extensive collection of Egyptian antiquities over the subsequent four decades. Bird studied Egyptology at University College London, home of the Petrie Museum, and in 1981 participated in Barry Kemp’s third season of fieldwork at Amarna. In 2016, the shabti was voluntarily and unconditionally offered to the Egyptian Government for repatriation (Sect. 7.1), but the offer was not taken up.

The shabti (Fig. 1) stands 7.3 cm tall; it is 2.4 cm wide at the shoulders and 2.4 cm deep at the foot. The rear surface is flat, with a slight undulation. The figurine is formed from moulded pottery-like material which has been coated with a pale blue-green wash, or perhaps a white and then blue-green wash (Sect. 2.1), probably to make it resemble a more expensive shabti of similarly-coloured faience. The bulk fabric appears to be a ceramic whose natural surface colour is reddish-brown. Painted TIP shabtis made of brown terracotta or sun-dried clay are known, as are varnished TIP shabtis made from pottery. Sun-dried Nile mud was commonly used to make shabtis during the TIP, but the good preservation of raised features on this figurine (such as the forward-projecting pointed face) suggests the robustness of a fired ceramic. In the base of the shabti there has been some loss, resulting in a cavity (0.8 x 0.6 cm) at the heel which allows one to see the inner material at the base of the figurine (Fig. 1g). The appearance of the interior is also consistent with firing, a point that will be discussed in more detail below (Sect. 1.4.2).
Fig. 1. The Australian shabti. Frontal views (a, b), then rotations clockwise (c-g), and base with hole (h). Enlarged versions of panels b and e form the frontispiece beneath the Abstract on the front page.
As an unvarnished figurine of pottery/terracotta rather than faience, this specimen has a matt rather than a vitreous finish. The blue-green pigment used for the wash is probably Egyptian Green (Cu-wollastonite). It does not seem to have bonded strongly to the surface, in that much of this layer has been lost through wear and abrasion. The blue-green colour that currently remains on the shabti is concentrated in low spots, recesses and pits on the surface. Some facial details (the eyes, eyebrows and headband), the accessories (the two hoes, and the bag at the back) and the hieroglyphic inscription have been painted in black, possibly using a manganese oxide paint. The black pigment seems to have been applied over the wash, although it is difficult to be certain since magnification reveals many tiny flecks of blue-green that seem to overlay the black; perhaps these just represent spots where particles of black from the top layer have detached, re-exposing the underlying wash. The seed-bag at the back is painted simply as a rectangular outline, without straps or hatching (Fig. 1e). The seshed headband, knotted at the back (Fig. 1e), is characteristic of shabtis of the 21st-23rd Dynasties, and its presence confirms Helios Gallery’s assignation of this item to the early TIP.

The inscription consists of ten hieroglyphs written in a vertical column of nine registers ("lines") on the front of the figurine. Subsidiary to the main top-to-bottom sequence, the orientation of the glyphs indicates a right-to-left reading direction. Consistent with this, line 5 contains two glyphs which read logically in that direction (Gardiner sign Z7, for -w, followed by the plural determinative Z2). The glyph in line 3 has almost entirely been lost due to abrasion. The sales invoice from Helios Galleries provided a provisional reading of the inscription (which naturally omitted the obliterated third symbol) as Ws-ỉr Nbwt-fs mst-f-hrw, meaning “The Osiris, Nebu-Aa, true of voice,” and further translated the personal name Nbwt-fs as “The Great Golden One, an epithet of Hathor.”

Niek de Haan, the Dutch proprietor of the online database at Shabti Collections, helpfully drew to my attention the existence of two parallels to the Australian shabti in this database, namely entries SC/73 and SC/90. These shabtis (Fig. 2a,b) were indeed close matches to the one under investigation, being similar in size (both 7.2 x 2.2 x 2.4 cm), composition (pale blue/green-washed pottery), and detailing (black-painted features). For example, the seed-bag on SC/73 (and probably on SC/90, where it is obscured by a modern stand) is a simple black rectangular outline painted on the dorsal surface without straps, just as it is in Fig. 1e. Both SC/73 and SC/90 are listed as shabtis of the 21st Dynasty, purchased in modern times in Gournah, i.e. Sheikh ʿAbd el-Qurna, a settlement on the west bank of Thebes. It is likely that the Australian shabti, which is thought to have come from Thebes, was also acquired by its first modern owner at Qurna, a long-time hub for the Egyptian antiquities trade.

The discovery of parallels to the Australian shabti in the Shabti Collections database proved a crucial step forward because the inscription on SC/73 is preserved in its entirety (Fig. 2a). The first glyph of the personal name – the symbol mostly missing from the Australian shabti – can now clearly be read as Gardiner glyph V13, T-. At face value, the name of the shabti owner reads T-hbw-fs, “Tjehebu the Great.” For SC/73 and SC/90, the database entries expanded this to “Tjay-n-hbw-Aa,” while cautioning that “the name of the owner is difficult to determine exactly.”
Fig. 2. Other shabtis from the same gang. (a) Shabti Collections SC/73; (b) Shabti Collections SC/90; (c) Ushabtis.com worker (a different photo of the shabti in panel a); (d) Ushabtis.com overseer; (e) Musée Antoine Vivenel de Compiègne, inv. no. 1995.206. Photos (a-b) by Niek de Haan, (c-d) by Dik van Bommel and (e) by the Musées de la Ville de Compiègne, who each retain all rights; images used here by kind permission.
Subsequently, I discovered a third parallel in another non-commercial website devoted to shabtis. Like the Shabti Collections database, Ushabtis.com is based in the Netherlands.31 The site is run by Dik van Bommel. Among the site’s many photographs, I noticed two TIP shabtis of “Tjayenheboea” from a private Dutch collection, both of them assigned to the vicinity of Thebes and the 22nd Dynasty.32 One of the shabtis (Fig. 2c) was clearly the same figurine as Shabti Collections SC/73 (Fig. 2a).33 The other – an overseer shabti – was new to me (Fig. 2d). As in this example, overseer shabtis are typically not mummiform but wear a kilt that projects forwards.34 Each overseer is intended to supervise a team of ten worker shabtis, one for each day of the 10-day Egyptian week.35 The identification of the shabti-owner’s name as Tjayenheboea (i.e., the expanded form of the name) rather than Tjehebua (i.e., the version actually inscribed) suggested that Dik was aware of the Shabti Collections entry for SC/73, or the source underpinning it, when writing his figure legend.

In support of its information about SC/73 and SC/90, the Shabti Collections database nominated two sources: Dominique Valbelle’s book, Ouchebtis de Deir El-Médineh,36 and a paper identified as “Societe d’Egyptologie 2005, page 57 and 58, with pictures.” Unfortunately, neither reference proved readily tractable. Valbelle’s book is out of print and exceedingly rare,37 and not held by any library in Australia. I was equally unable to find the other source among publications from the Egyptology societies of French-speaking countries for the year 2005.

In the absence of these scholarly references, my focus returned to the inscription on the shabti (Fig. 3a). Dictionaries of Egyptian and online resources on hieroglyphic formulae confirmed the interpretation of those parts of the inscription translated in the Shabti Collections database (“the great,” “true of voice,” etc.). As suggested in the documentation from Helios Gallery, the glyphs in line 5 did seem to approximate the cobra-complex for nbw, “the Golden One,” an epithet of Hathor.38 The cobra in nbw-\(\text{\textsuperscript{\textasteriskcentered}}\) faces the wrong direction (Fig. 3b), but TIP shabtis are relatively crude and it seemed to me possible that such a rudimentary inscription could contain scribal errors of this magnitude. At the time, though, I could not understand why the nbw component of the name in the database entries had gained an \(h\) and been split into “n-hbw.”

### 1.2 Reading the inscription

In January 2016, I attended a course on hieroglyphs in the Macquarie Ancient Languages School (MALS).39 The inscription on the Australian shabti once again came to mind, and the course instructor kindly assisted my renewed efforts to decipher the name of its original owner from a photograph. The tutor pointed out that the determinative in the presumptive nbw cluster was facing the wrong way, a concern that I had long ago forgotten; they also felt that there was too much missing from the putative collar glyph for it to be Gardiner sign S12, and thus for lines 4-5 of the shabti inscription to specify nbw. This, combined with the excellent introduction to Middle Egyptian that I received in the course, reawakened my interest in identifying the personal name within the inscription.
Fig. 3. Shabti inscriptions. Hieroglyphs in all panels read right to left to match the reading direction of the shabti inscriptions. (a) Facsimiles of the inscriptions on the (i) Australian, (ii-iii) Swiss, (iv-v) Dutch and (vi) French worker-shabti parallels. (b) Cobra in the presumed nbw--cluster faces the wrong direction. (c) Excerpts of (i) nbw collar from TIP shabtis for Ns-pr-(n)-nb(w) (PN I 176, 2), and (ii) hieratic w (V7) with plural determinative (Z) from a Late Period shabti for Riw (cf. PN I 217, 5). (d) Plural hb-basin (ii) resembles (i) the nbw symbol-cluster and (iii) the plural nb-basket.

Thus encouraged, I renewed my academic search by trying once again to locate the elusive “Societe d’Egyptologie 2005” references cited in the Shabti Collections database. One candidate institute was the Société d’Égyptologie, Genève. While exploring their website, I discovered that it included extensive catalogues of shabti names from different periods, curated by Jean-Luc Chappaz.40 The catalogue for the TIP contained two entries for 7A-n-Hbw-aA, a transliteration equivalent to that for SC/73 and SC/90 in the Shabti Collections database, each with a reference.41 Neither source, it seemed to me, was a publication of which I was aware. One paper – Hari & Chappaz (1980) “Fichier Permanent des Antiquités Égyptiennes (et Égyptisantes) des Collections Privées Romandes”42 – proved to be available online. Upon downloading, it turned out that this publication had the date of digitization (2005) displayed prominently at the bottom of each page, next to the name of the society; from its page-range, it became evident that this paper was, in fact, the long-sought “Societe d’Egyptologie 2005” article.

The other source cited was a 2007 catalogue for the Musée Vivenel,43 which unfortunately went out of print just as I placed an order for it. The title was not available on the second-hand market. Two copies were held by the Bibliothèque nationale de France, but in order to be allowed to purchase a scan of what I hoped were the relevant few pages – simply to read, not to republish – the BnF insisted that I
obtain written consent from the copyright holder, who at that time proved impossible to contact. Viewing the relevant page could only be done by ordering a monochrome paper photocopy from the BnF and having the library post this to me in Australia (at a cost approaching the purchase price of the 300-page colour catalogue, had it remained in print). In total, five months of sustained effort separated the day when I first learned that the Musée Vivenel might harbour a parallel shabti and the time when I was able to check the relevant page of the museum’s catalogue, my first view of which was kindly provided by staff at the Musées de la Ville de Compiègne. The Vivenel shabti – inventory no. 1995.206, and item no. 99 in the catalogue – measures 7.1 cm (h) x 2.7 (w) x 2.5 (d) and is assigned to the 21-22nd Dynasty (Fig. 2e). Its fabric is said to be Egyptian faience, although the underlying red-brown colour in the photograph indicates that it is made of pottery like its siblings. The provenance is recorded as unknown; it was acquired in a public sale in Soissons 1977. Since the museum’s inventory number commences with 1995, it is likely that the shabti was in a French private collection until 1995, when it was acquired by the museum. In the catalogue, the name on the shabti had been tentatively rendered in French as “Tchnebouâà.”

It was just as well that I had other highly promising leads to follow up in the time that it took to access the Vivenel catalogue. Finding Hari & Chappaz (1980) had opened up several paths forward. Among the authors’ descriptions of Egyptological items in the private collections of French-speaking Switzerland, they presented two cognates to the Australian shabti – their nos. 006 and 027 – which at that time were located in Geneva, accompanied by monochrome photographs of each. Their description of the first one as “terracotta, with white wash, detailed in black, some traces of pale blue-green,” suggests that the figurine had undergone two washes (first white, then blue-green). For the second shabti, only a white wash was mentioned. It is quite possible that all of the shabtis in this gang were supposed to have two washes, the first white and the second blue-green, but that some only received the first treatment. Numerous small red-brown pottery shabtis with a blue over white wash are held by the Manchester Museum (21-22nd Dynasty). Hari & Chappaz provided a commentary on the name inscribed on their shabtis 006 and 027, which they transliterated as $T(3y-n)-hbw$-$s$, citing related exemplars in Hermann Ranke’s *Die ägyptischen Personennamen* (PN I 387, 2, which they took to be a precursor of PN I 388, 12). They thanked Prof. Jean-Claude Goyon for helping them to make the connection.

The Ranke entries – transliterated as $t3-n(?)$-$hb$-$s$ and $t3j-m$-$hb$ (?) – use very different orthographies to the shabti inscriptions. However, it was at last clear to me why both Chappaz’s shabti-name catalogue for the TIP and the Shabti Collections database entries had employed the transliteration $n-hbw$; the “collar glyph” (S12) was in fact being read as a $hb$ basin (W3), while the “cobra determinative” was being read as a hieratic $w$ (V7), followed by the plural determinative (Z2) of which it was the phonetic expression. The symbols on lines 4-5 now read $hb$-$w$, so the central $n$ in the long form of the name is not from $nbw$, as I had originally thought, but rather an interpolation prompted by the entries in Ranke’s *Personennamen*. Importantly, in this reading the signs all face the correct direction. In support of the new interpretation, when a $nbw$ collar is genuinely present in TIP shabti inscriptions (Fig. 3c (i)), it is drawn more elaborately than the glyph under
investigation, proving the MALs tutor correct. Moreover, the symbol complex on line 5 of the shabtis is very close to examples of the hieratic w (V7) plus plural determinative (Z2) found on other shabtis (Fig. 3c (ii)).

Interpreting the glyph of line 4 as a $hb$-basin, as done by Hari & Chappaz (1980), links the name on the shabtis ($T-hb.w$-$ys$) to many variants collated by Ranke. Somewhat surprisingly, the alternative interpretation of the glyph as Gardiner sign V30, nb (“lord,” “every;” Fig. 3d (iii)) or as V31/31* (uniliteral k) found no support from Ranke. Accordingly, these options were largely omitted from further consideration.52

The MALs tutor suggested “man-in-festivals” or “man-in-festivity” as the closest sense to $Tsy-n-hbw$, the presumed long form of the shabti owner’s name, and encouraged me to make a more thorough investigation of this uncommon name with its idiosyncratic orthography. This paper is the result of that exercise. Originally envisaged as a short object-study with a foray into onomastics, the project grew in complexity and scope. In its final form, it includes a biographical survey of people bearing names similar to $Tsy-n-hbw$ or potentially related to it. The biographical study deepened my appreciation of the many potential variants of the name, their range of meanings, and their geographic, temporal and mythological associations.

1.3 Initial research on the name

As part of the wider search for potentially related names – by which I include phonetically similar names – I revisited Chappaz’s shabti-name catalogues at the website of the Société d’Égyptologie de Genève53 and checked his listings for periods other than the TIP. No candidates were found for the Middle Kingdom, Second Intermediate Period, New Kingdom or Nubian/Kushite period.54 There seemed to be no use of -$hbw$ within names in these periods, although in the Middle Kingdom there were a few names containing -$mhb$, such as $Hr-m-hb$, $Pth-m-hb$ and $Ps-Rt-m-hb$ (denoting Horus-in-festival, Ptah-in-festival, and Re-in-festival). In the catalogue for the Late and Ptolemaic Periods, though, the situation changed dramatically: this catalogue contained 3 entries for $Tsi-n-hbw$, 14 for $Tswn-hbw$, 1 for $Tsn-$n3-hbw$, 1 for $Ts-n-hb$, 29 for $Tswn-hb$ and 5 for $Tsn-hb(yt)$. There was also one entry for $Tswn-hb$ in a separate catalogue for shabti boxes, coffins and miniature sarcophagi. Each of the 54 entries had a bibliographic reference, although many proved just to be auction catalogue listings.

From this discovery, it was clear that names similar to $T3(y)-n-hb(w)$ – including variants with different types of h – had proliferated during the Late and/or Ptolemaic Periods. The four h-sounds of ancient Egyptian (transliterated h, $h$, $h$, and $h$) are of course distinct, but similar sounds can interchange over time. An example of this is the conversion of the sound-value of d (originally a dj-sound, as in the English word “jail”) to that of a plain d (as in “dog,” and thus indistinguishable from the Egyptian uniliteral d) by the time of the Middle Kingdom.56 A similar process is represented by the convergence of z with s.57 The pronunciation, orthography and interpretation or perceived etymology of a particular word may also evolve over time. A good – and particularly appropriate – example is provided by the Egyptian word for shabti, which
over time underwent changes in all of these categories, while still referring to a
funerary statuette designed to substitute for its owner in the duties of the afterlife
(Table 1). For simplicity, the form “shabti,” which was common at all times, will
be used globally throughout this paper.

Following up the references from Chappaz’s shabti-name catalogues and from
Ranke led to numerous relevant publications, many of which in turn led to yet more.
But the time for my chronological narrative draws to a close; it would be pointless to
try to list these in the order in which I encountered them. One stand-out discovery,
however, does require mention. The very last entry for $\text{T}_3-n-\text{Hb}<\text{yt}>$ in Chappaz’s
shabti-name catalogue for the Late and Ptolemaic Periods cited Pernigotti (1989),
which turned out to contain a reference to a paper central to the whole project: de
Tardive.” This paper included a study of Late Period names with the formats $\text{T}_3-n-$
$(ns)-\text{hbw}$, $\text{T}_3-n-\text{hb(yt)}$ and $\text{T}_3-n-\text{hb(yt)}$, along with a consideration of their possible
meanings.

Table 1. Changes over time in the Egyptian word for shabti.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyphs</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Meaning or presumed etymology</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Sjbt}$</td>
<td>$\text{$s!!b!.!ty}$</td>
<td>Actual household servant offering fowl.</td>
<td>Dyn 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Sjbt!yw}$</td>
<td>$\text{$s!!b!.!tyw}$</td>
<td>Pl. constructed as sing. “Food”?</td>
<td>MK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Sswjbt}$</td>
<td>$\text{$s!!w!!s!!b!!ty}$</td>
<td>“Shawabti.” Persea wood?</td>
<td>SIP-TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Sjbt}$</td>
<td>$\text{$s!!b!!t!y}$</td>
<td>“Shabti.”</td>
<td>NK-TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Sbt}$</td>
<td>$\text{$s!!b!!t!y}$</td>
<td>“Shebti.” From $\text{sbi}$, “to replace.”</td>
<td>Late NK-TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{w!sbt}$</td>
<td>$\text{w!s!b!!t}$</td>
<td>“Ushebti.” From $\text{w!s!b}$, “answerer.”</td>
<td>TIP-LP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The list is illustrative of the known diversity rather than exhaustive.
The expanding paper-trail was complemented by web searches, which uncovered yet more information and at times allowed the investigation to leap forward to more recent research. One notable breakthrough came from web-searching with keyword “Cairo CG1279,” for which the Trismegistos database entry cited Lodomez (2009) “Une Buste Anonyme Saiite Retrouve son Propriétaire.” For a Tjainhahebu of the Late Period, this exciting paper reunited – in our minds’ eyes, at least – the statue’s trunk and hand-held shrine (still in Egypt) with its long-misplaced head (now in France), and thereby provided one of our subjects with a face. The same paper also cited Vittmann (1983) “Zur Familie der Fursten von Athribis in der Spätzeit,” an important reference that had (understandably) not been captured in de Meulenaere & Yoyotte’s paper of the same year. The bibliography of Lodomez (2009) included Jansen-Winkeln (1998) “Drei Denkmäler mit archaisierender Orthographie,” which provided a much-needed verification and augmentation of my attempt to translate de novo the inscription on Cairo JE37873 (= CG48648), for which – up to that point – I had managed to discover only a photograph in an online database.

There were also some red herrings, false dawns and unexpected frustrations. For example, a very recent academic paper appeared to supply a much-needed “missing link” between the canonical orthography of the name Tsy and the T- that begins the name on the shabtis. Unfortunately, the connection did not survive a re-examination of the evidence and a discussion with the author, who kindly went out of his way to help me (Sect. 4.2). Indeed, the vast majority of the authors, collectors, institutions and publishers that I was obliged to contact – mostly to seek image permissions – were helpful and generous. One notable exception was a U.S. institute who refused my request to use a tiny portion (<1%) of a high-resolution image hosted on their website. The curator prohibited any use of their online image in a publication and insisted that I would have to pay for repeat photography of the item. This response contrasts sharply with, say, that of the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, which not only granted me permission to re-use a photograph from Hans Schneider’s classic book but voluntarily organised new photography of the relevant shabti – free of charge – to provide me with high-quality colour images of it for inclusion in this paper.

1.4 Other aspects of the shabti

Table 2 lists all known shabtis from the gang of the TIP owner T-hbw-ꜜs, whose name at face value reads “Tjehebu the Great” (Sect. 1.1); some of these are pictured in Figs. 1-2. The worker shabtis are similar in size and appearance, but not identical. The two specimens in the Shabti Collections database (Fig. 2a,b) are very similar to each other and probably come from the same mould (subset A). Their faces seem to have lost most of the black detailing of their eyes and eyebrows. As far as one can tell from the rather indistinct photographs in Hari & Chappaz (1980), Swiss shabti 006 also seems to belong to subset A. The Australian shabti (Fig. 1a-d, f-g) has a narrower face with a strong forward projection to the nose and mouth, resulting in a rather pointed chin; accordingly, it probably comes from a different mould (subset B). With its forward-jutting triangular face, the French shabti (Fig. 2e) most closely resembles the Australian one; both of these subset B shabtis retain the black detailing of their eyes and eyebrows. The facial shape of Swiss shabti 027 seems to place it too in subset B. The face of the Dutch overseer shabti (Fig. 2d) resembles that of SC/90 (Fig. 2b) in
Table 2. Known shabtis from the gang of TIP owner “Tjehebu the Great.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Schneider typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>Published (Sect. 1.4.1): 4.5.1 Tc:Cl.VIIIIB2 W20 H8 I5 B*/B0 TP7b/P (i.e., females).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Shabti Collections SC/73; Ushabtis.com</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>Proposed (Sect. 7.4): 4.5.1 Tc:Cl.VIIIIB2 W20 H8 I5 B13a/B0 TP7b/P (i.e., males).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands (?)</td>
<td>Shabti Collections SC/90</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Hari &amp; Chappaz 006</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Hari &amp; Chappaz 027</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiègne</td>
<td>Musée Vivenel 1995.206</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Ushabtis.com</td>
<td>Overseer</td>
<td>Proposed: 4.5.5 Tc:Cl..IXA/IXC W30(?) H33 I15 B0(?) TP7b/P.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tentative subdivisions by mould (Sect. 1.4): A, green fill; B, yellow fill; C, pink fill.

being quite round, but – in view of the different clothing and arm positions – must come from a separate mould (subset C). In total, at least three moulds are implied by the surviving ensemble of figurines (coloured fill, Table 2).

### 1.4.1 Typology

The Shabti Collections database nominates 4.5.1 as the first three numbers of the Schneider classification for its shabtis SC/73 and SC/90. This uncontroversial assignation (denoting TIP, pottery, and mummiform, with a non-royal named owner) is not followed by a more detailed Schneider typology, but Hari & Chappaz (1980) provide one for each of their two specimens, namely Tc:Cl.VIIIIB2 W20(?) H8 I5 B* TP7b/P for shabti 006 and Tc:Cl.VIIIIB2 W20 H8 I5 B0 TP7b/P for shabti 027 (Table 2, Workers, Published). As far as one can tell, all of the worker shabtis made for this owner conform to these published classifications for wig type (W), hand-position (H), implement type (I) and text position/type (T). Most of the known worker shabtis (i.e., all except Hari & Chappaz 027) have plain dorsal bags, albeit without the usual shoulder-straps, suggesting B13a as the default code; exceptions lacking a bag would merit B0, as recorded for Hari & Chappaz 006 (Table 2, Workers, Proposed). There can be no disagreement about Hari & Chappaz’s choice of Tc:Cl.VIII, which is the designation for mummiform shabtis of the 21st-23rd Dynasties. What is surprising, however, is their choice of B2 as the sub-class for Cl.VIII, since this group represents female workers of a Theban type with perpendicular sides. The sex of the shabtis attracted no specific comment in the text, but – since the typology was given twice, once each for shabtis 006 and 027 – it can hardly have been a misprint for its male counterpart, Cl.VIIIA2. However, breasts seem to be absent from all of the shabtis of T-ḥbw-śš for which images are available, so one must regard the assigned gender of these figurines as highly questionable.

Female shabtis are known for some male owners of the TIP, such as Userhatmes (PN I 86, 2) of Deir el-Bahri Cache II, so the presence of female shabtis does not require T-ḥbw-śš to have been a woman. However, in a published sample of 48 shabtis of Schneider Cl.VIII, only two of the six female shabtis with known owners (i.e.,
33%) belonged to men. For one of those men, male shabtis have also survived. In general, then, there does appear to be a bias towards the manufacture of female shabtis for female owners, so an ensemble of all-female worker shabtis would certainly increase the chances that the owner was a woman. The question of the gender of the shabtis – and their owner – will be reprised at the end of the paper (Sect. 7.4).

1.4.2 Fabric

The bulk fabric appears to be a ceramic whose natural surface colour is reddish-brown; the possibility of a red slip as a source of the russet tone can be excluded by the reddish-brown colour revealed in abrasions and scratches to the front surface of the French worker shabti (Fig. 2e) and by heavy wear to the projections on the Dutch overseer shabti (Fig. 2d).

In the base of the Australian shabti, there is a cavity which allows one to see the inner material at the base of the figurine (Fig. 1h). Hari & Chappaz (1980) mention that shabti no. 006 in their catalogue, which came from the same gang as the one studied in this paper, had been broken. Its core displayed a carbonaceous black aspect, which they considered appropriate to an artefact fired in antiquity.

In regard to the burnt core, Hari & Chappaz (1980) referred also to remarks in Dominique Valbelle’s *Oushebtis de Deir el-Medineh*, which – as mentioned in Sect. 1.1 – is vanishingly rare. A scan of the relevant page, kindly supplied by Niek de Haan (curator of the online Shabti Collections database, Sect. 1.1), revealed that its text relates to the internal fabric of shabtis. Specifically, Valbelle observed that breaks in some terracotta shabtis reveal a uniform colour throughout, whereas others reveal colour gradients that range from red or pink-beige at the outside to grey-brown at the centre.

The cavity in the foot of the Australian shabti shows that the fabric in the interior of the figurine’s base is dark brown (Fig. 1h). This is intermediate between the carbonaceous black observed by Hari & Chappaz (1980) for the core of a sibling shabti and the internal grey-brown coloration mentioned by Valbelle.

Overall, the red-brown colour of the natural exterior of the figurine (Sect. 1.1), the dark brown colour of material a little deeper inside it and the black colour of the inner core of a sibling shabti are consistent with the known properties of Nile silt, which fires red in oxygenated environments (e.g., at the surface of a figurine fired above clear flames with little smoke) but black in the absence of oxygen (e.g., deep inside the same figurine), with intermediate shades possible for intermediate depths below the surface.

1.5 Exploration of the name and its bearers

From here onwards, I will switch to describing the outcome of my analysis of the name on the shabti. This covers both the name itself (its variants, orthographies and possible meanings) and a survey of those individuals who bore it in ancient Egypt – an unconventional kind of prosopography, if you will. The analysis is centred around
a master-table (Table 3) which presents all names in standard hieroglyphic format; it in turn is underpinned by a master-figure (Fig. 4), which presents the clearest image or earliest/most authoritative transcript available to me for each name. Throughout this paper, codes in square brackets, such as [H1.1.1], refer to the indices assigned in Table 3. References to entries in Ranke’s *Personennamen* will continue to appear within normal brackets with the prefix PN, following the convention introduced in Sect. 1.2. In keeping with the convention introduced in Sect. 1.1, references to symbols in Gardiner’s sign-list will continue to appear in small bold type, e.g., A1 for the seated-man determinative.

Before presenting the study’s findings, it is worth repeating the caveat introduced above (Sect. 1.3). Throughout this paper, I use the phrase “the name” as a convenient catch-all term for names that resemble $Tz(y)-n-hb(w)$ or that appear to be related to it, whether as precursors, descendants, scribal abbreviations, nicknames, near-homophones, and so on. This convention is adopted solely for convenience, mainly to avoid an endless burdening of the text with cumbersome expressions. It is important to remember that there may be no true “genetic relationship” between names under consideration, even when they look or sound similar.

A disclaimer is also necessary in regard to my transliteration of two nouns present in different versions of the name. For “festival,” the *Wörterbuch* and Faulkner’s dictionary – and all of the literature upon which this paper draws – use $hb$, a writing now supplanted by $hzb$ in the *Thesaurus Linguae Egyptiae* (TLE). Partly for the sake of continuity, and partly because the *aleph* is not explicit in any name, I have retained the use of $hb$ and its vocalisation as “heb.” This issue is revisited in Sect. 7.2. For “ibis,” the TLE, *Wörterbuch* and Faulkner’s dictionary give $hby$, with deviant writings lacking the final $y$, whereas the sources for this paper use $hb$ or $hb.w$. As the final $y$ is specified in only one name [H6.2.1], I have opted to use $hb$ (as in Petty’s dictionary) and to add subsequent letters only when their presence is explicit.

It is hoped that this article will serve several purposes. First, it presents an unpublished shabti with six known parallels, all but one of which are in private collections. Second, the analysis triggered by the unusual name of its owner encompasses fields such as philology, onomastics, biography, genealogy and portraiture, thereby combining sub-disciplines that are usually treated separately. Hopefully there is both novelty and value in a holistic treatment such as this, where a particular personal name serves as the springboard for excursions – across a time-span of some 1500 years – in any and every direction that can illuminate the permutations of the name and their meanings, uses, geographic associations and mythological links. Third, the article reprises in English much of the earlier research on names related to $Tz(y)-n-hb(w)$ and the people who bore them. The source publications span more than a century and include many articles in French, German and Italian. As far as possible, the primary evidence has been re-presented here to enable the reader to assess it (and the validity of my interpretations) for him- or herself. Fourth, the content of earlier studies has been collated, corrected where necessary, and updated with developments from more recent research. Lastly, the body of knowledge amassed in the course of the project calls for the published gender assignment of the worker shabtis in this gang to be reassessed.
### Table 3: $T_{3\text{-}n\text{-}hb}w$ and potentially related names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index$^a$</th>
<th>Ranke PN</th>
<th>Transliteration$^c$</th>
<th>Orthography (rationalised)</th>
<th>M/ F</th>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Dyn</th>
<th>Source for Fig. 4; object$^d$</th>
<th>Relevant section &amp; person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H-series</strong> (names that contain -hb, -$\dot{hb}$, -$\dot{hb}$, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1.1.0</td>
<td>Nw-$t\text{-}hb$ $\varepsilon\varsigma$</td>
<td>M MK</td>
<td>von Bergmann, <em>sic</em>,$^{95}$ stela, Sect 2.3.1; “the Great”</td>
<td>Austria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1.1.1</td>
<td>I 387, 2</td>
<td>$T_{3-n\text{-}hb}$ $\varepsilon\varsigma$</td>
<td>M MK</td>
<td>von Bergmann,$^{96}$ rectified, &amp; Ranke.$^{97}$</td>
<td>Sect 2.3.1; “the Great”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1.1.2</td>
<td>wdpw $T_{3-hb}$ $\varepsilon\varsigma$</td>
<td>M MK</td>
<td>von Bergmann proposal, fn.1.$^{98}$</td>
<td>Sect 2.3.1 &amp; Fig 5c; “the Great”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1.1.3</td>
<td>kfn.w $T_{3-hb}$ $\varepsilon\varsigma$</td>
<td>M MK</td>
<td>von Bergmann$^{99}$ &amp; present paper.</td>
<td>Sect 2.3.1; “the Great”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1.2.1</td>
<td>$T_{3-n\text{-}hb}$ nmw</td>
<td>M MK</td>
<td>von Bergmann,$^{100}$ stela, <em>Austria</em>.</td>
<td>Sect 2.3.1; “the Dwarf”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1.2.2</td>
<td>I 387, 3</td>
<td>$T_{3-wdp(w)-hb}$ nmw</td>
<td>M MK</td>
<td>Ranke; stela.</td>
<td>Sect 2.3.1; “the Dwarf”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>I 388, 12</td>
<td>$T_{3y\text{-}m\text{-}hb}$</td>
<td>M NK</td>
<td>Ranke.</td>
<td>Sect 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>$T\text{-}hb.w$-$\varepsilon\varsigma$</td>
<td>M TIP</td>
<td>TIP shabtis, Figs. 1, 2 &amp; 3a.</td>
<td>Sect 1 &amp; 4.3; focus of this study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>$T_{3-t\text{-}hwB}$, $Dj-t\text{-}hwB$</td>
<td>TIP?</td>
<td>Watson,$^{101}$ shabti, <em>Birmingham</em>.</td>
<td>Sect 4.1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>I 374, 4</td>
<td>$Td\text{-}hb$</td>
<td>F LP</td>
<td>Ranke.</td>
<td>Sect 4.1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.1</td>
<td>II 330, 30</td>
<td>$T\ddot{s}-n\cdot hb\cdot w$</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Couyat &amp; Montet;\textsuperscript{102} W. Hammamat. Sect 5.2.1.4; Khnumibre’s ancestor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.2.1</td>
<td>I 386, 31</td>
<td>$T\ddot{s}-n\cdot hb$, $T\ddot{s}-n\cdot hb\cdot y$</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Ranke. Sect 5.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$T\ddot{s}-n\cdot hb$</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>deM&amp;Y Fig. 1, 3a; Strasbourg obelisk (not discussed).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.3.1</td>
<td>I 386, 30</td>
<td>[Ranke: $T\ddot{s}-n\cdot n\cdot hb\cdot w$]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Barsanti\textsuperscript{106} &amp; Bresciani;\textsuperscript{104,105} E, W, S walls.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.3.2</td>
<td>I 386, 30</td>
<td>$T\ddot{s}-n\cdot hb\cdot w$</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Barsanti\textsuperscript{106} &amp; Bresciani;\textsuperscript{107} E &amp; N walls, sarcophagus, shabtis,\textsuperscript{108} gold-work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.3.3</td>
<td>I 386, 30</td>
<td>$T\ddot{s}-hb\cdot w$</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Barsanti\textsuperscript{109} &amp; Bresciani;\textsuperscript{110} sarcophagus-sarcophagus, shabtis,\textsuperscript{108} gold-genius,\textsuperscript{110} us (once).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.4</td>
<td>Fig 1:3d</td>
<td>$T\ddot{s}-n\cdot n\cdot hb\cdot w$</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>25/26</td>
<td>Block statue, Cairo,\textsuperscript{111,112} Sect 5.2.1.2; Priest of Amun-Re</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.5</td>
<td>II 398</td>
<td>$T\ddot{s}-n\cdot hb\cdot w$</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Lodomez;\textsuperscript{113} bust, Roanne. Sect 5.2.1.3; Director of Mansions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.6</td>
<td>Fig 1:3c</td>
<td>$T\ddot{s}-hb\cdot w$</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Couyat &amp; Montet;\textsuperscript{114} W. Hammamat. Sect 5.2.1.4; Khnumibre’s ancestor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.7.1</td>
<td>Fig 1:3f</td>
<td>$T\ddot{s}-hb$</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>UCL;\textsuperscript{115} naophorous statue. Sect 5.2.1.5; Treasurer to King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.7.2</td>
<td>Fig 1:3f</td>
<td>$T\ddot{s}$</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>UCL;\textsuperscript{116} naophorous statue. Sect 5.2.1.5; Treasurer to King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7.1</td>
<td>Fig 2:6c</td>
<td>[deM&amp;Y: $T\ddot{s}-n\cdot hb(yt)$]</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reisner;\textsuperscript{117} canopies, Cairo. Sect 5.2.2.1; Son = Ankh-psamtik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7.2.1</td>
<td>II, 398</td>
<td>$T ś$-n-$h b y$</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Piehl;(^{118}) statue of Osiris, Munich. Sect 5.2.2.2; Son = Rei-irdjis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$T ś$-n-$h b y p$</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Piehl;(^{119}) statue of Osiris, Munich. Sect 5.2.2.2; Son = Rei-irdjis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7.3.1</td>
<td>I 387, 1</td>
<td>$T ś$-n-$h b$</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>26(?) David Nice;(^{120}) canopies, Trieste. Sect 5.2.2.3; mistress of the house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7.3.2</td>
<td>I 387, 1</td>
<td>$T ś$-n-$h b$</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>30 Schneider;(^{121}) shabti. Sect 5.2.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7.3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$T ś$-$h b$</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>30 Schneider;(^{122}) shabti. Sect 5.2.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>I 389, 18</td>
<td>$T ś t$-n-$h b i$, $T ś t$-n-$h s$-$h b i$</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>25 Legrain;(^{123}) stela, Cairo. Sect 5.2.2.4; wife to Chief of Rebit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Fig 2.9a</td>
<td>$T ś$-$h b$, $T ś$-($ś$)-h-b($ii$)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>26 Schiaparelli;(^{124}) coffin no. 26, Turin. Sect 5.2.2.5; mother of Mutenmehat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10.1.1</td>
<td>Fig 2.9c</td>
<td>$T ś$-n-$h z$</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>deM&amp;Y Fig. 2.9c; Harpocrates, Sect 5.2.2.6 ex Hilton-Price.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$T ś$-n-$h z$</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Griffith/PM 802-010-750;(^{125}) Harpo-Sect 5.2.2.6 crates, ex Hilton-Price.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10.2</td>
<td>Fig 2.9d</td>
<td>$T ś$.w-n-$h z$</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>deM&amp;Y, Fig. 2.9c; shabtis, Delta. Sect 5.2.2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-series</strong> (names that contain -$n b$, -$n b w$, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1.1</td>
<td>I 386, 29</td>
<td>$T ś$-n-$n b w$</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>12 Daressy;(^{126}) stela, bought at Qurna. Sect 2.1.2 &amp; 2.3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ts-n</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Daressy;\textsuperscript{127} stela, bought at Qurna. <strong>Sect 2.1.2 &amp; 2.3.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>I 387, 8</td>
<td><strong>Ts-nb</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Petrie;\textsuperscript{128} stela of Redikhnum, <strong>Sect 2.1.2 &amp; 2.3.2</strong> Dendera.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exotic forms** (X-series, probably unrelated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X1</th>
<th>I 391, 21</th>
<th><strong>Tny-m-hb</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>NK</th>
<th>Ranke <strong>Sect 6.1</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>I 386, 27</td>
<td><strong>Ts-n-izb</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Ranke <strong>Sect 6.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| X3 | **Tsy-nb**  
[\textsuperscript{L&Y}b: **Tsy-i-nbt**] | | M | LP | (27) \textsuperscript{L&Y};\textsuperscript{129} nomadic enemy of Napatan **kings. Sect 6.1** |

**Names similar to **Tsy** “Tjay”** (J-series)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J1.1.1</th>
<th><strong>Tsy</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>NK</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>Franzmeier\textsuperscript{130} &amp; OIM E11782,\textsuperscript{131} <strong>Sect 4.2</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1.1.2</td>
<td><strong>Tsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Franzmeier;\textsuperscript{132} tomb of Parahotep. <strong>Sect 4.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1.1.3</td>
<td><strong>Tsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Franzmeier\textsuperscript{133} &amp; OI E11782,\textsuperscript{134} <strong>Sect 4.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1.1.4</td>
<td><strong>Ty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Franzmeier;\textsuperscript{135} tomb of Parahotep; <strong>no longer equated to Tsy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1.2</td>
<td>I 389, 30</td>
<td><strong>Ty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1.3</td>
<td>I 389, 30</td>
<td><strong>Ty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Ranke. <strong>Sect 4.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1.5</td>
<td>I 388, 10</td>
<td>Ts4 [Ranke: Tsjj]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>11 Brunner,137 Hefner Stela, Berlin. Sect 4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1.6</td>
<td>I 388, 11</td>
<td>Ts4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>20 Kitchen,138 Sect 2.2; To, nicknamed Tjay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ts4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>19 Kitchen,139 Sect 2.2; Merenptah’s scribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>19 Kitchen,140 Sect 2.2; Merenptah’s scribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2.1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>19 Kitchen,141,142 Sect 2.2; Merenptah’s scribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2.1.4</td>
<td>I 376, 11</td>
<td>Ts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>19 Sethe,143 Reverse also found (Ranke). Sect 2.2; Merenptah’s scribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3.1</td>
<td>I 387, 11</td>
<td>Ts4i</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Ranke. Sect 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3.2</td>
<td>I 387, 11</td>
<td>Ts4i</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Ranke. Sect 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>25 Schiaparelli,144 coffin no. 25, Turin. Sect 2.2; Tja, father of Hetepamun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4.1</td>
<td>I 386, 22</td>
<td>Ts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Ranke. Sect 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4.2</td>
<td>I 386, 22</td>
<td>Ts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Ranke. Sect 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ranke)
A third-level number (e.g. the final numeral in H6.3.2) is used only to subdivide orthographies of the name belonging to a single person, including variant transliterations by scholars. Names in the H-series that depart substantially from the canonical form are in grey type.


Generally follows Ranke, unless his rendition diverges unacceptably from the hieroglyphs (e.g., in order to establish a connection with a known name). In such cases, Ranke’s transliteration is provided in square brackets for comparison.

Modern collection/museum location of object, if considered helpful, is given in italics.

Ibis mistakenly shown as quail chick by de Meulenaere &Yoyotte (1983) [ref. given in note b].

---

**Fig. 4 (following page). Compilation of orthographies.** Sources are given in Table 3. When a determinative appears to be integral to the name (or an orthography attested only once includes one) then it is shown here. Horizontal facsimiles and transcripts that have been flipped to match the reading direction of the photographic excerpts in the figure are marked with an asterisk (*). One horizontal transcript (marked #) has been rendered vertically to align with and complement the vertical entries shown adjacent to it. Extracts from photographs under copyright are reproduced by kind permission of Glenn Janes [H6.3.2]; David Nice [H7.3.1]; Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden [H7.3.2-7.3.3]; Osirisnet.net [J1.2]; and Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden [J1.5].
2. The name in the Middle Kingdom

2.1 Middle Kingdom forms of the name

2.1.1 Names involving -hb

\(Tz-n-hb\) [H1] is a male name (PN I 387, 2-3), and is presumably pronounced “Tjainheb” or “Tjaneheb.” In general, I shall assume the former, as this conforms better with the suppositions of previous researchers.\(^\text{145}\)

2.1.2 Names involving -nb

There are also Middle Kingdom names of the form \(Tz-n-nb(w)\) (PN I 386, 29) [N1.1] and \(Tz-nb\) (PN I 387, 8) [N2], which would range in pronunciation from “Tjainenebu” to “Tjaineb,” that commence with the duckling glyph \(G47\) for \(Tz\) - and use the collar glyph \(S12\) for \(nb(w)\). These are not only phonetically close to the name on the TIP shabtis but also visually close; remember that the Helios Gallery documentation had actually thought the name to contain \(nbw\) (Sect. 1.1), the ideogram built up from \(S12\) that is used to denote gold.\(^\text{146}\) These names are included for comparison in Table 3. As mentioned above (Sect. 1.2), it is unlikely that the basin-like symbol is actually a collar because the latter is generally drawn more completely in TIP shabti inscriptions (Fig. 3c(i)). However, the possibility will be revisited briefly below (Sect. 4.1.2).

2.2 \(Tz\) as an abbreviation of \(Tzy\)

\(Tz\) may be an abbreviated form of the name \(Tzy\), which means “man.”\(^\text{147}\) The abbreviation or nicknaming of \(Tzy\) [J2.1.1] as \(Tz\) [J2.1.2-4] is certainly attested in the New Kingdom, accompanied by a change in orthography.\(^\text{148}\) Kurt Sethe, nominating [J2.1.4] as the abbreviated name for Tjay [J2.1.1], the Scribe of Merenptah, observes that “it is now certainly not a special full name \(Tz\), meaning the ‘earth’ or ‘land,’ but a nickname \(T\) in ‘syllabic’ writing. We recognize it as an abbreviated form of the name \(Tsj\) whose \(T\) has presumably – as in so many cases – become a \(T\);”\(^\text{149}\) indeed, the sound value of \(t\) had become indistinguishable from that of \(t\) as early as the Old Kingdom. Another contraction of identical nature is known for Tjay, High Priest of Osiris, at the transition of the 18\(^{\text{th}}\) to the 19\(^{\text{th}}\) Dynasty.\(^\text{150}\) Conversely, in the New Kingdom we also find a son of Amennakhte named \(Tz\) (“To”) who repeatedly styles himself “scribe Tjay” in his own graffiti,\(^\text{151}\) spelling the name \(Tzy\) [J1.6].\(^\text{152}\) Another example of the equivalence occurs on an early 19\(^{\text{th}}\) Dynasty shabti for the “Chief Guardian of the Front Diadem of Pharaoh.”\(^\text{153}\)

Of course, \(Tz\) would be even closer than \(Tz\) to the full name, \(Tzy\). In the New Kingdom and Late Period, there is direct evidence for the use of \(Tz\) to write the name \(Tsi\) [J3.1-3.3], although here the determinatives indicate that we are dealing with the verb \(Tsi\), meaning “to take” or “to seize,” rather than the noun \(Tzy\), meaning “man.”\(^\text{154}\) The use of the verb form \(Tz-\) to begin Late Period names will be addressed in Sect. 5.1. If, for the Middle Kingdom onwards, we allow the corresponding loss of terminal \(yodhs\) from the noun and view \(Tz\) [J4.1-4.2] as a contraction of \(Tzy\) [J1.1.1-1.1.3, 1.4,
1.6 & 2.1.1], the original sense of $T_3-n$-$hb$ could have been “the man of/for the festival;” in full, the genitive option would read $T_3-n$-$y$-$hb$. Ranke certainly takes the $hb$ component in names ending with -$hb$ and -$hbw$ to mean “festival.”\[156\]

**2.3 Middle Kingdom bearers of the name**

**2.3.1 Names involving -$hb$**

From von Bergmann (1892) we know that two names related to $T_3-n$-$hb$ [H1] occur on limestone stela no. 61 in the Egyptian Antiquities Collection of the Austrian Imperial Family.\[157\] No findspot is reported for the stela, but the inscription in its lunette relates to an Imensat who was a chantress of Montu of Madu, the latter being a town located 8 km NE of Thebes.\[158\] The writing of the first name [H1.1.0] is somewhat confounded and is open to competing interpretations that will be assessed in Sect. 2.4, but for now we can take it that its bearer was a man called $T_3-n$-$hb$ $s^3$ [H1.1.1], “Tjainheb the Great,” and that he was a baker. His inscription on the stela is followed immediately by mention of another man bearing the same personal name, Tjainheb the Dwarf [H1.2.1]. Even in the Old Kingdom, dwarfs were seen as useful and valued members of society, and worked as craftsmen, officials, servants and entertainers.\[159\]

Both men are described by von Bergmann as sphragistae, a class of priests responsible for checking the ritual purity of sacrificial cattle,\[160\] but seemingly only because he has misinterpreted the hieroglyphs for $nb$ $imsh$ (Fig. 5a) hyper-literally as “lord of the meat-offerings” rather than idiomatically as “possessor of reverence” or “revered one.”\[161\] This phrase is an epithet applied to a deceased person, and the people before whom a dead man is an $imsh$.w are usually responsible for maintaining his funerary estate.\[162,163\] Perhaps von Bergmann makes this unusual interpretation of the $nb$ $imsh$ symbol-group because the first occurrence of hieroglyph $F40$ (a portion of backbone suggestive of a meat offering)\[164\] in this excerpt has a vertical line beneath it which looks like a logographic stroke. Moreover, von Bergmann seems to read the symbol-group as a title or job description preceding the second and third names in the inscription (the two Tjainhebs), whereas the two occurrences of $nb$ $imsh$ actually terminate the columns of text for the first and second names. It would therefore make more sense to see the epithet as appended to Seneb and Tjainheb the Great, in the same way as $nb$ $imsh$ is appended to the protagonist’s name in the Ikhernofret Stela (Berlin 1204), where it concludes a list of Ikhernofret’s accolades and terminates a line of text (Fig. 5b).\[165\] Tjainheb the Dwarf must also be presumed dead at the time of the inscription,\[166\] because both Tjainhebs are listed as $m^3$-$hwrw$, “true of voice.”

Viewed in context, the epithet “the Great” is less likely to be an accolade for Tjainheb the baker and more likely to be a way of distinguishing him from his diminutive contemporary; it might be rendered colloquially as “Big Tjainheb.” Tjainheb the Great is listed in Ranke’s compendium (PN I 387, 2); Tjainheb the Dwarf is the subject of Ranke’s next entry (PN I 387, 3), which will be discussed further in Sect. 2.4. The two entries are cited by Hari & Chappaz (1980) as relevant to the name on the two parallels to the Australian shabti listed in their paper (Sect. 1.2). In contrast, Ranke’s entries for these two Tjainhebs were not included in the detailed
survey of this type of name by de Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983) because these authors limited their scope to the Late Period. Other nearby entries in Ranke’s compendium, being assigned to that era, were captured in their analysis; these will be discussed in Sect. 5.

2.3.2 Names involving -nb

\textit{T}s-\textit{n-bw} [N1.1] is a female name for a deceased person who appears near the end of a listing of family members on a gravestone, CG20429 (JE29244). This rectangular limestone stela, which was acquired at Gournah/Qurna, dates from the Middle Kingdom. Transcripts from this stela, which commemorates a herald named Ibia’-Intef,\textsuperscript{171} are presented in two publications, both over a century old.\textsuperscript{172,173} The extract containing the name of interest (Fig. 6a(i)) repeats in tandem some of the names of family members of the deceased; for \textit{T}s-\textit{n-bw}, the second version is the abbreviation \textit{T}s-\textit{n} [N1.2]. The extract commences “Khnumihapyt, issue of Bebi, her daughter Tjainenebu, true of voice, Tjain, true of voice, Memi, true of voice, her son Intef, true of voice, Intef, true of voice…” \textit{T}s-\textit{n} features again in the lower register of the extract (Fig. 6a(i)), where – confusingly – it carries the male determinative \textit{A1} but is followed by the feminine epithet \textit{ms}\textsuperscript{c}.\textit{t-hrw}. Perhaps the male determinative reflects an understanding of \textit{T}s as a contraction of \textit{T}s\textit{y}, “man,” as suggested in Sect. 2.2. Either way, it is clear from the upper register that \textit{T}s-\textit{n} is an abbreviation of the female name \textit{T}s-\textit{n-bw}.
Fig. 6. Middle Kingdom stelae. (a) Transcripts from the stela of Ibiaʿ-Intef (CG20430). (i) Inscription mentioning the female name $T\dot{s}$-n-nbw and its abbreviation $T\dot{s}$-n, with the names boxed in red. (ii) Caption mentioning the female name $T\dot{s}$-m-hb. (b) On the stela of Redikhnum (CG20543), the protagonist’s friend $T\dot{s}$-nb has a shaved head and offers two geese; his name is inscribed opposite his face. All now public domain.

Interestingly, another register on the same stela shows a woman with the caption $s\dot{s}.t\dot{s}f \ T\dot{s}$-$m$-$hb$ (Fig. 6a(ii)), “his daughter Taimheb.” The last syllable is given by the booth-and-pole glyph O22, which is well known as the upper part of $hb$ symbol W4. While at face value O22 specifies $sh$, it formerly specified $hb$ even when used on its own, and Ranke recognises O22 as $hb$ in the Middle Kingdom name $T\dot{s}$-$m$-$hb$ (PN I 376, 19). This name, which means “the land is in festival,” can be borne by both men and women (Sect. 3). $T\dot{s}$-$m$-$hb$ is mentioned on another stela for Ibiaʿ-Intef (CG20430, JE 29243), whereas $T\dot{s}$-n-nbw is not. While the names $T\dot{s}$-$m$-$hb$ and $T\dot{s}$-n-nbw are evidently distinct, their co-occurrence within a single family is interesting. In addition, it seems from the two stelae that this family made repeated use of names involving the nbw collar glyph S12.
$T\text{-}n\text{b}$ [N2] is a male name that appears on the stela of Redikhnum, which was found in the cemetery at Dendera, some 60 km north of Thebes. The stela, which is now housed in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (CG20543), dates from the reign of King Mentuhotep II of the 11th Dynasty, and thus from the beginning of the Middle Kingdom. Although it was in poor condition, Flinders Petrie described it as the most important find in the cemetery. Redikhnum (Chnemerdu or Khnumerdu in older literature) was a steward of the lady Neferukayet, who in turn was the king’s favourite, Heiress of the South, the daughter of a king and beloved wife of a king. This Neferukayet may in fact be Queen Neferu I, wife of Mentuhotep I, or alternatively the wife of Intef II Wahankh. Neferukayet inherited from her mother a large fortune which made her “chief of the people from Elephantine as far as Aphroditopolis,” the latter being in the 10th nome of Upper Egypt. The scene at the end of the stela (Fig. 6b) shows a servant, Intef, pouring unguent from a vase before Redikhnum, who is seated on a chair under (or beside) which sits a dog. Behind Intef appear three friends of Redikhnum, named by Petrie as “Adedu, Apuy and Tha-nub.” This “Tjaineb” has a shaved head and holds offerings; specifically, in each hand he holds a goose by the base of its wings (Fig. 6b, at bottom right).

2.4 Middle Kingdom complexities

Many images are available in the database of Egyptian stelae in the Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien, but unfortunately there is no photograph of the one that served as a source for von Bergmann (Sect. 2.3.1). We must therefore rely completely upon his recording of the inscription (Fig. 5a).

Von Bergmann seems to believe that the bowl ($nw$-pot) $W24$ in the first name [H1.1.1], which is mysteriously placed before rather than after the $T\text{-}$ (giving at face value the anomalous $Nw-T\text{-}n\text{-}h\text{b}$ $T\text{-}$, [H1.1.0]), is a corruption of beer-jug plus quail-chick, i.e. $W22-Z7$, $wdpw$ (“cook, butler”). Von Bergmann seems to view the word as qualifying the previous symbol-group (which consists of bread glyphs) and thus proposes that the man was a “bread-cook” or baker. In a footnote (Fig. 5c), he promotes this interpretation [H1.1.2] over seeing the pot/bowl $W24$ as a faulty plural ($n.w$) for the genitive adjective $n(, y)$, “of, belonging to.” Von Bergmann actually renders both names [H1.1.1 & 1.2.1] as “Taheb,” even though the stela shows the $W24$ pot/bowl in the normal position the second man’s name, i.e., between $T\text{-}$ and $-h\text{b}$.

The beer-jug glyph shown by von Bergmann in his footnote [H1.1.2] has a fill-line or collar but no handles; as such, it is actually intermediate between the handleless beer-jug glyph $W22$ (which has a fill-line or collar) and the jar-with-handles glyph $W23$ (which does not). These two glyphs are in fact interchangeable in the word $wdpw$, and the Wörterbuch uses exactly the same composite vessel as von Bergmann in $wdpw$ (Fig. 5d) and elsewhere. For some reason, Ranke opts to replace the $W24$ pot/bowl with the composite beer-jug hieroglyph only in the second name [H1.2.2], a revision that – in von Bergmann’s scheme – could be justified solely for the first one. For the second name, Ranke sensibly avoids $T\text{-}wpw-h\text{b}$ in favour of the far more credible transliteration $T\text{-}n\text{-}h\text{b}$, albeit with a question-mark after the $n$. Present in both [H1.1.1] and [H1.2.1], Ranke’s $-n(?)$- convention also
encompasses the alternate possibilities of *nw* and *in* for the *w24*-pot by focusing attention on the shared consonant.195

There is in fact another path to the identification of the first man as a baker. In this understanding, the pot/bowl *w24* in [H1.1.0] appears before the *T3*- because it completes the word *kfn*- that precedes the bread determinatives in von Bergmann’s transcript, thereby forming the word *kfn.w*, “baker” [H.1.1.3].196 The interruption of the word by the three bread glyphs may reflect an error on the part of the original scribe; for example, if one pot/bowl *w24* was intended at the end of the phonetic portion of *kfn.w* and another after the duckling *G47*, but only one was actually written (in an intermediate position), then we would replicate what von Bergmann reported. Alternatively, the interruption *kfn.w* by the bread symbols may be an inaccuracy introduced during von Bergmann’s transposition of ambiguously-positioned glyphs from their initial vertical register to the horizontal one on the printed page.197

Overall, the near-identity of the hieroglyphic forms of the two names (Fig. 4, [H1.1.0] & [H1.2.1]), their mention in tandem, and the provision of distinguishing epithets for the two bearers suggests strongly that the two men shared the same name, *T3-n-hḥb*. Ranke arrives at the same conclusion (PN I 387, 2-3). While the personal name of Tjainheb the Great has become entangled with the glyphs that describe the man’s occupation, it is reasonable to assume that his full name-and-epithet combination is best represented by *T3-n-hḥb ṣs* [H1.1.1] and that his counterpart’s is best represented by *T3-n-hḥb nmw* [H1.2.1].

3. The name in the New Kingdom

*Tsy-m-hḥb* [H2] is a male name (PN I 388, 12), presumably vocalised “Tjaimheb,” which Hari & Chappaz (1980) view as a later variant of *T3-n-hḥb*.198 Such a modification of the central consonant does seem likely, as an *n* to *m* transition would make the name conform to the common format of *Hr-m-hḥb* (PN I 248, 7), *Pḥ-m-hḥb* (PN I 140, 2), etc. The change would alter the sense of the name to something like “man-in-jubilation,” which might be compared with name *T3-m-hḥb*, “the land is in festival” (PN I 376, 19; Sect. 2.3.2). For the Middle Kingdom, Ranke lists male and female examples for *T3-m-hḥb*, whereas for the New Kingdom he provides only a male example. Given the known abbreviation of *Tsy* to *Ts* in the New Kingdom (Sect. 2.2), *Tsy-m-hḥb* and *T3-m-hḥb* might even be applied interchangeably to the same man.

4. The name in the Third Intermediate Period

4.1 TIP forms of the name

4.1.1 Names involving -ḥḥb

The name *T-ḥḥb.w-ḥḥb* [H3] is the one inscribed on the TIP shabtis that formed the impetus for this project (Sect. 1). It is actually closer to Middle Kingdom than New Kingdom forms of the name. Relative to the Middle Kingdom form *T3-n-hḥb ṣs* [H1.1.1], we see a loss of the weak central consonant *n*, a loss of the first ḳ, the gain of
a .w for plural, and retention of the epithet ‘s at the end. If the Middle Kingdom name is actually  $T3-n.y$-hb (Sect. 2.2), then the loss of the central $n(.)y$ could merely reflect a change from indirect to direct genitive.

At face value, the name for the TIP shabti owner, “Tjehebu the Great,” is actually very close to von Bergmann’s rendering of the Middle Kingdom equivalent (Sect. 2.4) as “Taheb der Grosse” (Fig. 5a).

4.1.2 Names involving -nb

For the Middle Kingdom, we saw that there are names of the form $T3-n-nb(w)$ [N1.1] and $T3-nb$ [N2] that commence with the duckling glyph $G47$ and use the collar glyph $S12$ (Sect. 2.1.2). Although we have concluded that it is unlikely that the basin-like symbol on the TIP shabtis depicts a collar, it remains possible that there is a sort of “hieroglyphic pun” or double entendre at work, both on the visual and the phonetic level.¹⁹⁹ The plural $hb$-basin does resemble the $nbw$ symbol-cluster (Fig. 3d(i-ii)), and sounding it as the latter (“Tjenebu”) would restore the lost central $n$ to the name. The near-homophone $T3-n-hb.w$ is a male name that we will encounter when considering the Late Period (Sect. 5.1.1 & 5.2.1.4). Its variant $T3-n-n(A)-hb.w$ (Sect. 5.1.1, 5.2.1.1 & 5.2.1.2) contains a potential phonetic counterpart to the doubled $n$ of $T3-n-nb(w)$ [N1.1].

Equally, the visual similarity of the $hb$-basin – especially in the simplified form drawn on the shabtis – to the wicker basket $V30$, phonetic $nb$ (Sect. 1.2), has the same effect (Fig. 3d(ii-iii)). Sounded as $T-nb.w$ (“Tjenebu”), the name once again regains its central $n$ sound.

4.1.3 Another name of interest

There may be a name with some similarity to $T3y-n-hb$ on Birmingham Museum’s shabti no. 200, an undated bright blue faience shabti with crude black calligraphy (and thus most likely made during the TIP).²⁰⁰ The name ([H4], Fig. 4) is recorded in the museum’s catalogue as “T(3)-di-m-hwb (?))” but is more probably $T-t-hwb or Di-t-hwb$, perhaps a variant of the Late Period name whose orthography literally reads $Td-hb$ [H5], but which Ranke tentatively renders $T3-di(.t)-hb$ (PN I 374.4).²⁰¹ If the last three strokes on the Birmingham shabti are a plural rather than a poorly-drawn $msz$-hrw glyph (see ahead to Section 5.1.2.2 and Fig. 8b(v,viii)), then the name would be $T-t-hwb.w$ or $Di-t-hwb.w$, pronounced something like “Ta-tjehubu” or “Dji-tjehubu.” The $t-hwb(.w)$ component of this name makes an interesting comparison with the $T-hb.w$ of the TIP shabtis [H3].

4.2 The names $T3y$ and $Ty$

From Table 1, we can see that the evolution of the Egyptian word for shabti shows a change over time from an initial biliteral glyph ($M8$), $Sz$, to the uniliteral ($N37$), $s$, which then becomes prefixed by yet another a uniliteral ($G43$ or $Z7$), $w$. The first transition – conversion of an initial biliteral to a uniliteral, with loss of an $s$ – is
similar to the one we must propose for the first syllable of $T_3-n-hb$ or $T_5y-m-hb$, if we are to convert them into the orthography on the shabtis of Figs. 1, 2 & 3a. In this case, the initial duckling glyph $G47$ (biliteral $T$, as seen in the Middle Kingdom and New Kingdom examples [H1.1.1-1.2.2 & H2]) must change into the tether symbol $V13$ (uniliteral $T$, as found on the TIP shabtis [H3]). From Sect. 2.2., we know that the $T_3$ may be a contraction of $T_5y$, “man;” the word even appears in full in [H2]. Obviously, the hypothesis that the initial glyph of $T_3-n-hb$ [H1.1.1-1.2.1] or $T_5y-m-hb$ [H2] changes from duckling ($G47$) to tether ($V13$) would be strengthened greatly if a similar conversion could be demonstrated for the noun $T_5y$ or the personal name derived from it, especially around the time of the New Kingdom.

In a recent analysis of Ramesside finds at Sedment el-Gebel, Henning Franzmeier postulated that the name $T_5y$ (“Tjay”) [J1.1.1-1.1.3] is equivalent to $T_5y$ (“Tjy”) [J1.1.4], a mutation caused by loss of the $s$ and thus accompanied by a change in orthography from the initial duckling glyph $G47$ [J1.1.1-1.1.2] to the tether symbol $V13$ [J1.1.4]. These changes match precisely those required in the first syllable of $T_3-n-hb$ [H1.1.1-1.2.2] or $T_5y-m-hb$ [H2] to generate the orthography at the start of $T-hb.w$ [H3], the name on the TIP shabtis. However, despite a claim that “[t]he name Tjay or Tjy occurs on two objects in each variant,” a re-examination of the Sedment finds revealed that the two names do not co-appear on any one object. Specifically, two forms of $T_5y$ [J1.1.1 & J1.1.3] appear together on a $nms.t$ vessel of blue-green faience (Chicago Oriental Institute E11782), while the instance of $T_5y$ is confined to a fragment of a white faience shabti (E11779). This circumstance leaves open the possibility – indeed likelihood – that the two names belong to different individuals. $T_5y$ is in fact well attested as a male name from the Old Kingdom (PN I 389, 30). For example, the 5th Dynasty mastaba of $T_5y$ in Saqqara is one of the best-known Old Kingdom tombs, being renowned both for the quality of its decoration and for its state of preservation. This $T_5y$ [J1.2] spelled his name using precisely the orthography claimed for Sedment find E11779 [J1.1.4]. The name persisted into the New Kingdom, where Ranke attests it of women [J1.3] rather than men [J1.1.4].

Although $T_5y$ can no longer be considered an abbreviated form of $T_5y$, the latter name does offer other variants that support the identification of the first syllable of $T-hb.w$ [H3] with that of $T_3-n-hb$ [H1.1.1-1.2.2]. For example, from Ranke we can see Middle Kingdom examples of Tjay in which the initial glyph can be either the duckling $G47$ [J1.4] or the tether $V13$ [J1.5]. The latter example occurs on the Hefner Stela from Thebes (Berlin 1197), where one of the two instances of $T_5y$ was originally misrecorded in the literature as $T_{s}i$. Tjay was Hefner’s eldest son and the donor of the stela, on which he is pictured offering a goose. Although this variant of Tjay commences with the tether $V13$, as does the $T-hb.w$ on the TIP shabtis, the spelling retains the $s$ of the first syllable. In this it resembles other known abbreviations of $T_5y$, such as $T_3$ (Sect. 2.2). Genuine contractions of $T_5y$ that omit the $s$ have yet to be identified.

4.3 TIP bearers of the name

The name for the TIP shabti owner is $T-hb.w-s'3$ [H3], “Tjehebu the Great.” If the Tjeheb portion is a contraction of $T_5y-n-hb$ and our earlier interpretation of that name
is correct (Sect. 2.2), then the suffixation of $hb$ by $.w$ by will change “festival” to the plural and the sense of the modified name (Tjehebu) will be “the man of/for the festivals.”

Beyond that, no information about the original owner of the TIP shabtis has come to light. For example, no suitable name is listed among the few known Theban tombowners of the TIP$^{211}$ or among the names inscribed on shabtis or coffins of the two Deir el-Bahri caches.$^{212,213}$

5. The name in the Late Period

5.1 Late Period forms of the name

In Chappaz’s catalogue, hosted online by the Société d’Égyptologie de Genève, the forms $T\text{sw-n-hb}$, $T\text{sw-n-hbw}$ and $T\text{s-n-hb}(y\text{t})$ have the most attestations, amounting to 48 in total (Sect. 1.3). These versions are closest to Middle Kingdom and TIP forms of the name. In all cases, the final $\text{ts}$ present in some of these earlier forms has been dropped. In most versions there has been a replacement of $h$ with $h$, which is supposedly accompanied by the gain of a $w$ suffix for $\text{ts}$; however, the $w$ seems to be an interpolation by the catalogue compiler to conform with the assumption of de Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983) that this sound is present but not written. The latter do not explain why they assume this; perhaps they are thinking of the noun $\text{tsw}$, “bearer,” where the final $w$ is explicit in the hieroglyphs, and the related verb $\text{tsw}$, “to seize,” where it is usually omitted.$^{214}$ Where $h$ is present, the name may acquire a $y$ at the end, which has been interpreted by de Meulenaere & Yoyotte as an abbreviation for $y\text{t}$; this is discussed below (Sect. 5.1.2.1).

As before (Sect. 2.2), one might reasonably expect the initial $T\text{s}$- to be an abbreviated form of the word $\text{tsy}$, “man.” Despite its male connotations, some use of $\text{tsy}$ as a female name is attested back in the Middle Kingdom (PN I 388, 11), suggesting that gender would not disqualify females from names beginning with $T\text{s}$-; indeed, in the Late period, we shall see that forms of the name such as $T\text{s-n-hb}$ and $T\text{s-n-hb}(y\text{t})$ were popular for women (Sect. 5.1.2). In line with this, Hans Schneider takes the female name $T\text{s-n-hb}$ to be a shortened form of $T\text{sy-n-hb}$. A further interpretation of $T\text{s}$- that is independent of gender, and that may have operated in the Late Period, will be described in the next subsection (Sect. 5.1.1). In Hellenistic Egypt, $\text{tsy}$ was routinely used to mean “carrier” or “bearer” (cf. Middle Egyptian $\text{tsw}$, mentioned above).$^{216}$

Some Late Period names that commence with $T\text{s}$-, and which typically start with the duckling glyph $G47$, are imprecatory declarations of the formula “May the god $N.$ seize them!” (where $N.$ is replaced by the name of a divine being). Examples cited in Marianne Guentch-Ogloueff’s study of such names include $T\text{sy-imn-im.w}$ (May Amun seize them!; PN I 387, 14), $T\text{s(y)-in-\text{hr}.t-im.w}$ (May Onuris seize them!; PN I 387, 15) and $T\text{s(y)-ss.t-im.w}$ (May Isis seize them!; PN I 387, 12);$^{217}$ in many cases,$^{218}$ the $yodhs$ in $T\text{sy}$ are not specified explicitly. Such names, which first
appeared in the 22nd Dynasty and persisted until Roman times, direct the god’s wrath in a clandestine manner towards foreign rulers of Egypt, who (for pragmatic reasons) are not named outright.\textsuperscript{219} However, it makes no sense to view $Tsw-n\text{-}hb(w)$, $Tz-n\text{-}hb(y)$, etc. as names of this type, as the rest of the name is a poor fit to the formula. Better explanations exist; they will be discussed below. In line with this understanding, Guentch-Ogloueff’s study of imprecatorial personal names makes no mention of names such as $Tsw-n\text{-}hb(w)$.

5.1.1 Male names: “Descendant of the ibis”

$Tz(w)\text{-}n\text{-}hb(w)$, “Tja(u)neheb(u),” or $Tz(i)\text{-}n\text{-}hb(w)$, “Tja(i)neheb(u)” is a male name.\textsuperscript{220,221} From Faulkner, $hb$ could mean an ibis or a plough (both nouns), or to tread, send, travel, or enter (all verbs).\textsuperscript{222} The bird is clearly the referent in the Ptolemaic-era name ‘nh\text{-}ns\text{-}hb.\text{w} (PN I 64, 20), which means “the ibises live.” Ranke (PN II 330.30) interprets the 26th Dynasty name $Tz-n\text{-}hb.\text{w} [H6.1], where a duckling (G47) – or, more generically, a fledgling\textsuperscript{223} – provides the initial syllable and a sacred ibis (G26*) and plural determinative (Z3) provide the final syllables, quite ideogrammatically in the translation “Ibis-chick,” an interpretation attributed to Gerhard Fecht (1952). This is presumably a more natural rendering of the literal reading of $Tz-n(.)\text{-}hb.\text{w}$ as “A chick of the ibises.” Application of the same logic to $Tz-n\text{-}hb$ (Ranke I 386, 31) [H6.2.1] would yield “A chick of the ibis,” but this is not stated. As an ideogram, the duckling glyph G47 means “child.”\textsuperscript{224}

Writing about the Overseer of the King’s Ships (Sect. 5.2.1.1), Edda Bresciani comments that his name – whose canonical form he specifies as $Tsy-n-(ns)\text{-}hb\text{w}$ – is relatively rare.\textsuperscript{225} He interprets it as “The nest-egg of the (sacred) ibis.”\textsuperscript{226,227} Bresciani identifies this as a Memphite name because “ibises were objects of worship at Memphis, raised lovingly by the living, and buried with care in tombs in the necropolis of Saqqara after death.”\textsuperscript{228}

In an extension of Ranke and Fecht’s logic, de Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983) treat the duckling $Tz\text{-} (G47)$ at the start of this type of Late Period personal name as an ideogram signifying “offshoot, descendant,”\textsuperscript{229} after which comes -n- and the name of a divinity or place. They go on to parse the name $Tz(w)\text{-}n\text{-}(ns)\text{-}hb\text{w}$ and its variants [H6.1-6.7] as $Tz(w)\text{-}n\text{-}$ “Descendant of” plus $n\text{-}(ns)\text{-}hb\text{w}$, without specifying which divinity they have in mind. “Nahebu” might at first sight appear to specify the god Nehebu-Kau (literally, “he who harnesses the spirits”),\textsuperscript{230} thus making the bearer a protégé of this invincible snake-god, but the god’s name – $Nhbw-kz.\text{w}$ – uses $h$ rather than $h$. It is much more likely that de Meulenaere & Yoyotte again take $hb\text{w}$ to mean $hb\text{.w}$ “ibises,” an interpretation supported by the use of the sacred ibis glyphs G26/G26* in the orthographies [H6.1-6.2.2 & H6.4-6.7.1]. If one takes $hb\text{.w}$ as a collective noun, the name as a whole would mean “Descendant of the ibises.” Günter Vittmann’s recent translation, “Scion of the (sacred) ibises,” also sees the ibis as the divine referent.\textsuperscript{231} Accordingly, the name $Tz(w)\text{-}n\text{-}(ns)\text{-}hb\text{w}$ would identify the bearer as a descendant of the god Thoth.\textsuperscript{232} While indirect, this level of convolution would not be out of place. For example, the final part of the preceding name in de Meulenaere & Yoyotte’s table, $Tz-n\text{-}mi(t)$, is explained in a footnote as “the (female) cat,”\textsuperscript{233} with a later footnote mentioning that $mi(t)$ probably denotes the goddess.
This represents another instance in which the link to a divinity occurs via an animal, and indeed by a connection far less secure than the identification of the ibis with Thoth.\(^{235}\) For the other names in their table, the divinity is identified explicitly within the name: \(T\text{t}-n-hr\) nominates Horus, and \(T\text{t}-n-hnsw\) specifies Khonsu.\(^{236}\)

### 5.1.2 Female names

#### 5.1.2.1 \(T\text{t}-n-hb\), “Originally of Behbeit.”

\(T\text{t}-n-hb\) [H7.1 & H7.3.1-7.3.2] is a female name (PN I 387, 1) in which the final component is sometimes followed by a terminal \(y\) [H7.2.1]; it is presumably pronounced “Tjainheb(\(y\)).” De Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983) interpret the \(hby\) as shorthand for \((Pr-)Hbyt(\(y\)),\(^{237}\) and thus take it to mean Behbeit el-Hagar in the Central Delta,\(^{218}\) about 15 km north of Busiris.\(^{239}\) By implication, all of their \(T\text{t}-n-hb\) examples should be interpreted as \(T\text{t}-n-hbyt(\(y\)), meaning “Originally of Behbeit.” The site is known for its Temple of Isis (Iseion); Christine Favard-Meeks distinguishes between \(Hbyt\) (literally, “the festival hall”) and \(Pr-Hby\) (“the estate of Hebit”) as denoting the temple and the town, respectively.\(^{240}\) She also cautions that Hebit and Per-Hebite(t) are “recurrent in other parts of Egypt,” so that mentions of such a name – which are found in sources from the New Kingdom onwards – need not necessarily refer to Behbeit.\(^{241}\)

De Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983) cite only Montet’s \textit{Géographie de l’Égypte Ancienne} for instances of the Egyptian place-name for Behbeit. From a comparison of their examples of personal names with Montet’s toponyms (Fig. 7(i) & (iii-iv)), the correspondence is unconvincing. For the \(-hbyt(\(y\))\) component, none of the personal names presented by de Meulenaere & Yoyotte [H7.1, 7.2.1 & 7.3.1] or Ranke [H7.3.2] contains an explicit \(t\) at or near the end, three of the four names lack any \(y\) or \(l\), and none carry a place-name determinant. The toponyms from Montet are also unhelpful to the comparison. For example, only one of the place-names (Fig. 7(iii)) uses uniliterals to specify the \(hb\) component, a feature common to almost all of the personal names, and there the similarity ends; this place-name lacks the \(hb\)-basin glyph (W3/4) common to all but one of the personal names, and includes two uniliterals (\(q\, t\)) found in none of them. One might at this point consider the connection proposed by de Meulenaere & Yoyotte to be untenable. However, a form of \(Hbyt\) used in the Temple of Isis (Iseion) on the site (Fig. 7(ii)),\(^{242}\) an orthography unmentioned by Montet,\(^{243}\) may in fact represent the most canonical spelling of the place-name.\(^{244}\) As it commences with the uniliterals for \(hb\), followed by a \(y\) and the \(hb\)-basin glyph W4, it aligns well with segments of most of the personal names; in its entirety, it is especially close to [H7.2.1]. The inclusion of this version in the comparison, along with some additional examples of personal names, swings the balance decisively in favour of de Meulenaere & Yoyotte’s proposal (Fig. 7).

\(T\text{t}-n-hby\) [H7.2.1] is also recorded a second time in the source stela as \(T\text{t}-n-hbyp\) [H7.2.2],\(^{245}\) a fact unmentioned by Ranke or de Meulenaere & Yoyotte. It is tempting to see the final \(p\) (Q3) as a mis-rendering of the final \(t\) (X1) of \(Hbyt\) or of its place-name determinative, O49; such a mutation could reflect an error on the part of the original scribe or a misreading/misprinting of the inscription by Piehl in 1888.\(^{246}\)
Fig. 7. Comparison of versions of T3-n-hb and Hbyt(y). Hbyt(y) is the ancient name for Behbeit el-Hagar. Personal names are identified by their index in Table 3 and are facsimiles of hieroglyphs in the following sources: [H7.2.1-7.2.2], Pichl; [H7.1], Reisner; [H7.3.1], Civico Museo di Storia ed Arte; [H7.3.2], Schneider; [H7.3.3], Schneider. The toponyms are identified by Roman numerals: (i) Pr-Hby, a toponym from the New Kingdom onwards which underpins the modern Arabic name Behbeit; (ii) Hbyt, a form used in the Iseion on the site; (iii) Hdbt, a place where Isis had been struck or beaten according to Pyramid Text 1272c-d, which Montet identifies as a variant of Hbt; and (iv) Hbt, a place name older than (i) and declared by Montet (with the mistransliteration 2bt) to have numerous examples in the Iseion. To aid comparisons, determinatives have been omitted from personal names, and irrelevant portions of the names of persons and places have been de-emphasised in grey.

A consideration of the site and its history raises some issues relevant to our onomastic exercise. By way of background, we should note that the Iseion of Behbeit, which currently lies in ruins, may be the Iseum referred to by Roman authors. The site appears to have been favoured by both of the kings named Nectanebo; Nectanebo I, the first king of the 30th Dynasty, considered himself “beloved of Osiris-Hemag, the great god which lives in Behbeit,” while the third and final king of that dynasty, Nectanebo II, included the name hbyt in his nomen, Nakht-hor-hebyt. The construction of the temple was begun by Nectanebo II and was continued or modified by Ptolemies II and III. Isis, the Lady of Hebit, was the main focus of its cultic rites. The eighteenth-century travellers who discovered the ruins in the modern era
mistakenly believed that they were the remains of the Temple of Isis that Herodotus had described at Busiris (Histories II, Ch. 59).263

If construction of the Iseion was not begun until the end of the 30th Dynasty, this raises the question of how the name Hbyt features in personal names of the 26th Dynasty ([H7.1]). The answer is that cult and festival activities occurred at the site long before the construction of the late temple. Set-wah-ikhet, the name for the site in a mythology text of the TIP known as the Delta Papyrus, means “the place where offerings are set down,”264 it refers to the offerings placed before a clay statue of Osiris Khenty-imnetet, built anew there each year, to ensure his rebirth.265,266 These TIP ceremonies may have been sheltered only by temporary structures built for the occasion. A statue-cult for some of the late Saite kings (late 26th Dynasty) is also attested at Behbeit, so it is very likely that these rulers had constructed a temple there before the Iseion was begun.267 The only other occurrence of a personal name of the form Tz-n-hbyt with a dynastic assignment [H7.3.1-7.3.3] belongs to the 30th Dynasty; accordingly, it may reflect Nectanebo II’s interest in Behbeit and the commencement of work on its Iseion.

5.1.2.2 Tz-n-hbyt, “Originally of Khemmis.”

Tz-n-hbyt,268 “Tjainchebit,” is another female name listed by de Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983). These authors interpret hbyt to mean sh-bit, i.e., Khemmis (sh-bi.t), a place near Buto in the Eastern Delta (and thus unrelated to the Khemmis in Upper Egypt that is now known as Akhmim).269 It is within the papyrus marshes of this Khemmis that Isis is said to have given birth to Horus.270,271 Like that in Sect 5.1.2.1, the connection between the personal name and the toponym is less than straightforward, as the distinctive bee glyph L2 (usually transliterated bi.t) that is present in normal forms of the place-name272,273 is absent from all of the personal names allocated to this group [H8-10.2]. Moreover, in most names (whether of persons or places) it is necessary that the papyrus-clump glyph M16 (normally hs) be read as the papyrus-clump glyph M15 (sh) and repositioned or taken as a determinative (Fig. 8a). As determinatives or ideograms, these papyrus-clump symbols denote the Delta or Lower Egypt in general.274

The identification of the personal name with Khemmis is convincing for orthographies in which the hbyt is specified phonetically, such as de Meulenaere & Yoyotte’s Fig. 2:9a-b, i.e. names [H8-9]. This is especially true for [H9] as this orthography combines (in a compound glyph) the canonical papyrus clump for Khemmis, M15, with the place-name symbol (Fig. 8a, viii). In this reading, the personal names [H8-9] mean “Originally of Khemmis.” Such a reading is also credible for names where only the papyrus clump M16 is present, followed by a determinative that looks like a diminutive herb glyph M2, as this determinative (which has its origins in the obligatory papyrus clump)275 is distinctive for late forms of the name Khemmis.276 The presence of this determinative provides much-needed support for the claim that de Meulenaere & Yoyotte’s Fig. 2:9c-d, i.e. [H10.1.1 & H10.2] – which at face value read Ts(.w)-n-hs – should be read Ts(.w)-n-hbi.t.
Fig. 8. Comparison of versions of $\text{T}_3-n$-$\text{hblt}$ and $\text{sh-bl.t}$. (a) Versions of $\text{T}_3-n$-$\text{hblt}$ are compared with versions of $\text{sh-bl.t}$, the ancient name for Khemmis. (b) Similarity of “herb determinative” and single-glyph $\text{mAa(.t)-xrw}$. Entry (b)(viii) is a facsimile tracing of the inscription for Henutmeter (PN I 243, 16), grandmother of Amenemope. Abbreviations for references are expanded in an endnote.  

For [H10.1.1], however, there is some doubt over whether this final glyph is present. No photographs of the statue were forthcoming, but the glyph is not included in the transcription of the name provided by Griffith Institute entry 802-010-750 for this item [H10.1.2]. For [H10.2], which is sourced from shabti inscriptions that cannot readily be checked, there is a risk that the “herb determinative” could actually be the single-glyph form of $\text{ms}\text{.t}-\text{hrw}$ (“true of voice”), a symbol used in some shabti inscriptions. The same symbol is used with this meaning in other contexts;
for example, the wall-inscriptions in the Ramesside tomb of Amenemope (TT148) provide many such instances (e.g., Fig. 8b, viii), where it is identified as Gardiner sign M2. Two published examples of TIP shabtis for an owner named Iset-em-khebit (“Isis is in Khemmis,” PN I 4, 3 & 5) actually show this $m\sigma^{(t)}-\text{hrw}$ glyph following immediately after the papyrus clump M15 at the end of the place-name [sib-ib.t = Khebit = Khemmis] (Fig. 8b, v-vi), where it resembles the Khemmis determinative given by de Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983) and their sources (Fig. 8b, ii-iv). Conversely, there is no such symbol after the papyrus clump M16 that terminates the owner’s name on a Late Period shabti for Hor-(em)-khebit (Fig. 8b,vii), as it lacks the epithet $m\sigma^{(t)}-\text{hrw}$. We should, however, give our experienced transcribers the benefit of any doubt. Even though the “herb determinative” of Khemmis and the single-glyph form of $m\sigma^{(t)}-\text{hrw}$ are both technically sign M2, they are often differentiated by the use of opposite orientations in horizontal shabti inscriptions (compare Fig. 8b, iii-iv with vi), and the latter symbol is encountered more often in shabtis of the TIP than in those of the Late Period.

Overall, since the relationship of de Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983)’s Fig. 2:9a-b (i.e., [H8-9]) with Khemmis is convincing, it seems reasonable to extend this identification to other forms of the name that have a papyrus clump near the end, such as de Meulenaere & Yoyotte’s Fig. 2:9c-d (i.e., [H10.1.1 & 10.2]). At worst, such names probably refer to an origin elsewhere in the Delta. Naturally, names such as “Originally of Khemmis” need not specify the birthplace of the name-bearer herself; they could simply indicate that her ancestry is believed to lie in the place specified.

### 5.2 Late Period bearers of the name

With two possible exceptions, all of the entries for names ending in $n$-$\text{hb(w)}$ in Chappaz’s catalogue of shabti names for the Late & Ptolemaic Periods proved to be for the same individual, the Overseer of the King’s Ships. He will be discussed in Sect. 5.2.1.1. Of the two possible exceptions, one is actually a 26th Dynasty shabti whose owner is recorded in the source document as Tjainehesu, and whose alleged findspot is not Saqqara in 1900 but “Teira-el-Gabal, Fouad I Univ. Exc.1936.” The owner’s name is presumably close (but not identical) to that on the “shabti of Tjanebesu” in the British Museum (EA9148, no photograph) that Schneider has listed as belonging to $T\text{s-n-hb}$ [H7.3] (Section 5.2.2.3).

#### 5.2.1 Men

Lodomez (2009) observes that the name reached its highest frequency during the 26th Dynasty, i.e. the Saite period, and we shall see that this is true.

*5.2.1.1 T\text{s-n(n)(s)-hb.w, Overseer of the King’s Ships (Egyptian Museum, Cairo)}*

The best known bearer of the name $T\text{s-n-n-hb.w}$ [H6.3.1] was the Overseer of the King’s Ships and Overseer of the Scribes of the Council under Pharaoh Amasis (Ahmose II, 26th Dynasty). His name is usually rendered in English as “Tjainehebu.” It is transliterated $T\text{s-n-n\text{-}3-hb.w}$ by Ranke (PN I 3386, 30), while the variants $T\text{s-n\text{-}hb.w}$ [H6.3.2] and $T\text{s-hb.w}$ [H6.3.3] are known from his tomb and recorded by Ranke
in the same entry. Bresciani, who transliterated the core name as ‘Tṣj-n-(n3)-ḥbw,’\textsuperscript{291} allowed the mid-length form [H6.3.2] as a variant but viewed the shortest form [H6.3.3] as a typographical error on the part of the scribes.\textsuperscript{292} Note that the shortest version [H6.3.3], “Tjahebu,” is phonetically close to the Tjehebu on the TIP shabtis [H3], although it uses different orthography.

Tjahebu, son of Taneferetiyyti (PN I 364, 2), was evidently a rich and powerful official; buried close to the pyramid of Unas in Saqqara, his tomb contained a splendid carved sarcophagus and sumptuous gold and jewelled artefacts made by the finest craftsmen in Memphis.\textsuperscript{293} On the sarcophagus, Tjahebu is described as a “confidant of the king.”\textsuperscript{294} This and two adjacent Saite tombs were discovered intact in 1899-1900 by Alessandro Barsanti and Gaston Maspero;\textsuperscript{295,296} the other tombs belonged to Psamtik, the Chief Physician and Commander of the Libyans, and his son Pedenisi/Pediese, Overseer of Sealed Documents.\textsuperscript{297,298} Psamtik’s tomb was never actually used.\textsuperscript{299}

Tjahebu’s career started in the administrative court, where he served as head of the court scribes, and later reached its zenith during his term as head of the king’s fleet, a position from which he controlled Egypt’s inland transport by water.\textsuperscript{300} The fact that Tjahebu was buried at Saqqara and was the Overseer of the King’s Ships indicates that Memphis was the seat of his activities.\textsuperscript{301} In the title (i)m.y-r(A) Hwa.w nsw, Overseer of the King’s Ships, the word Hwa (and its variant, Haw) is a reprise – in the time of Amasis and in the vicinity of Memphis – of the Old and Middle Kingdom word used to indicate cargo vessels, with a special emphasis on river traffic.\textsuperscript{302,303} In some sources, the Overseer of the King’s Ships is rendered as “Admiral,” a title adopted for its brevity in Table 3. Two other officials from the reign of Amasis, namely Psamtikmeriptah and Hekaemsaf, are known to have held the same position; it is likely that the former preceded Tjahebu in the office and that the latter succeeded him.\textsuperscript{304} Hekaemsaf is buried on the east side of the pyramid of Unas; his tomb, along with that of Pedeneith, Overseer of the Cavalry, was discovered in 1901-3.\textsuperscript{305}

As mentioned, Tjahebu’s tomb contained many important artefacts. Within a large external sarcophagus made of limestone was an anthropoid sarcophagus made of greenish shale.\textsuperscript{306} The cover of the latter presents Tjahebu, mummiform, his head covered with a wig incised with vertical stripes (Fig. 9a). Sergio Pernigotti describes the representation as follows. “The face of the deceased shows an inspired treatment with great simplicity: the eyebrows are indicated by a slight swelling of the stone, while the cosmetic line and lashes are marked by an embossed strip that is not very pronounced. The nose is rather wide and barely detectable: the nostrils are indicated by shallow grooves. The mouth is narrow, perfectly horizontal, with full lips. The folds around the mouth are indicated by fairly obvious incisions.”\textsuperscript{307} Inside the sarcophagus, an embossed golden mask (Fig. 9b) had been placed where the face of the mummy would be.\textsuperscript{308} The mummy itself (and its adornments) had been embedded in bitumen by filling the inner sarcophagus to the brim with this material.\textsuperscript{309} Unfortunately the nose and chin of the mask had been crushed upon closure of the anthropoid sarcophagus, thereby distorting the facial features.\textsuperscript{310,311} The anthropoid sarcophagus and the golden mummy mask were both designed to present idealised representations of Tjahebu’s face.\textsuperscript{312,313}
Fig. 9. Portrayals of Ṣ₃-₅-ₙ-ₙ(s)-ḥb.w, Overseer of the King’s Ships. (a) Face, lid of inner sarcophagus. (b) Mummy mask, distorted by crushing. Both reproduced with permission from La Tomba di Ciennehebu, © Fabrizio Serra editore, Sede di Pisa.
A total of 401 shabtis (the full complement for the period) were found for Tjainehebu, all slender statuettes with finely modelled legs. Of these, only 18 have become part of the collections of the Egyptian Museum in Cairo; the others are now dispersed among a wide range of museums (including the British Museum and New York’s Metropolitan Museum of Art) and private collections. Some fine examples are shown in Fig. 10. In the Middle Kingdom, shabtis were substitutes for their owner, and therefore resembled them physically, in the 12th Dynasty, the precursor of the shabti spell was “to be spoken over a figure of the owner as he was on earth.” During the 18th Dynasty, shabtis for elite individuals were specially made in small numbers and appear to have been personal portraits. In the 21st Dynasty, however, the identification between a shabti and its owner weakened as the number of shabtis per burial increased; instead, the scholarly consensus is that the shabti ensemble became thought of as a team of servants or slaves. However, Federico Poole argues against the idea that the shabti had become a depersonalised slave for the deceased in later New Kingdom and TIP thought. “In my opinion, there is no explicit evidence that the shabti ever lost its identification with its owner,” he states, adding that “there is strong evidence that the shabti remained an image of the owner, magically identified with him through the writing of his name, throughout the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period.” Some finds from the Ramesside era are consistent with the belief that the shabti was still viewed as an image of its owner.

The 25th Dynasty (Kushite/ Nubian rule) brought a revival of archaic practices, especially the artistic conventions of the Middle Kingdom and the realistic depictions of kings; some shabtis from that era exhibit strong portraiture that is reminiscent of 12th Dynasty examples. The Saite renaissance of the 26th Dynasty continued to revive ancient forms of statuary and text, preserving the Nubian influence of the preceding Dynasty and presenting individualized royal faces. The revisions in funerary practice instigated in the 25th Dynasty continued into and beyond the 26th Dynasty, and shabtis were redesigned to mimic closely the form of the inner coffins, so it is possible that the features of elite Saite shabtis continued to be influenced by the appearance of their owners. For example, Bassir & Creasman (2014) view a Saite shabti for a man named Payeftjauemawyeth as a representation of its owner and attach significance to the similarity between its facial features and those on a naophorous statue for a high official of the same name. The shabtis of Tjainehebu may likewise reflect something of their owner’s actual appearance (Fig. 11c). In a detailed analysis of their design, Pernigotti clearly equated the shabtis with their owner, writing “The funerary statuettes of Ciennehebu are of silica paste, glazed in blue … Our character is represented standing on a low base, mumiform and leaning against the back pillar … Tjainehebu wears the braided beard…”

Tjainehebu’s shabtis (Fig. 10 & 11c) show numerous small differences in height (17.5-21.5 cm), hand position, tool and bag shape, wig style, and beard type; the facial features are often (although not always) rendered with great care. These differences demonstrate the presence of a number of craftsmen, and indicate that the figurines were the output of a large workshop. Tjainehebu’s shabtis are of a completely different type to those of Pedenisi/Pediese, a near-contemporary of his who occupied one of the adjacent tombs at Saqqara. Nevertheless, Pernigotti observed that
Fig. 10. Shabtis of ḫa-n-n(t)-ḥb.w, Overseer of the King’s Ships. (a) Shabti; (b) another shabti from the same gang; and (c) a third shabti from the same gang. Photographs (a-c) by permission of Glenn Janes; (d), image by permission of Alexander Ancient Art; (e), photograph courtesy of Sotheby’s, Inc. © 2016. Sources retain all rights to their images.
Fig. 11. ʪ-s-n-n(ς)-hb.w, Overseer of the King’s Ships – faces on funerary equipment, and relevant comparisons. (a) Lid of inner sarcophagus (reprised from Fig. 9a). (b) Imseti stopper, canopic jar. (c) Faces on shabtis of Tjainehebu and Hekaemsaf, plus the only two definite Saite busts of Amasis. Panels (a-b) are from La Tomba di Ciennehebu. In panel (c), Tjainehebu faces are from Fig. 10 (courtesy of sources named there), Shahty Collections (by permission of Niek de Haan), La Tomba di Ciennehebu and public domain sources; Hekaemsaf (left) is courtesy of Glenn Janes; Hekaemsaf (right) is an OASC image from the Metropolitan Museum; Amasis photo (left) is by the Walters Art Museum (Baltimore); Amasis photo (right) is by Ben Pirard (Netherlands), both reproduced under licence CC BY-SA 3.0 and colour-adjusted to match other panels. Images from La Tomba di Ciennehebu are © Fabrizio Serra editore, Sede di Pisa, reproduced here by permission. Sources of non-public domain images retain all rights to them.
Tjainehebu’s shabtis conform to the typological norms of the Saitic period.\textsuperscript{350} Saite portrayals of private individuals were usually idealised to reflect the face of the current king.\textsuperscript{351} From Fig. 11b, however, is clear that the face on Tjainehebu’s sarcophagus and the facial features of Tjainehebu’s shabtis differ considerably from the features of his king, Amasis (Ahmose II). Despite this, the representations will have been heavily influenced by other artistic conventions of the time. The extent to which the shabtis’ features are generic can be inferred by comparing some of their faces with those on some of the 401 shabtis made for Hekaemsaf, another Overseer of the King’s Ships under Amasis (see above), which are stylistically very similar (Fig. 11c).\textsuperscript{352,353} Jurgen van Oostenrijk recently conducted a study of Late Period shabtis from Saqqara. His survey, which included shabtis of both Tjainehebu and Hekaemsaf, highlighted the iconographic uniformity of shabtis within (and even between) gangs made during the reign of Amasis, relative to those made earlier in the 26\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty.\textsuperscript{354} He attributes this move toward homogeneity to the abandonment of hand-manufacture in favour of mass-production using moulds.

In addition to the shabtis, all four of Tjainehebu’s canopic jars were recovered. As is usual, the stopper of the vase containing the liver bears a human head; it represents Imseti, one of the four sons of Horus. This stopper differs from the other three by being unfinished, as it appears that the final polishing of the stone was never carried out.\textsuperscript{355} Since early canopic stoppers typically depicted the owner of the tomb rather than the four sons of Horus,\textsuperscript{356} the question again arises of whether the features of a funerary accessory might to some extent be influenced by the actual appearance of the deceased. Describing the head on the canopic lid, Pernigotti recorded that “his eyes are narrow and elongated, his eyebrows marked with a slight bulge, the eyelashes and the cosmetic line with a narrow strip; the nose is narrow and thin, the thick and fleshy lips slightly curved upwards towards their ends.”\textsuperscript{357} The stopper is shown in Fig. 11b, where it can be seen to have some elements in common with the face on the inner sarcophagus (Fig. 11a) and the faces on the shabtis (Fig. 11c).

In this instance, the facial features of the shabtis and of the Imseti stopper are of relatively little importance since an authoritative – albeit idealised – form of Tjainehebu’s face is depicted on his sarcophagus and mummy mask. The idealisation of faces in 25\textsuperscript{th} and 25\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty sculpture is considered further in Sect. 5.2.1.3. For other individuals, the absence of an anthropoid sarcophagus or mummy mask (e.g., Sect. 5.2.2.3) means that there may be no alternative but to rely upon the faces of shabtis and/or the Imseti stopper in the hope that they reflect something of the features of the deceased.

5.2.1.2 Ƭ3-n-ȵ-hb.w, priest of Amun-Re (Egyptian Museum, Cairo)

A long form of the name, Ƭ3-n-ȵ-hb.w [H6.4], is known from a 25\textsuperscript{th}-Dynasty or, more probably, 26\textsuperscript{th}-Dynasty block statue from Karnak (Fig. 12).\textsuperscript{358} This “Tjanenahebu,” whose wife was called Nefersakhmet, was a priest (hm-ntr) and God’s-Father (it-ntr) of Amun-Re. He was a Privy Councillor of the necropolis, a shaven-headed priest (fk.ty), and a God’s-Sealer (htm.w-ntr).
The last title, $\textit{htm.\;w-ntr}$, can either be a religious one, where it is associated with embalming, or a civil term, in which case it denotes the leader of a (usually nautical) expedition. Since the latter usage is mainly associated with the Old Kingdom, and since Tjanenahebu was a religious official of the Late Period, the priestly interpretation is the obvious choice here, even though this function is not supposed to have been common outside Memphis until after the destruction of Thebes by Ptolemy IX Soter II, which occurred in the first century BCE. The statue is a commemoration of Tjanenahebu's son Psamtik, who was also a priest of Amun-Re.

5.2.1.3 $\textit{Tz-n-hs-hb.\;w}$, Director of the Mansions (Musée de Roanne & Egyptian Museum, Cairo)

Another long form of the name, this time $\textit{Tz-n-hs-hb.\;w}$ [H6.5], appears on a naophorous statue. The head of this Saite statue is in the Musée de Roanne, France
(Fig. 13), while the trunk and shrine are in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo. The inscription on the rear pillar commemorates Tjainhahebu, “Director of the Mansions, the one responsible for anointing, the ḫṣ. ty.-⟨bgr⟩.” “Director of the Mansions” (ḥrp hw. wr) is an Old Kingdom title that was still in use in the 26th Dynasty; it originally referred to the official responsible for royal regalia and coronation rituals, but in the Saite period it denoted a priestly and administrative role. The Mansions referred to are those of the goddess Neith of Sais. The designation ḫṣ. ty.-⟨.w⟩ means “prince,” “governor” or “mayor,” but ḫṣ. ty.-⟨bgr⟩ (whose meaning is unknown) may just have been an honorific title. Tjainhahebu was the son of the prince and governor Ḥn-ṣ⟨(t)⟩, Henat (PN I 229, 19), who was both a Director of the Mansions and also “a priest of Thoth, who presides at Sais.” His mother was Ṣbḥt-nt, Tashebenneith (PN I 363, 4), a sistre-player of the House of Neith.

Fig. 13. Portrayal of Ṣb-n-ḥṣ-hḫ.w, Director of the Mansions. Bust, 11.2 x 6.6 x 5.5 cm, Musée de Roanne. Inventory no. D.991.11.1, Dépôt du Musée Rolin d’Autun au Musée Joseph-Déchelette de Roanne. Image © Musée Joseph-Déchelette/Ville de Roanne, reproduced by kind permission of Musée J. Déchelette.
Lodomez argues that Tjainhahebu’s father was Henat Khnumibre-men,\textsuperscript{375,376} “a priest of Thoth, who presides at Sais,”\textsuperscript{377} the son of a certain Udjahorresnet (who held the same title) and his wife Ireturu.\textsuperscript{378} This Henat was indeed a “Director of the Mansions”\textsuperscript{379} and also a hr.y-h(z)b hr.y-dp, a ritualist/lector-priest and magician;\textsuperscript{380} interestingly, the latter title (Demotic hr-\textit{t}b) entered Hebrew with the plural suffix -\textit{īm} as הרטמים,\textsuperscript{381} as for example in," the magicians of Egypt" (Exod. 7:22). Henat Khnumibre-men was also hnnm hnm-f, “a friend of his Majesty.”\textsuperscript{382} Two of his sons – Psamtiksaneit and Udjahorresnet – are named in the so-called “Henat genealogy,” which is derived from stelae in the Serapeum of Memphis.\textsuperscript{383,384,385} Members of this family were probably relatives of the last Saite pharaohs.\textsuperscript{386} The records of the family recovered to date do not mention anyone with a name resembling Tjainhahebu.\textsuperscript{387,388}

Lodomez’s proposed identification, along with other independent observations, place Tjainhahebu towards the end of the 26th Dynasty, during the reign of Amasis (Ahmose II).\textsuperscript{389} An overlap in family names, functions, time and place suggests that Tjainhahebu may have been related to the famous Udjahorresnet, an Overseer of the King’s Ships,\textsuperscript{390} royal physician and priest of Neith in Sais under Amasis and Psamtik III, who later became chancellor and chief physician to the Persian conqueror Cambyses.\textsuperscript{391} Having acculturated Cambyses to the role of Pharaoh, this Udjahorresnet continued his collaborationist mission with Cambyses’ successor, Darius I. In the autobiographical Udjahorresnet Inscription, he names his mother as Atemirdis and his father as Peftuaneith.\textsuperscript{392} He describes the latter as “Director of the Mansions,”\textsuperscript{393} using the same title as held by Tjainhahebu and his father.\textsuperscript{394}

The head of Tjainhahebu’s statue in the Musée de Roanne provides us with a face for this individual. The face was important to ancient Egyptians as the seat of identity, and royal statues were designed to be eternal vessels for the king’s soul.\textsuperscript{395} As mentioned in Sect. 5.2.1.1, the faces of private statues were usually not direct portraits but rather were idealised to reflect the face of the current king.\textsuperscript{396} In this case, the king was again Amasis. The only two Saite heads of Amasis to bear inscriptions, which we have already encountered (Fig. 11c), exhibit high-set slanted eyes and a long face.\textsuperscript{397} Fig. 14a,b shows that Tjainhahebu’s bust does not have these features and that it differs substantially from portrayals of Amasis. However, it still need not be a true likeness of Tjainhahebu. Private statues of the 25-26th Dynasties were also strongly influenced by prior conventions, sometimes combining styles and features from several periods, e.g. a Kushite face, a New Kingdom wig and an Old Kingdom torso.\textsuperscript{398} Kushite features include a round face, short broad nose, nasolabial furrows and thick lips,\textsuperscript{399,400} exemplified in Fig. 14c by king Taharqa, so it is likely that this convention underpins the somewhat negroid features of Tjainhahebu on the Roanne bust. The representation is not so much a realistic physical reproduction of the man’s true appearance as it is “a perfect vessel of the spiritual individual.”\textsuperscript{401} Nevertheless, this is as close as we can come to a likeness for Tjainhahebu, Director of the Mansions.
Fig. 14. Tš-n-hb.w, Director of the Mansions – relevant facial comparisons. The face of Tjainhahebu (centre) is compared with that of Amasis (above, left and right) and Taharqa (below, left and right). Tjainhahebu credit as for Fig. 13; Amasis credits as for Fig. 11; Taharqa (left), detail from a copyright-free image by Jon Bodsworth,\(^\text{402}\) (right) detail from an image by David Liam Moran, reproduced under licence CC BY-SA 3.0.\(^\text{403}\)

5.2.1.4 Tš-n-hb.w and Tš-hb.w, ancestors of Khnumibre (Wadi Hammamat)

Tš-n-hb.w [H6.1] and Tš-hb.w [H6.6], two shorter forms of the names discussed in the preceding sections [H6.3-6.5], are both attested in an inscription in the Wadi Hammamat, an ancient quarry in the Eastern Desert. This inscription provides a deep genealogy claimed by Khnumibre, a priest at Heliopolis and Memphis and a Superintendent of Works in Upper and Lower Egypt under the Persian king Darius I.\(^\text{404}\) Khnumibre made eleven inscriptions in the quarry, the earliest in the reign of Amasis (26th Dynasty) and the most recent of the dated ones in the time of Darius (27th Dynasty).\(^\text{405}\) Our main concern is a set of three adjacent panels.\(^\text{406}\) In the first panel,\(^\text{407,408}\) the inscription provides a date, lists some civil titles for Khnumibre, and
names him, his father, his mother and his maternal grandfather. Some names (or portions of them) are placed in cartouches because they reflect the names of kings. Khnumibre, being the prenomen adopted by Amasis as well as the name of our protagonist, appears within a double-plumed cartouche.

In the next panel, the inscription commences with an extensive list of (first) priestly and (then) civil titles for Khnumibre. It is followed by a genealogy that runs backwards from Khnumibre, his father, grandfather and great-grandfather, with the first four names all involving cartouches. Commencing five generations before Khnumibre, there is a segment spanning seven generations in which the name $T\tilde{s}$-$n$-$h$-$b$. $w$ (“Tjainhebu”) occurs once and $T\tilde{s}$-$h$-$b$. $w$ (“Tjahebu”) appears three times (Fig. 15). Each of these ancestors was reportedly $t\tilde{s}$. $(t(y)$, a vizier; the Tjainhebu was also $i$m.$(y)$-r$A$ niw.$t$, superintendent of a town, while each Tjahebu was $(i)m$.$(y)$-r$(A)$ k$A$.t, a Superintendent of Works (i.e., master builder). The inscription concludes in the third panel. After having listed some 22 generations of royal architects, the genealogy ends with Rahotep, a vizier of Rameses II in the 19th Dynasty. Khnumibre then compares Rahotep’s prowess favourably with the great Old Kingdom builder Imhotep, a vizier of King Djoser in the 3rd Dynasty. Imhotep was unusual in being a non-royal individual who underwent deification; in the Late and Greco-Roman periods he was worshipped as a god of medicine and wisdom. His veneration even extends to modern times, in that many Freemasons consider Imhotep to have been the first Mason.


**Fig. 15.** $T\tilde{s}$-$n$-$h$-$b$. $w$ and $T\tilde{s}$-$h$-$b$. $w$ in the Wadi Hammamat genealogy. The excerpt contains the only occurrence of the long form of the name and the first occurrence of its short form (red boxes). Detail (no. 93, lines 10-13) from Couyat & Montet (1912) *Les Inscriptions Hiéroglyphiques et Hiératiques du Ouàdi Hammâmât*, Pl. XXII, now public domain.
Although the inscription as a whole contains some information about much earlier times that is historically correct, such as the fact that Imhotep served King Djoser, it is likely that Khnumibre had no real entitlement to the claimed pedigree. While his recent ancestry is presumably correct, the older parts of the lineage – including the four illustrious ancestors named $T^3-(n-)hb.w$ – are most likely fictitious. Jansen-Winkeln points out that the author, in the middle of the desert, had no written records to draw upon, and that the oldest members of the list bear anachronistic names and/or titles. Politely, he remarks that “The four-fold repetition of Nes[shu]tefnut – Taienhebu (over 8 generations) is doubtful; a mistake could easily have been made here.”

In view of the proposed father-son duo of Khnumibre-men and Tjainhebu encountered in Sect. 5.2.1.3, it is interesting to see versions of the name Tjainhebu listed repeatedly in the present Khnumibre’s genealogy. Since the individuals operated in different cities, it may be no more than a reflection of the widespread use of both names during the 26th Dynasty. The name Tjainhebu/Tjainehebu peaked in popularity during this time, perhaps in response to illustrious individuals such as the Overseer of the King’s Ships (Sect. 5.2.1.1), while the use of Khnumibre increased because it was the prenomen of Amasis. However, Jean Vercoutter’s analysis of the appointments cited and deities honoured in the two genealogies suggests that the Khnumibre of the Wadi Hammamat inscription and the Henat Khnumibre-men of Sect. 5.2.1.3 were both originally from the same area, namely the vicinity of Tura, near Memphis. Tura is mentioned repeatedly in Khnumibre’s inscriptions. Like Wadi Hammamat, Tura was the site of a major quarry, in the Old Kingdom, it had provided the fine limestone used to case the Great Pyramid at Giza. In a further overlap, the Wadi Hammamat inscription (and another inscription of Khnumibre’s on an offering-table) calls Khnumibre “Director of the Mansions,” a title that featured prominently among the family of Khnumibre-men (Sect. 5.2.1.3). In the 26th Dynasty, this title usually related to Sais; the Wadi Hammamat and offering-table inscriptions date to the 27th Dynasty, and their use of the title makes no explicit mention of Sais.

Even if fabricated, the sequence of names at Wadi Hammamat is relevant to our enquiry. Specifically, the loss of the central $n$ from the short version of the name parallels the abbreviation of $T^3-n-hb.(w)$ to $T-hb.(w)$, as found on the TIP shabtis that formed the impetus for this project (Sect. 1.1). Commenting on the variant orthographies of Tjainhebu in the inscription and in two other instances of the name known to him, Posener observed that “The omission of $n$ does not make a different name.”

Khnumibre’s genealogy has been used by the revisionist historian David Rohl to support his so-called New Chronology, in which the dating for kings of the 19-25th Dynasties is brought forward by up to 350 years. Specifically, Rohl identifies the second Haremsaf in Khnumibre’s genealogy with the architect of Sheshonq I. If correct, this would in turn redate Rameses II to the 10th century BCE, a time conventionally associated not with the 19th but with the 21st-22nd Dynasty. The New Chronology finds support in certain quarters because it allows some characters in the biblical Old Testament to be identified with people whose names appear in
archaeological finds. Another such revisionist, Jim Reilly, moves the 26th Dynasty forward some 120 years; he identifies Khnumibre as the son of king Amasis (whom he demotes to the top indigenous official within an Egypt ruled by Persia) and the Henat Khnumibre-men of Sect. 5.2.1.3 (the putative father of Tjainhahebu, “Director of the Mansions”) as Amasis’s grandfather.445

Some scholars have read Khnumibre’s genealogy as actually extending back to Imhotep, which in conventional chronology amounts to a span of well over two millennia.446,447 In 2001, this interpretation was put to controversial use by Emmet Sweeny, another revisionist historian. Believing that the genealogy places Imhotep 24 generations before Khnumibre,448 Sweeny asserts that King Djoser must in fact have lived around 1000 BCE, a time conventionally associated not with the 3rd but the 21st Dynasty. In a parallel to Rohl’s and Reilly’s agendas, Sweeny’s major shift in dating allows him to identify Imhotep with the biblical Joseph.449 However, as Khnumibre’s inscription jumps directly from the 19th to the 3rd Dynasty, the conventional wisdom is that this juxtaposition “cannot be taken as a serious link.”450

None of the revisionist timeframes have found academic acceptance. For the New Kingdom, Late Period and TIP, the error associated with the conventional chronology is only about 10-20 years.451 The uncertainty drops to zero after 664 BCE, the start of the 26th Dynasty.452

5.2.1.5 T3-hb, Treasurer to the King (Petrie Museum)

T3-hb [H6.7.1] is a counterpart to [H.6.6] where the second part of the name has changed from plural to singular. This form appears on a fragment of a kneeling statue of a person whose hands hold the figure of Osiris in a shrine (Fig. 16); the even shorter form T3 [H6.7.2] also appears (cf. Sect. 2.2, and especially the convergence of [H6.7.2] with [J4.2]). The statue, which is thought to come from 26th Dynasty Memphis, represents this Tjaheb, who was Treasurer to the King. At face value, the title hmt.w bi.ty or sḏsw.ty bi.ty appears to read “Seal-Bearer”453 (i.e., Treasurer) to the King of Lower Egypt,” which would of course be consistent with a Memphite origin, but since bi.ty really denotes the king in his human, ephemeral aspect,454,455 the title is better read as “Treasurer to the current King.” A mention of Ptah (on the left-hand border of the shrine, context lost) supports the idea that the statue came from Memphis.

The entry in the Petrie Museum’s online catalogue456 calls Tjaheb “Chancellor Pabes”457 and the entry in the UCL online catalogue “Chancellor Pa.Ba.Sa.”458 both having evidently identified the (ambiguous) first bird as a pintail duck, G40,459 rather than a duckling, G47, and the (unambiguous) second one as a jabiru, G29,460 rather than an ibis, G26. In contrast, his name is recorded as T3-(n-n3-)hbw by Stewart (1983),461 who thanks Herman de Meulenaere for the identification. The name is again recorded as T3-(n-n3-)hbw by Leahy (1986),462 in Porter-Moss (1999)463 and in the Griffith Institute’s online Topographical Bibliography.464 On the bottom border of the shrine, two instances of the name of Tjaheb’s mother collide in the centre of two opposing inscriptions, but it seems to be a form of the name ḫst-ỉr-di-s (Ranke I 3, 19-20; Greek ἐσορτας, “It is Isis who has given it”).
Fig. 16. Statue of \( T\hbox{-}hb \). Treasurer to the King. Fragment of a kneeling naophorous statue, Petrie Museum UC14662; Tjaheb’s name and its abbreviation, Tja, are boxed in red (left and right, respectively). Base image © 2015 University College London, reproduced under licence CC BY-SA-NC.
5.2.2 Women

5.2.2.1 Ṣnḫb, mother of Ankh-psamtik (Egyptian Museum, Cairo)

A Ṣnḫb [H7.1] is recorded as the mother of Ankh-psamtik on his four canopic jars, which are now in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (CG4153-4156).466 Found in Saqqara, they date to the Saite period.467 The inscription on the jar representing the baboon-headed god Hapi, which contained his lungs, is shown in Fig. 17.

The canopic inscriptions are somewhat abridged.468 Little is known of Ankh-psamtik apart from the fact that he bore the title “God’s-Father” (ḥnfr).469 Even less is known of his mother Tjainheb, other than that her origins probably lay in the Central Delta site of Behbeit el-Hagar (Sect. 5.1.2.1) and that – being ms*(t)-ḥrw – she had presumably predeceased her son.

![Fig. 17. Canopic inscription mentioning Ṣnḫb, mother of Ankh-psamtik.](image)

Inscription on Ankh-psamtik’s ape-headed canopic jar (CG4154), with Tjainheb’s name (including determinative A52, denoting a revered person)470 boxed in red. Redrawn from Reisner’s Canopics.471
5.2.2.2 Țs-n-hby(p), mother of Rei-irdjis (Glyptotech, Munich)

This Țs-n-hby [H7.2.1] or Țs-n-hby[p] [H7.2.2], “Tjaneheby(p),” is mentioned on a statue of Osiris (Glyptothek, Munich), for which no find-spot is recorded.472 Her husband was Pd-ḏi-iset and the inscription is a request for life, health and strength by her son Rei-ir-ḫs.

The original publication of the inscription is shown in Fig. 18. The transcription reads “(1) The Dual King, Osiris-Wenefer, ruler of eternity, very great god, man [born] of Geb, foremost of the Westerners, complete, son of Nut. (2) That he may give life, health and strength, a long life, a great and good old age to Rei-irdjis, son of Padji-iset, whose mother was Tjaineheby. (3) That Osiris may give life to Rei-irdjis, son of Padji-iset, whose mother was Tjainehebyp, health.”

As mentioned previously (Sect. 5.1.2.1), this woman’s origins presumably lay in the Central Delta site of Behbeit el-Hagar, formerly Ḥbyt, in which case the unusual orthography Țs-n-hby[p] may actually be a misrendering of Țs-n-ḥbyt.473

Fig. 18. Inscription mentioning Țs-n-hby(p), mother of Rei-irdjis. Full transcript of Piehl (1888),474 now public domain. The two instances of the name (Tjaineheby in Piehl’s segment b, Tjainehebyp in segment c), each including the female determinative B1G, are boxed in red.475
5.2.2.3  T3-n-hb, mistress of the house (Civico Museo, Trieste)

The four canopic jars of a woman called T3-n-hb [H7.3], “Tjainheb,” are located in Trieste at its Civico Museo di Storia ed Arte.476 As Cia-en-heb, she was the headline feature for a seminar at the museum in 2014,477 and a photograph of the stoppers from her canopic jars forms the cover of the museum’s luxurious catalogue, Collezione Egizia del Civico Museo di Storia ed Arte di Trieste.478 The canopic jars, which the museum dates to the 26th Dynasty, are shown in Fig. 19.479 The only title Tjainheb is given in the inscriptions on the jars is nb(.t) pr(.w), “mistress of the house.”480 As well as appearing on the canopic jars [H7.3.1], her name is inscribed on a number of shabtis [H7.3.2-7.3.3]. One of these is in the collection of the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden at Leiden (Fig. 20).481 Another is in the Petrie Museum, photographed in the museum’s online database (Fig. 21d) and misrecorded under the name T3-n-hb (with the wrong type of h) in UCL’s catalogue of shabti-names represented in the collection (UC 40113, Petrie no. 577).482 Two more of Tjainheb’s shabtis are in the British Museum (EA34105 & EA34106, no photos). While her canopic jars have been assigned to the 26th Dynasty, all of these shabtis have been dated to the 30th Dynasty. Since the epithet “mistress of the house” is found only on the canopic inscriptions, and since the name is recorded consistently on the jars [H7.3.1] in an orthography that differs somewhat from the versions on the shabtis [H7.3.2-7.3.3], we should bear in mind the possibility that the canopics and shabtis could belong to two different individuals.

The shabtis already mentioned, along with others, are listed by Hans Schneider, who – as noted in Sect. 5.1 – took the name T3-n-hb to be an abbreviation of Tzy-n-hb.484 An additional shabti of this gang is in the State Museum of San Marino, where it is dated to the 26-30th Dynasty.485 There is a tentative reference by Ranke (PN I 387, 1) to a shabti of T3-n-hb in Hannover, which would presumably be in the Egyptian collection of the Museum August Kestner. Schneider does not mention this shabti; if it exists, it almost certainly comes from the same gang as the shabtis held in Leiden, London and San Marino. Schneider seems certain that the canopic jars and the shabtis all belong to the same woman,486 a conclusion perhaps supported by the archival records for the artefacts in the various museums.487 In the absence of strong evidence to the contrary, let us assume that he is correct. Despite the extensive suite of funerary equipment for Tjainheb, no provenance or find-spot has been recorded; however, given the acquisition dates for the shabtis in the British Museum, the discovery of the tomb must predate 1878. Tjainheb’s personal origins presumably lay in Behbeit el-Hagar, a site in the Central Delta (Sect. 5.1.2.1).

In Sect. 5.2.1.1, I raised the question of whether the head on the stopper of Imseti canopic jars might reflect or be influenced by the actual features of the deceased, and the possibility must be considered again here (Fig. 21a-c). Early stoppers, including those of the New Kingdom before the Amarna period, typically depicted the owner of the tomb rather than the four sons of Horus,488,489 and some later New Kingdom jars of high status women continued the tradition.490 It was easy to adapt the head of Imseti for deceased women as this human-headed deity was originally female.491
Fig. 19. Canopic jars of T3-n-hb, mistress of the house. The four canopic jars of Tjainheb, mistress of the house, are held by Trieste Museum; images © David Nice, reproduced by kind permission. Each alabaster jar is associated with one of the four sons of Horus (whose likeness appears on the stopper) and contains a different internal organ, as follows. (a) Hapy, lungs; (b) Duamutef, stomach; (c) Kebekhsenuf, intestines; (d) Imseti, liver.
Fig. 20. A shabti of $T3-n-hb$, mistress of the house. Shabti in Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden; 30\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty, 14.8 x 4.5 cm. The epithet “mistress of the house” is not included in the inscription. Images © Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden, used here by permission.
Although female sculpture flourished during the Late Period, especially in the 25th and 26th Dynasties, it was undoubtedly subject to the same stylistic overlays and idealisations as male portraiture (Section 5.2.1.3). Moreover, the dating of Tjainheb’s canopic jars to the 26th Dynasty is rendered doubtful by the assignation of shabtis from her gang to the 30th Dynasty by several different museums; accordingly, the vases were probably made in the second (rather than the first) half of the Late Period. Realistically, then, it is most likely that the Imseti jar simply came from pre-produced funerary stock. Likewise, Tjainheb’s shabtis (Fig. 21d-e) probably do not convey anything of her actual appearance. Shabtis of the 30th Dynasty – which were invariably male – had become elegant in a decorative sense, with meticulously modelled details in high relief, but “their portraiture in particular was characterised by a bland simper.”

5.2.2.4 Ṭṣてしまった التي is a Theban stela that dates from the 25th Dynasty, i.e., the period of Kushite rule. At face value, the first portion of the name reads Ṭṣてしまった, “vizier,” including even the space-filling stroke, with the full name suggesting (most anomalously) “the vizier of/for Khemmis.” However, it is much more likely that what is intended by Ṭṣてしまった is Ṭṣてしまった.t,
“Tjainchebit” (Sect. 5.1.2.2), which can be achieved by a repositioning of the $t$. Failing that, the $t$ may have been introduced in an attempt to feminize the $Ts$ component (Section 2.2) in recognition of the gender of its bearer.

The stela is dedicated to Amenirdis, daughter of the first Kushite king, Kashta. Some time around 740 BCE, Kashta managed to install Amenirdis as heiress to the title “God’s Wife of Amun” in Thebes; she therefore became the successor to the serving God’s Wife of Amun, Shepenwepet, daughter of Osorkon III (a Libyan king of Upper Egypt during the 23rd Dynasty). Since this achievement legitimized the Kushite takeover of Thebes, it constituted for Kashta “the key moment in the process of the extension of Kushite power over Egyptian territories.”

Tjainchebit is recorded as the wife of Ankh-hor (the Chief of Rebit, a title discussed below) and mother of $Nb.t-imz.w-m-h3.t$, “Nebet-imau-imhat” (cf. PN I 187, 29), a Chantress of the House of Amun. It is Nebet-imau-imhat who has commissioned the stela. The first publication of its three-line inscription, done by Georges Legrain, is shown in Fig. 22. Legrain restored the missing glyph after Kashta’s cartouche as $D4$, $ir$, a reading later excluded by Karl Jansen-Winkeln. The inscription reads: “May Amun, the giver of life, the good guardian, give all life and dominion to the Divine Adoratrice Amenirdis, daughter of the king, Kashta. [Dedication of] the Chantress of the House of Amun, Nebet-imau-imhat, who is the daughter of the great chief of Rebit, Ankh-hor, and whose mother is Tjainchebit.”

“Chantress of the House of Amun,” $hs(y.t) hn(w) Imn.w$, denotes a middle-ranking temple priestess senior to the commonplace $sm*y.t n.t Imn.w$, “Chantress of Amun.” The role of the former was to assist the Divine Adoratrice, a high priestess with a rank similar to the God’s Wife, $hm.t-ntr$. The inscription gives Amenirdis the title $dw3.t-ntr$, Divine Adoratrice. Above the inscription, the stela shows the God’s Wife Shepenwepet in this role, playing sistra before Amun, Mut and Khonsu (not shown). The supreme female offices of the temple reached the peak of power in the 23rd-26th Dynasty. As God’s Wife of Amun, Shepenwepet

Fig. 22. Stela inscription mentioning $Tst-n-hbl$, wife to the chief of Rebit. First transcript of the inscription (3 lines, reading right-to-left in the original) by Legrain, now public domain. The name occupies the second half of the third line.
was the *de facto* ruler of Upper Egypt; having a governing administration of her own, she bore the epithets *nb.t ts.wy*, “Mistress of the Two Lands,” and *nb.t h.r.w*, “Mistress of Appearances,” as something more than time-honoured honorific titles. It is as God’s Wife and perhaps also as sovereign that Shepenwepet is entitled to stand directly before Amun in the illustration on the stela.

Traditionally, as a king reached the end of his reign, the God’s Wife of Amun would adopt the daughter of his heir as her successor in order to facilitate the transition of rule. Shepenwepet is known to have adopted Amenirdis in this sense. In his book of 1965, titled *Recherches sur les Monuments Thébains*, Jean Leclant claimed that the use of *mwt=s* (“...whose mother is...”) – rather than *ir(i).tn* (“...issue of [parent’s name]”) or *ms(i).tn* (“...born of [mother’s name]”) – for the relationship of Nebet-imau-imhat, Chantress of the House, to Tjainchebit indicated that this filiation too was adoptive, with the corollary that Tjainchebit must also have been a Chantress of the House. Leclant made this claim on the authority of a paper he had co-authored in 1952 with Jean Yoyotte, which includes remarks that anticipate the latter’s “Les Vierges Consacrées d’Amon Thébain,” a paper of 1961 in which Yoyotte asserted that Chantresses of the House were, like the God’s-Wife or Divine Adoratrice, sacred virgins dedicated to Amun. Yoyotte’s belief was that a new Chantresses of the House was deemed to be an adoptive daughter of an incumbent of that office, with the notional filiation expressed by the somewhat indirect expression *mwt=s*. Unfortunately, Yoyotte’s interpretation – which gained widespread acceptance – rested on a number of misunderstandings that were highlighted in 1998 by Robert Ritner, whose rejection of Yoyotte’s position has been endorsed by subsequent scholars. Accordingly, we may safely conclude that Nebet-imau-imhat was the biological daughter of Tjainchebit, who in turn need not have been a Chantress of the House.

Ankh-hor, Chief of Rebit, is probably the chieftain of a Libyan tribe. In this era, the Western Delta was dominated by the great chiefs of the Libyan *Libou*, and the Eastern Delta around Mendes was controlled by the Libyan *Ma*. Libyan infiltration of the Western Delta had been ongoing since the end of the New Kingdom. While a series of Libyan chiefs rose to power as rulers in the 22nd Dynasty, most of the TIP – especially the 22nd-24th Dynasties – can in fact be considered a “Libyan Period.” Egyptian acculturation had begun at an early stage, so many Libyans (or men of Libyan extraction) bore Egyptian names.

5.2.2.5 *Tš-hb* or *Tš-(s)ḥ-b(i.t)*, mother of Mutenmehat (*Museo Egizio, Turin*)

A coffin lid of the 25-26th Dynasty from the Valley of the Queens (Fig. 23) mentions a *Tš-hb*, “Tjacheb,” or *Tš-(s)ḥ-b(i.t)*, “Tjachebit,” depending on whether one reads the compound papyrus clump/place-name as a silent determinative or a vocalised ideogram. Her husband is *Bšk-rnšf* (literally, “The servant of his name;” PN I 91, 17), and her daughter is *Mw.t-n-n-mḥt*, no doubt intending *Mw.t-nmḥ.t*.
Fig. 23. Internal sarcophagus of Mutenmehiat, daughter of Tsj-ib. Wooden inner coffin held by the Museo Egizio, Turin. Image: E. Schiaparelli, *Relazione sui Lavori,* 533 now public domain.
The coffin belongs to this Mutenmehat, whose origins or ancestry presumably lay in Khemmis of Lower Egypt (Sect. 5.1.2.2). Found in tomb QV44, the coffin is now in the Museo Egizio of Turin with catalogue no. Sup. 5242 (PM I² 771). Catalogues group the coffin with those of non-royal officials such as priests and administrators. A recent analysis has shown it to be a later Saite coffin of the newly-defined “Eleven-Eleven” type, in which a procession of eleven gods appears on each side of the lid, perpendicular to its long axis. These deities guard the deceased at the momentary divisions between the twelve hours of the day and the twelve hours of the night, with the relevant hour-goddess of the Osirian Stundenwachen (“hourly vigil”) tradition guarding him/her during each of the twenty-four periods of the diurnal cycle. Coffin-lids of the “Eleven-Eleven” type feature an image of the goddess Nut set low and separate from the broad collar design; her outstretched arms take the form of feathered wings (visible in Fig. 23) and each of her hands grips an ankh. Typically, a ram on a standard is shown on each side of Nut. An ouroboros usually encircles the lid, with its head meeting its tail at the feet of the deceased. On such lids, the main text apron contains Spell 89 from the Book of the Dead, which is designed to tether the bs of the deceased to its mummy.

5.2.2.6 Ṭ3-n-ḫ3 (ex Hilton-Price & Hearst collections)

De Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983) group this Ṭ3-n-ḫ3 [H10.1.1-10.1.2] with the women of Sect. 5.2.2.4-5.2.2.5 [H8-9] rather than those of Sect. 5.2.2.1-5.2.2.3 [H7.1-7.3.3] on account of the papyrus-clump glyph (M16) in the name. The orthography has been discussed at length in Sect. 5.1.2.2; note that the ḫ has been omitted from the name in the Griffith Institute’s online Topographical Bibliography, which gives it as Ṭ3-n-ṣ. The name is inscribed on a Harpocrates statue in private hands, which is thought to have come from the Faiyum. At different times, this sculpture has formed part of the F.G. Hilton-Price and W.R. Hearst collections.

At face value, Ṭ3-n-ḫ3 [H10.1.1-10.1.2] would be vocalized as “Tjainha,” but – in view of the identification with Khemmis (ṣḥ-bi.t, Sect. 5.1.2.2) – the name is probably to be pronounced “Tjainchebit.” The owner of this name was the wife of Rimnīti and mother of Nḥt (PN I 209, 16), “Strong,” the (male) dedicator of the statue.

5.2.2.7 Ṭ3.w-n-ḥ3 (shabtis from the Eastern Delta)

De Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983) group this Ṭ3.w-n-ḫ3 with the women in Sect. 5.2.2.4-5.2.2.6 [H8-10.1.2] rather than those in Sect. 5.2.2.1-5.2.2.3 [H7.1-7.3.3] on account of the papyrus-clump glyph (M16) in the name. Despite the presence of a plural determinative (Z2) after Ṭ3-, de Meulenaere & Yoyotte think that this owner may be same person as the Ṭ3-n-ḫ3 of Section 5.2.2.6. The orthography of such names has been discussed at length in Section 5.1.2.2.

At face value, Ṭ3.w-n-ḥ3 [H10.2] would be articulated as “Tjauenha,” but – in view of the identification with Khemmis (ṣḥ-bi.t, Sect. 5.1.2.2) – the name is probably to be pronounced “Tjau-en-chebit.”
6. Other considerations of the name

6.1 Wider comparisons

\(\text{Tny-m-hb} [X1]\) is interesting in that it is a female name from the New Kingdom, whereas the contemporary \(\text{Tzy-m-hb} [H2]\) – the only form of our name known from the New Kingdom (Sect. 3) – is borne by a man. Indeed, it is not until the Late Period that we find female usage of \(\text{Tz-n-hb}\) (Sect. 5.1.2.1). \(\text{Tny-m-hb} [X1]\) is interpreted as “the city of Thinis is in festival” (PN I 391, 21).

The last component of the name \(\text{Tz-n-ib}\) [X2] may relate to the east (\(\text{ib}\cdot\text{t}\)), e.g. the east wind, but the name carries a double determinative that relates it both to a building or room (O1) and to a god (A40).

Sect. 1.2 made mention of the lack of attestation in Ranke for names of the form \(\text{Tz-(n)-nb}\) in which the \(\text{nb}\) component is supplied by glyph \(\text{V30}\), the wicker basket. This is somewhat surprising, since – following the logic of Sect. 5.1.1 – Late Period names of this type could be interpreted as “descendant of the lord.” One instance of a name whose phonetic component terminates with glyph \(\text{V30}\) did eventually come to light. \(\text{Tzy-nb} [X3]\) is found in an inscription of the Nubian king Irike-Amanote that lists the names of nomadic tribes against whom the Napatan kings had been obliged to defend their territory.\(^{545}\) It carries a seated-man determinative (A1) after the first syllable, rendering the first part of the name similar to the familiar \(\text{Tz}\) (often abbreviated \(\text{Ts};\) Sect. 2.2), and yet – to the surprise of Leclant & Yoyotte (1952), who marked it \textit{sic} – the full name appears to carry a god determinative (A40).\(^{547}\) In this respect, names [X2] and [X3] are alike.

6.2 Structural parallels with other names

The name \(\text{Bsk-n-(ns)-nf.w}\) (cf., Ranke PN I 91, 10) is encountered among the Late Period royals of Athribis, a city of the southern Central Delta;\(^{548}\) in the cuneiform Annals of Ashurbanipal, it appears in Assyrian guise as \(\text{Bu-uk-ku-na-an-ni'-pi}\).\(^{549}\) In a study of its Egyptian etymology, Günther Vittmann has pointed out that this name exists in precisely the same variants as \(\text{Tz-n-(ns)-hb.w}\) (Table 4). He believes that these are purely scribal variations whose modulations are not reflected in pronunciation.\(^{550}\) Vittmann’s list of \(\text{Tz-n-(ns)-hb.w}\) variants includes the form \(\text{Tz-hb.w}\), a close phonetic match to the \(\text{T-hb.w}\) on the TIP shabtis that formed the impetus for this paper (Sect. 1.1).

Vittman interprets \(\text{Bsk-n-(ns)-nf.w}\) to mean “Servant of the winds,”\(^{551}\) This is in harmony with the various interpretations proposed above for \(\text{Tz-n-(ns)-hb.w}\) and its variants with different types of \(h\), in all of which the central \(-n-(ns-)\) component is taken to be an indirect genitive, \(-n.y-(ns-)\), and understood to mean “of the.” Complete meanings range from “The man of the festival” (Middle Kingdom; Sect. 2.2) to “Descendant of the ibis” and “Originally of Behbeit/Khemmis” (Late Period; Sect. 5.1.1-5.1.2).
Table 4. Vittmann’s comparison of $Bsk-n-(n3-)nf.w$ with $T3-n-(n3-)hb.w$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>$Bsk-n-(n3-)nf.w$</th>
<th>$T3-n-(n3-)hb.w$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With $-n-n3$-</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With $-n$-</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Discussion and conclusions

7.1 The shabtis and the name of their owner

Seven shabtis from the same gang are now known (Table 2). Two are listed in the online Shabti Collections database, two have been published by Hari & Chappaz (1980), one is in the Musée Vivenel and has been published in their catalogue, and one has been described in this paper. The diversity of the specimens suggests the use of at least three moulds (Table 2). That the provenance of two of the seven shabtis (Australian and French) is unknown prior to their purchase in Britain and France in 1977 (Sect. 1.1 & 1.2) suggests that the owner’s tomb may have been discovered not long before that date. Two more shabtis from the same gang are known to have been in Swiss collections by 1980. The export under licence of non-unique Egyptian antiquities (i.e., artefacts for which multiple similar objects were known and for which the State was already deemed to possess sufficient examples) remained legal until 1983. Naturally, any Egyptian antiquity that was exported illegally prior to 1983 should be offered to the Egyptian government for repatriation. To err on the side of caution, the Australian shabti was in fact so offered, with the relevant information from this investigation and without any request for compensation. The offer was not taken up.

In view of the claimed link to Qurna (Sect. 1.1), the shabtis’ findspot presumably lies somewhere in the Theban necropolis and perhaps within the cemetery of Qurna itself. While deploring the loss of archaeological context inherent in unauthorised excavations, and while not in any way condoning the past, present or future looting of ancient sites, my view is that we have an obligation to try to salvage as much information as possible from the mistakes of past generations. If an ancient Egyptian tomb-owner has suffered the indignity of having their last resting place violated in a previous century, as so many did, the least we can do is to reconstruct and preserve what we can of that individual’s name, identity and legacy.
At face value, the name of the owner in the shabti inscription reads T-hbw-tw, “Tjehebua” or “Tjehebu the Great.” Jean-Claude Goyon has proposed that this is shorthand for – or a variant of – the name T3-n-hb [H1.1.1], a suggestion endorsed by Hari & Chappaz (1980) (Sect. 1.2). By extension, we may envisage the full form of the source name as T3y-n-hb.w-tw (“Tjainhebua,” or “Tjainhebu the Great”). As we have discovered in the course of this paper, the evidence in support of such an origin remains circumstantial and far from complete. Nevertheless, it does appear to offer the most convincing reconciliation of the name on the TIP shabtis with known personal names (Fig. 24). One of the impediments to researching the name and its variants was the diversity of “phonetic translations” of the same name, both within and between different European languages (Table 5). To this we may add the complication that, since the noun Hb is now thought to be a contraction of HAb (Sect. 1.5), our vocalisation of T-hbw, T3-n-hb and T3y-n-hb.w should probably modulate to “Tehabu,” “Tainhab” and “Tainhabu.” Moreover, although I have carefully maintained the distinction between t and t in this paper because they are written differently, we should be aware that the phonetic equivalence of these two letters in the Middle Kingdom and thereafter would further amend the vocalisation to “Tehabu,” “Tainhab” and “Tainhabu.” For consistency, however, I will conclude the paper using the forms and conventions adopted thus far.

The Middle Kingdom male name T3-n-hb [H1] – a contracted variant of the proposed source name T3y-n-hb.w – is present in Ranke’s compendium and found in a further shortened form on the TIP shabtis (Sect. 1.2). It was not included in the survey of such names by de Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983) because these authors limited their scope to the Late Period. The excluded information has now been integrated with their data (Sect. 5.1, Table 3 & Fig. 24). Revisions and additions have also been made to their original dataset (Sect. 5.1-5.2 & Table 3); this included resolving the accidental conflation of the Director of the Mansions (Sect. 5.2.1.3) with the better-known Overseer of the King’s Ships (Sect. 5.2.1.1), and separating Khnumibre’s supposed ancestors (Sect. 5.2.1.4) from the Treasurer to the King (Sect. 5.2.1.5). Original inscriptions (or, where unavailable, the most authoritative transcripts that could be obtained) have been checked, and photographs and transliterations of previously- and newly-identified inscriptions have here been gathered in the one location (Fig. 4). After standardisation, their transcripts have been grouped and collated (Table 3).

7.2 Variations in form and orthography

The name on the TIP shabtis, T-hb.w [H3], is thought to be a contraction of T3-n-hb.w, itself a contraction of the putative source name T3y-n-hb.w (Fig. 24). The orthography on the shabtis is unusual in that the first syllable starts with the uniliteral tether sign (V13) and there is no explicit z, whereas both the earlier and later forms of this name begin with the duckling sign (G47), and thus specify the z. An identical substitution-and-loss postulated recently for the name Tjay in Ramesside finds proved, upon detailed investigation, to lack support (Sect. 4.2). However, a Middle Kingdom form of Tjay, namely [J1.5], starts with the tether sign rather than the duckling glyph, and thus exemplifies the sort of intermediate required for conversion of the first syllable of T3-n-hb.w (G47-) into the first syllable of T-hb.w (V13-) (Sect. 4.2). As
Fig. 24. Dendrogram of names potentially related to T3y-n-hb.w. The scheme shows putative lineages and inter-relationships for key names and representative hieroglyphs. Kingdoms are indicated by standard acronyms at left (blue text), from top (oldest) to bottom (newest); for progressive abbreviations and conversions of the names, a notional intra-kingdom gradient (not to scale) runs left-to-right across the figure. Red-brown text distinguishes female names from male ones (black). English text is in grey. Non-genetic similarities at the hieroglyph level are highlighted by grey background; “Descendant of…” field (Sect. 5.1) is highlighted by pale cyan background.

suggested by de Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983) for the Late Period, the duckling at the start of the name may have come to be seen iconographically as a fledgling and taken to mean “Descendant” (Sect. 5.1.1). Its mutation to the non-logographic tether symbol would therefore have been resisted, explaining why forms of the name beginning with V13 seem to have died out after the TIP.

The orthography on the TIP shabtis also lacks the central \( n \) sound(s) of the canonical name. If the full name is actually \( T\bar{s}-n.y-hb \), then the loss of the central \( n \) could merely reflect a change from an indirect genitive (\( T\bar{s}-n.y-hb \)) to a direct one (\( T\bar{s}-hb \)) (Sect. 2.2 & 4.1.1). In the Late Period, loss of the central \( n \) sound(s) from the name (Table 3) is encountered with three of the five men in the survey (Sect. 5.2.1.1, 5.2.1.4 and 5.2.1.5) and two of the seven women (Sect. 5.2.2.3 & 5.2.2.5). For the men, the resulting “Tjahebu” (or in one case, “Tjaheb”) is phonetically very close to the “Tjehebu” recorded on the TIP shabtis (Sect. 1.1). The shortest known form of the name is “Tja” (Sect. 5.2.1.5).
Table 5. Existing transcriptions of individual names in European languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>German / Dutch*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Tjayenheboea*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Tchnebouaâ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Tjaheb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 [N2]</td>
<td>Thanub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1.1</td>
<td>Tjaenhebu</td>
<td>Tchanéhebou</td>
<td>Ciennehebu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tjainehebu</td>
<td>Tanhebu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tjanehebu</td>
<td>Zannehibou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tjaenhebenu</td>
<td>Tjennhebou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tchanahhebu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tjanehbu</td>
<td>Djenhebu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1.2</td>
<td>Thanenhebu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1.3</td>
<td>Tja(n)enhebu</td>
<td>Tjaenhébou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Djaenhébou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1.4</td>
<td>Tainehebu</td>
<td>Thanhebou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tja(en)hebyu</td>
<td>Thahebou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tahebou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1.5</td>
<td>Tja(nen)hebu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2.1</td>
<td>Thaenhab</td>
<td>Taenheb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2.2</td>
<td>Thanhebi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cia-en-heb</td>
<td>Tjayenheb*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taenhebi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2.4</td>
<td>Djaïtenkhab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tjatienkhebyt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tjacebi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2.6</td>
<td>Tjaenha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By coincidence, the misreading of -ḥbw as -nbw in the sales documents accompanying the Australian shabti restored the central n sound lost from the more complete name (Sect. 1.1); the same effect is obtained by reading the ḥb-basin as the wicker basket nb (Sect. 4.1.2). Accordingly, one may wonder if in fact some sort of hieroglyphic double-take or shorthand was not intended. However, it is unclear whether the n in the name was ever prominent in the pronunciation even when written; for example, von Bergmann (1892) rendered the Middle Kingdom name as Taḥeb (Sect. 2.4), a close match to the way the name recorded on the TIP shabtis would – at face value – be pronounced. On the other hand, Vittmann, by analogy with the name Bsk-n-(n2-nf).w, would see all contractions to the central portion of 7A-n-nA-hb.w – including total loss of the n glyphs – as scribal abbreviations that are not reflected in pronunciation. Bresciani would go one step further, viewing the shortest form as a typographical error on the part of the scribe. No matter which view one prefers, it
seems that Posener was correct when he said “The omission of \( n \) does not make a different name” (Sect. 5.2.1.4).

One other issue of pronunciation remains in need of discussion. If \( \text{h}b \) is in fact a contraction of \( hsb \) (Sect. 1.5) and the vocalisation of \( \text{h}b \) must be revised from “heb” to “hab” (Sect. 7.1), does this cause the \( \text{h}b \)-containing names to separate from those containing \( \text{h} \) and \( \text{h}b \)? Not necessarily. For \( \text{h}b \) (ibis), which does not appear in the name until the Late Period, we find that many New Kingdom writings use \( hsb(y/w) \). For \( \text{h}b(\text{i}t) \) (Khemmis), the semi-vowel associated with the signature papyrus-clump in the name of the town (Fig. 8) is again an \( \varepsilon \), given the phonetic value of \( h \) for the glyph that is more common in personal names (M16) [H8 & 10.1.1-10.2] and \( sh \) for the one that is less common (M15) [H9].

7.3 Meanings of the name and the identities of its bearers

\( T\=n-hb.w \) may originally have meant something like “the man of the festivals” (\( T\=n.y-hb.w \)) or “the man for the festivals” (\( T\=n-hb.w \)) (Sect. 2.2 & 4.3). If the short form \( T\=hb(w) \) is a direct genitive (Sect. 4.1.1 & 7.2), its sense might best be conveyed by “festival-man.”

The first Tjainhebu that we encounter dates to the Middle Kingdom and was a baker. He seems to have been called “the Great” to distinguish him from a namesake who was a dwarf, so “Big Tjainhebu” is probably all that is intended by the epithet (Sect. 2.3.1). In an apparent mistranslation, both men were originally identified as priests who checked the purity of sacrificial cattle.

Forms of this name are known from the Middle Kingdom, New Kingdom and TIP (Sect. 2-4), but are not widely attested. For the Late Period, however, a similar name – “Tja(i)neheb(u)” or “Tja(u)neheb(u)” – appears frequently in the Egyptological literature, although mainly because of one person: Tjainehebu, Overseer of the King’s Ships, whose 26th Dynasty tomb at Saqqara was discovered intact (Sect. 5.2.1.1). Four other men who bore versions of the name in the 25-26th Dynasties have also been discussed (Sect. 5.2.1.2-5.2.1.5). Interpreting the name as “Descendant of the ibis” associates the name with Memphis (Sect. 5.1.1), and three of the five men (Sect 5.2.1.1 & 5.2.1.4-5.2.1.5), are indeed closely linked with that city. The activities of a fourth (Tjainhahebu, “Director of the Mansions,” Sect. 5.2.1.3) are focused upon Sais, but, if the proposals of Lodomez and Vercoutter are correct, his wider family is commemorated in Memphis and his father’s origins lie in nearby Tura. The ibis was closely identified with the god Thoth, and Tjainhahebu’s father was in fact a prophet of Thoth. The fifth man (Sect. 5.2.1.2), although commemorated in Karnak, held a priestly title that – in his time – was quintessentially Memphite.

Up to the end of the TIP, all of the known name-bearers were male. In the Late Period, however, forms of the name were also used by women. The name “Tjaneheb(y),” in which the \( h \) of earlier eras is retained, is one example, and its interpretation by de Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983) as indicating that its owner’s origins lie in Behbeit el-Hagar of the Central Delta is likely to be correct (Sect. 5.1.2.1). Three women who bore this name have been discussed (Sect. 5.2.2.1-5.2.2.3).
The name “Tjanecheb(y),” in which the $h$ has been replaced by an $h$, was also used by women. In this case, de Meulenaere & Yoyotte (1983) provide a credible argument that the name indicates that the owner’s roots lie in Khemmis of the Eastern Delta (Sect. 5.1.2.2). Any form of the name that involves a terminal papyrus clump may also indicate that the bearer’s origins lie in Khemmis. Four women with names in this group have been discussed (Sect. 5.2.2.4-5.2.2.7).

Prior to the Late Period, when names like $T\bar{s}-n-hb.w$ seem to have related to festivals and to have been borne only by men, the geographical associations are mixed. However, they seem mainly to involve Upper Egypt, with recurring links to Thebes. In the Late Period, both the male and female forms of the name relate strongly to Lower Egypt. For male names, we have already seen that the main connection is to Memphis and its ibis-cult. For women, we have seen that the onomastic link is to Behbeit el-Hagar and Khemmis (or, failing the latter, to other sites in the Delta). Although two of the items naming such “women of Khemmis” were discovered in Thebes and another may have been found in the Faiyum, these individuals were wives or mothers whose origins may still have been in the Delta. For example, the Tjainchebit named in the Theban stela (Sect. 5.2.2.4) seems to have been married to a Libyan chieftain at a time when the Libyans controlled much of the Delta, so she may well have grown up there. Interestingly, Isis is important both to Behbeit el-Hagar, where she is honoured in the Iseion as the “Lady of Hebit,” and to Khemmis, where she is said to have given birth to Horus.

We have been able to view (idealised) faces for two of the men that we encountered in this study: the Overseer of Kings Ships (Sect. 5.2.1.1), and the Director of the Mansions (Sect. 5.2.1.3). Although human faces adorn some of the funerary equipment of Tjainheb, mistress of the house (Sect. 5.2.2.3), it is unlikely that they reflect anything of her actual appearance.

7.4 Gender issues: the shabti owner and his gang

Beyond the name preserved in the inscriptions, no information about the original owner of the TIP shabtis has come to light. From the broad sweep of textual evidence, however, we can assume with some confidence that this Tjehebu/Tjainhebu was a man. The alternative – that this individual was a woman with roots in Behbeit and therefore called $T(r-n)-h\dot{b}(ty)$ – would require her to be ahead of her time. The shabtis date to the 21st-22nd Dynasties of the TIP (Sect. 1.1; 1069-715 BCE), whereas female usage of such a name is not attested until the 26th-30th Dynasties of the Late Period (Sect. 5.2.2.1-5.2.2.3; 664-343 BCE). Accordingly, we can take it that our owner was a man, and – in view of the epithet appended to his name\textsuperscript{58} – probably a large one at that.

The only published Schneider typologies for this man’s shabtis – those of Hari & Chappaz (1980) for two worker figurines – class them as female (Sect. 1.4.1). Since female shabtis of the TIP are more likely to be associated with female owners (Sect. 1.4.1), and since Tjehebu/Tjainhebu’s figurines lack breasts or other distinctively feminine attributes, it is reasonable to call for their assignation to Schneider Cl.VIII B2 to be reconsidered. Indeed, it seems that a gender-reassignment of these shabtis to Cl.VIII A2 is now justified (Table 2, Workers, \textit{Proposed}).
Despite the enduring lack of personal and biographical details about Big Tjehebu/Tjainhebu, it is hoped that the exploration of his name and its relatives across a time-span of some 1800 years has proven interesting and insightful. It constitutes a modern attempt at “causing his name to live”559 (Sect. 7.1). Viewed generously, the unconventional prosopography of the present paper (Sect 1.5, 2.3-2.4, 3, 4.3, 5.2 & 6.1) has enabled our protagonist to reassert his masculinity, if not his identity, and has provided him with a cohort of (near-)namesakes that amounts to an alternative form of context: one that is onomastic rather than archaeological.
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In that case, the baker’s name would have been written using the contracted form, $Ts$-$\text{hb}$. 


Moreover, since $\text{yodh}$s are easily lost from words, it made it easy to imagine a progression from $T\text{ry}$- to $T\text{y}$- and then $T$-.

The author of the Sedment analysis now agrees with this assessment, and moreover indicates that he knows of no monument where $T\text{jay}$ and $T\text{yj}$ are used for the same person (H. Franzmeier, pers. comm., Feb. 2016).
227 My translation from the Italian. Il nidiandolo, “the nest-egg” is a real or fake egg placed in a bird’s nest to encourage laying, or in a hen-coop to encourage laying to occur in the same place; additionally – like the English phrase – it seems that it can carry the sense of financial savings. Bresciani, “La Tomba di Ciennehebu,” p.16-17. My translation from the Italian.
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233 de Meulenaere & Yoyotte, “Deux Composants «Natalistes>,” p.108 fn 2. Their suggestion that mirt is an abbreviation of miw (cat) with a feminine suffix (miw.t). The TLE has one such entry for miw.t, lemma-no. 854443.
235 Neith is not usually identified as feline, a point unremarked by de Meulenaere & Yoyotte. It would more usual for “la chatte” to denote Bastet, as for example in name I3 in Guentch-Ogloueff, “Noms Propres Imprécaatoires,” p.124-125.
236 de Meulenaere & Yoyotte, “Deux Composants «Natalistes>,” p.108 (Table 1).
237 In view of complexity inherent in the multiple isomorphs of this place-name, no effort has been made to parse ḫbyt into ḫb. yt, etc.
238 de Meulenaere & Yoyotte, “Deux Composants «Natalistes>,” Table 2:6a-c & Fig. 2:6a-c
239 Osirisnet.net – Behbeit el Haggar, online at http://www.osirisnet.net/monument/behbeit/e_behbeit.htm.
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473 There are some other places in the inscription where a p is recorded contrary to expectation, such as under the egg glyph after Rei-irdjis’s name, which expresses filiation [Gardiner, *Egyptian
and after the n in the final word, snb. Accordingly, the terminal p of Ti-n-hbyp should be regarded as provisional until Piehl’s transcript can be verified against a photograph of the original artefact.

474 Piehl, “Textes Égyptiens Inédits,” 530 (no. 1).
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482 [UCL], Index to the Named Shabtis in the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology at University College London, online at http://www.ucl.ac.uk/museums-static/digitegypt/downloads/shabtis.pdf.

483 Twice on each of the four jars; in all cases the orthography is as shown in [H7.3.1].
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500 Török, Between Two Worlds, p.322.
Although scholars habitually associate the title Divine Adoratrice with the role of God’s Wife of Amun, and often use the two titles interchangeably, they were not synonymous in the New Kingdom and early TIP. In the 18th Dynasty, the titles were held concurrently by different women, while in the 21st-22nd Dynasties, there were Divine Adoratrices (such as Henuttawy and Karomama Merytmut) in the absence of God’s Wives. Ayad, *God’s Wife, God’s Servant*, p.3-4, 10 & 19. See also the next note.

To continue the theme of the previous note, Kashta’s daughter Amenirdis (25th Dynasty) was the first woman known to have combined the three related titles God’s Wife of Amun, Divine Adoratrice, and God’s Hand. Ayad, *God’s Wife, God’s Servant*, p.19.

To continue the theme of the previous note, Kashta’s daughter Amenirdis (25th Dynasty) was the first woman known to have combined the three related titles God’s Wife of Amun, Divine Adoratrice, and God’s Hand. Ayad, *God’s Wife, God’s Servant*, p.19.

Török, Between Two Worlds, p.323.


Shepenwepet, daughter of the Libyan king Osorkon III (the only woman of this name mentioned in the main text). A later God’s Wife of Amun in the 25th Dynasty was Shepenwepet, daughter of the Nubian king Piye. Ayad, *God’s Wife, God’s Servant*, p.12 (genealogy) & 19.


Leclant & Yoyotte, “Notes d’Histoire et de Civilization Éthiopiennes.”


Ritner, “Fictive Adoptions or Celibate Priestesses?”


Ayad, *God’s Wife, God’s Servant*, p.147.


Török, Between Two Worlds, p.320.


Schiaparelli, *Relazione*, vol. 1: “Valle delle Regine,” Fig. 171.
This includes proper study of the huge volume of minor Egyptian artefacts that had entered Western collections – with little or no provenance – prior to 1983, when the export of antiquities from Egypt was suppressed by Egyptian Law 117 and all antiquities discovered subsequently were deemed the property of the State (see the two previous notes). This is a more conservative position than, say, one that would include antiquities acquired prior to the host country’s accession to the UNESCO Convention (see previous note) or its enactment of equivalent domestic legislation. It is, however, more permissive than the standard now applied by many institutions and museums to antiquities still in private ownership, where artefacts without a verifiable collecting history prior to 1970 or 1972 (dates derived from the inception of the UNESCO Convention) and proof of legal export are considered to be out of scope. [See, e.g., The ASOR Policy on Professional Conduct, Apr 2015, online at http://www.asor.org/about/policies/conduct.html; The University of Queensland – R.D. Milns Antiquities Museum – Prospective Donation form, Apr 2013, online at http://www.uq.edu.au/antiquities/documents/034.PotentialDonation.Form.pdf, p.1]

To my mind, it matters little whether the plundering occurred as a consequence of ancient tomb-robery, the Western imperialist greed for national treasures, the reckless actions of colonialist adventurers, the locals’ need to feed their families, or the work of syndicated criminal profiteers. Further evidence for a male owner may be adduced from the form of this suffix. This adjective, which should agree with the gender of the proper name, is written ʿr (masculine) rather than ʿʾr.t (feminine). While the feminine suffix could certainly have been omitted as (yet another) scribal short-cut, it is simpler to assume that the shabti owner was a man.
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