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ABSTRACT

Although women are acknowledged to have played an important role in affairs domestic, religious, and even political in ancient Egypt, very little work has been done to evaluate their actual rights, powers, and influence. The studies which have appeared tend to be either of a general nature, spanning events from the First Dynasty down to the Roman Period, or specialise commentaries upon a single document or group of similar documents, dealing only with one aspect of the subject.

There are many aspects of the lives of women in ancient Egypt which would reward detailed examination, but the evidence is voluminous and widely scattered, and ranges over a time span of three thousand years. This thesis investigates the role played by women in their families and in the community as a whole during the Middle Kingdom, which for the purposes of this work is defined as Dynasties Eleven, Twelve and Thirteen.

The world's great collections of Egyptian stelae have been relatively well published, and these form the basis of the evidence utilised in the first two of the five sections. Section I examines the nature of the evidence to be obtained from stelae, discusses the multiplicity of meanings of Egyptian kin-terms, and assembles all the examples of possible consanguineous marriages of various types.

Section II is devoted to a detailed analysis of all individual stelae of interest, and to the reconstruction of the family trees thus revealed.

The third section presents a comprehensive collection of the titles and professions of women of all classes, excluding the royal family, and their consequent standing in the community, as revealed by paintings, reliefs, artefacts, and the comments of the Egyptians themselves in the writings of the sages and in other literary texts.
The fourth section reviews the legal position of women, and here the paucity of evidence necessitated the inclusion of material from other periods of pharaonic history. The individual documents have been examined by many scholars, who were interested in Egyptian laws and legal practice, but I have attempted to re-analyse the documents to ascertain the extent of women's rights and duties, the degree to which they were dependent on their male relatives, and in what fields they could act on their own initiative. This review relies mainly upon secondary sources and does not depend, as do the other sections, upon re-analysis of the original evidence.

The final section deals with the costumes worn by women during the Middle Kingdom and examines how far they can be shown to reflect their age, status, wealth and nationality, because it has long been my belief that many of our sources fail to convey a full and accurate picture of the variety of colour and styles worn during life.

The results show that, though still relatively rare during the Middle Kingdom, most degrees of consanguineous marriage were entered into by non-royal personages, and that, while women owed obedience to their husbands, they could still exert and have considerable authority in certain spheres. Rank and status among Egyptian women were well-defined by a variety of distinctions and usages, and this thesis shows the nature and extent of their legal status, what offices they might hold, and what powers they could exercise.

While none of the results obtained are entirely novel, the examination and analysis, in part statistical, of this large body of evidence, have given them greater emphasis and definition. This treatment, combined for the first time with the various aspects of the social role of women, gives better historical perspective to the character of the Middle Kingdom.
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KEY TO SYMBOLS USED IN THE FIGURES AND IN THE FAMILY TREES

△ Man
○ Woman
＝ Insufficient data supplied to determine sex.
→ Married to.

The marriage symbol crosses a line of affiliation, and two lines of affiliation cross.

? A possible marriage.
? An unidentified spouse.
× An alliance with a woman who is not an acknowledged wife.

— Possible child of a marriage.

↓ Descendants of a marriage, not listed individually.
← Indication of the location of figures on a stela, and the direction in which they are facing.

* Probably the same person, who has been named twice.
MULTIPLE PAGES MISSING IN THE ORIGINAL THESIS
There are also stelae, which are discussed individually in Sect. on II, where the words sn and ant are applied to the children of a sister of the owner *(15). Either these children were born of a father/daughter marriage (see fig.9), or it must be concluded that, in this context, sn(t) must be translated as nephew and niece in English.

To these already numerous alternative translations for n(t) must be added at least two more.

On Cairo stela 20245, the brother of the mother of the wife of the owner is referred to as sn.f (see fig.10). To be the actual brother of the owner, this man would have to have been born of an otherwise unrecorded marriage between the father of the owner and the maternal grandmother of the wife of the owner (see fig.11). While

this is not impossible, it is more reasonable to accept that sn(t) could be used of an uncle or aunt by marriage, a relative.

On Cairo stela 20457 and Florence 2546, the foster-brothers of the respective owners are each said to be sn.f. Sn(t) can therefore also be used for foster-brothers and foster-sisters, but since a wet-nurse/also might have been her master's concubine, her children could actually be the half-brothers and half-sisters of her nursingling.

There are stelae *(16) where three generations of men and women are all referred to as being the sn(t) of the owner. It might just be possible
to imagine a situation where enough consanguineous marriages had taken place to produce blood relationships of this complexity, but it is unlikely in the extreme. The reasonable alternative is that sn(t) was being used to express some of the differing degrees of kinship discussed above.

Sister-in-law and brother-in-law are unlikely to be alternative translations for snt and sn as it was customary to refer to the brother and sister of a wife as sn,s and snt,s, her brother and her sister. The wife of the brother of the owner was always referred to by her relationship to her husband, not to the owner of the stela, so either she would be designated hmt sn,s, the wife of his brother, or her name would follow that of her husband, as in the following typical pattern:

X born of Y.
His wife A born of B.
His brother Z born of Y.
His wife C born of D.

In order to identify the husband of his sister, the owner of the stela would either show the figure of his sister in close proximity to that of an otherwise unidentified man, whose children were born of her, or would name his sister twice, once as his sister, and once as the other man's wife, as in the following example:

X born of Y.
His wife A born of B.
His sister Z born of Y.
C born of D.
His wife Z born of Y.

In conclusion, there is one meaning of sn(t), involving the use of multiple kin-terms, which deserves special consideration, and this is the question of whether there is any significant difference of meaning.
between $s_n(t)$ $mwt.f$ (or $l_t.f$) and $sn(t)$ $n(t)$ $mwt.f$ (or $l_t.f$) on the one hand, and $sn(t)_f$ $mwt.f$ (or $l_t.f$) and $sn(t)_n(t)$ $mwt.f$ (or $l_t.f$) on the other, or whether they are variants of the same term.

The terms $sn(t)$ $mwt.f$ (or $l_t.f$) and $sn(t)_n(t)$ $mwt.f$ (or $l_t.f$) are clearly to be understood as referring to the maternal or paternal aunt or uncle of the owner, but it is conceivable that $sn(t)_f$ $mwt.f$ (or $l_t.f$) and $sn(t)_n(t)$ $mwt.f$ (or $l_t.f$) were intended to identify the half-brother or half-sister of the owner, that is the child of the parent mentioned, by another marriage. This would be in keeping with the Egyptian preference for mentioning a parent's second marriage by indirect means.

The conclusive evidence concerning the meaning of $sn(t)_f$ $mwt.f$ (or $l_t.f$) and $sn(t)_n(t)$ $mwt.f$ (or $l_t.f$) is to be found on only two stelae, where details are given which favour the uncle/aunt interpretation.

In the first case *(17)*, the man referred to as $sn.f_n$ $l_t.f$ is said to be born of the known paternal grandmother of the owner. Thus $sn.f_n$ $l_t.f$ must mean paternal uncle (see below fig.12), unless a mother/son union is to be postulated.

**Fig.12**

![Diagram](attachment:fig12.png)

On the second stela *(18)*, set out in figure 13, the woman who is said to be $nt.f_{nt}$ $mwt.f$ was born of the maternal great-grandmother of the owner. Unless it is suggested that a woman had a child by the husband of her own granddaughter, a highly unlikely contingency, it must be accepted that $sn.t.f_{nt}$ $mwt.f$ could be used of a maternal great-aunt.

**Fig.13**

![Diagram](attachment:fig13.png)
On the basis of this evidence, it will be assumed that \( n(t) \) of \( (t) \) and \( t, t \) of \( (t) \) are variants of \( n(t) \) and \( t, t \) of \( (t) \), and they will be translated as maternal or paternal, aunt or uncle, as appropriate (13) in the discussion of individual stelae in Section II.

c) The translation of \( s(t) \).

The Egyptian kin-terms discussed so far have each had more than one meaning in English, but the words \( s[j] \) and \( s[t] \) appear never to have meant anything other than on and daughter respectively. There is no evidence to show, for example, that they were ever used of a son-in-law or a daughter-in-law, nor were they used of grandchildren.

If the owner of a stela wished to include the name of his daughter-in-law, he would either employ the term \( bmt s[j] \), the wife of his son, or he would put her name directly after that of his son. For example:

His son X born of Y.

His wife A born of B.

There are very few examples of stelae where the son-in-law of the owner has been specifically identified, and this was only achieved by naming a girl twice, once as her father's daughter, then again as her husband's wife, as in the following example:

A born of B.

A's wife C born of D.

is on E born of C.

His daughter F born of C.

X born of Y.

His wife F born of C.
There were three methods by which the owner of a stela could establish the identity of his grandchildren. The figure of his daughter might be followed by those of s3₅ and s5₁₆, her son and her daughter, or the grandchild might be said to be s₃(t)₃(t), the son (or daughter) of his, meaning the owner's son (or daughter). Finally a combination of kin-terms and mothers' names might be used. For example:

I born of I.

His wife A born of B.

His son C born of A. C now becomes the subject of the inscriptions and the following kin-terms are given in relation to him.

His wife M born of M.

His son D born of M.

There are only two occasions (on Caire stelae 20733 and 20749) when the term s₃(t), is used of a child born of a woman who is herself the child of the owner of the stela, and these are so unusual that they may well represent cases of father/daughter marriages (see below p. 34/35).

One stela *(20) was dedicated by a man who is said to be both the son (s₃) of the owner, and s₃ sn.f n mt.t, the son of his maternal uncle. It is clear that, as the first cousin (see below fig.14), and probably nearest surviving male relative of the deceased, this man was dedicating the stela in the purely priestly role of the "beloved son". No consanguineous marriage can possibly be involved here.

![Fig.14](image)

d) The translation of *ḥst and ḫbt pr.
The word hmt, written in hieroglyphs as $\text{ונות}$, and not to be confused with $\text{.offer}$, which is also transliterated hmt but means a female servant or slave, was regularly used on stelae for wife.

A discussion of the significance of the title nbt pr, the lady of the house, is presented below (see Section III, pp.262/263). Here it should be noted that, for the purposes of reconstructing family trees in Section II, a nbt pr will be considered to be the wife of the owner, if she is said to be the mother of his children, or is shown on the stela in a place normally reserved for the wife of the owner (see Exousus D).

e) The use of hms(t), ym(t) and yym.

These terms occur so infrequently on the stelae under review, that they play no significant role in the reconstruction of family trees.

The usually accepted meaning of hms(t) is friend *(21), but there are three stelae on which it was also applied to relatives of the owner. One example occurs on Cairo stela 20027, but, unfortunately, as will be explained in the discussion on this stela on ps. 47/48, the exact relationship between the man in question and the owner of the stela cannot be ascertained, though he may have been his nephew. On Cairo stela 20025, however, the hms can positively be identified as the sister-in-law of the owner, and she is the mother of his second wife as well (see below ps. 45/47). The hms on Cairo stela 20713 is the brother-in-law of the owner.

On the basis of these three examples, it cannot be assumed that hms(t) had the secondary meaning of a relative or in-law, for in each of the three cases quoted above, friend or companion would be an acceptable translation.
In regard to the words ḫm(t) and ḫjm, the prototypes for the Coptic words for in-laws, only three examples survive from the Middle Kingdom. In one case *(22)*, the figure of the wife of the owner of the stela is followed by that of a woman said to be ḫmā. Since the two women are placed so close together the second may be the mother of the first, and she would thus be the mother-in-law of the owner. The second example occurs on a stela *(23)* which bears an inscription but no figures. The name of ḫm.f Tti is the last but one in the list, and as it comes after the name of one of the sisters of the owner, Tti might have been her husband and consequently the brother-in-law of the owner. Finally there is a tomb in which the term ḫjm appears in a banqueting scene *(24)*. The owner and his wife face their guests, who are headed by a man and his wife. This couple are clearly important members of the family and are probably the son and daughter-in-law of the owner and his wife. Behind them, drawn on a slightly smaller scale, but sitting on chairs, whereas all the succeeding couples are seated on mats, are another man and wife. The man is said to be ḫjm.f, but further details are not supplied, so the exact relationship to the owner cannot be established.

**Part 3 - Consanguineous Marriages.**

The term consanguineous marriage is to be preferred to incestuous marriage in the present context, because incest is socially defined in terms of a society's kinship system and religious beliefs. The degrees of kin forbidden sexual intercourse, and the savagery with which sanctions are imposed, vary from society to society.

The present study of consanguineous marriage in Egypt has been limited to the Middle Kingdom, and the evidence is drawn from the stelae of this
period, occasionally augmented by details of family relationships recorded in the tombs of the researches.

The tendency for stelas to omit the name of the father of the owner's wife, and often the name of the father of the owner as well (see Chart 1), is a serious obstacle to progress in this matter because, in order to offer incontrovertible proof of a consanguineous marriage, it is necessary to know the names of the parents of both contracting parties. Absolute proof is therefore lacking, but it is hoped that strong inferential evidence can be offered.

It is regretted that it has been necessary to omit any detailed examination of the complexities of consanguineous marriage within the royal family, but these require a separate study of their own, and anyway, it would be unwise to involve royal marriage practices as evidence of the occurrence of consanguineous unions in any other level of society, since the habits and customs of a divine royal family may differ from the rules binding their subjects *(1).

The classical authors and the Graeco/Roman papyri attest the existence of consanguineous unions at that late period, but the evidence for non-royal consanguineous unions in earlier periods has never been fully analysed, though the existence of such marriages has often been accepted without question. Some attention has been paid to the problem. The late Professor J.Černý, for example, published an article on the subject *(2), and reference will be made to his findings, but the number of stelas he examined was limited, and he was only considering brother/sister unions. Dr. Margaret Murray also did research into the problem and made several published references to her conclusions *(3).
It is proposed to consider the following types of consanguineous marriages: (a) brother/sister.
(b) mother/son.
(c) father/daughter.
(d) aunt/nephew and uncle/niece.
(e) first cousins.
(f) in-laws.

(a) Brother/sister marriages.

This is the type of consanguineous marriage most commonly associated with ancient Egypt. The Egyptians had good mythological justification for such unions in the marriages of Shu and Tefnut, Geb and Nut, Osiris and Isis, and Seth and Nephthys.

The Pharaohs had imitated this divine example, at least from the reign of Huni *(4)*, and possibly from a much earlier period. Although it is the stated policy of this work to avoid entanglements with the royal family and its probably atypical customs, a family tree for the Fourth Dynasty has been included (see pl. 1), in order to give some indication of the regularity with which consanguineous marriages could and did occur, with no apparent ill effects *(5)*. Complex as this tree is, it is by no means complete, and concentrates only on the kings' immediate relations.

Unfortunately, there is far less detailed information available concerning the exact relationships of members of the royal families of the Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth Dynasties, though there can be no doubt that the practice of consanguineous marriage continued. Nebhepetre Mentuhotep of the Eleventh Dynasty, for example, is known to have married his sister, Nfrw *(6)*, while Senwaret I of the Twelfth Dynasty married his sister, another
Nfrw *(7) and Semuaret II married his sister, Nfrt *(8).

The evidence concerning consanguineous marriage outside the royal family has mainly been drawn from stelae, but it is augmented by information from tombs, offering tables and statues. A full discussion of each stela of interest is presented in Section II, so only the basic minimum of detail will be supplied here.

Examples:
1) British Museum stela, vol. III, pl. 7.

The owner and his wife are both said to be born of ḫš péri. If it is accepted that ḫš perí represents one woman, rather than two, then the owner married his sister, or at least half-sister. This is one of the stelae examined by Černý and accepted by him as a probable brother/sister marriage.

2) British Museum stela, vol. III, pl. 15.

The owner of this stela was born of a woman called Ky. Facing him, in the area where one would normally find the wife, is the nbt pr ḫš perí n Ṣw n nbt pr Ky. There are also five girls, all born of ḫš perí.


Both the owner and his wife are said to be born of ḫš Ky.


The issue to be decided here is whether the phrase n sḫtṣ ẖn Ṣw ḫḥ is to be translated "to his daughter and to his sister ḫḥ" or to his daughter of his sister ḫḥ. If the first alternative is preferred, then it is very strange that the name of the daughter is omitted. It might be argued that sḫtṣ was here being used for niece, but such a reading is not employed anywhere else. Admittedly, if the second translation is to be preferred, the phrase ought to have read n sḫtṣ Ṣw n Ṣw, but the omission
of the feminine I on stelae is too frequent an occurrence to attach much significance to it. Černý was prepared to consider the possibility of the implied consanguineous marriage.

5) Louvre stela C.3, pls.IV/V.

The owner of this stela is said to have a son, but no wife is named. However, the owner does have a sister and she is shown standing in the place normally reserved for the wife. This cannot be regarded as proof of a brother/sister marriage but it certainly suggests the possibility.

6) Louvre stela C.16/18, pls.II/III.

The owner of these three stelae is shown on all three before a table of offerings. Opposite him a woman called Dtt *(9) is shown. On C.16 she is called hast.f nbt pr, on C.17 she is nbt pr only, while on C.18 she is ant.f nbt pr. Černý examined these stelae and concluded that "Since we have found, on overwhelming evidence, that wives were not called 'sisters' before the New Kingdom, we are left with two alternatives: either we accept 'his sister' on C.18 as a simple mistake for 'his wife', which is unlikely, or we are compelled to admit that Dto was Senwosret's wife as well as his sister". *(10).

7) Louvre stela C.179, pl.XXIV.

This stela is divided into two horizontally. In the upper half of the owner and his wife are shown together with their son Pth-sʿnh and their daughter Ḥḥpt. In the lower half of the stela a man called Pth-sʿnh appears together with his wife Ḥḥpt and their children. If, as is very likely, the Pth-sʿnh and Ḥḥpt of the first register are the same two people who appear in the second, then this is another case of a brother and sister marrying, and in this instance they are full brother and sister.
8) Louvre stela C.44.

This unpublished stela was quoted by Černý *(11) as a possible brother/sister marriage, on the grounds that both spouses were said to be born of S3t-Hthr. Černý acknowledged, however, that S3t-Hthr was so common a name that its re-appearance could be a simple coincidence.

9) Florence stela 2522, photograph 33.

Mnw-htp, the owner of the stela, had a sister called 'nhÎ, who appears to have born children to a man called Htpy. Htpy is probably to be identified as the half-brother of Mnw-htp and 'nhÎ (see below p.170 ).

(10) Florence stela 2512, photograph 45.

A man and his wife, the parents of the owner, are both said to have been born of 'nhÎ, so they may have been brother and sister, as well as husband and wife.


The parents of one man are described as mw.t.f Shtp-1b ľr n S3t-Hthr and ľt.f Shtp-1b ľr n S3t-Hthr. The repetition of the name S3t-Hthr is not conclusive, but, taken in conjunction with the fact that the husband and wife also have the same name, there is a strong a priori case for a brother/sister marriage. For comments on the re-use of names within the Egyptian family, see Exкурsus B.


The parents of the owner appear to have been a brother and sister, both being born of S3t-Snt.w.

13) Caire stela 20025.

The owner of this stela is a man called Wdj, and he had children by his wife, Snbt. However, he is also said to have a daughter called NhÎ.
born of Nhti. The only Nhti named on the stela appears to have also been his half-sister, so W3d must have married, or at least had a child by, his half-sister.

14) Cairo stela 20138.

Two couples are represented at the top of this stela. The owner and his wife, 'krr and Dd.e, are on the left, facing Hn.w and Hwtt-twt. On analogy with other stelas, the people most likely to appear on the right hand side of such a stela are either the parents of the owner, or his son and daughter-in-law. Hn.w and Hwtt-twt cannot be the parents of 'krr because elsewhere his mother is named as Ht.p, but it is known that 'krr had a son and daughter named Hn.w and Hwtt-twt. It is therefore possible that the brother and sister mentioned in one place are the married couple shown in another. It is also perfectly possible that Hn.w and Hwtt-twt were related to 'krr in some other way but, since this is a stela where kinship terms are carefully recorded, it would be somewhat perplexing that no reference was made to the relationship between 'krr and Hn.w, unless it was the stated one of father and son.

15) Cairo stela 20161.

This is a large stela, recording several generations of one family by inscription with no accompanying figures. Among those listed are a man and his wife, both said to be born of 'dp, thus providing a possible example of a brother/sister marriage.

Further down, the stela records the names of the family of Hnww-nht. He had a sister called 'ty and a wife called Hnww'-3, who was the mother of his son. Hnww-nht also had two daughters, but their mother is said to have been 'ty. Since sn(t) not s3(t) were the words used for a man's nephew
and niece (see above p. 15), it would appear that Hnw-nbt had two wives and that one of them was his own sister.

16) Cairo stela 20265.

Since all the women on this stela are called either Hty or Imw-htp it is impossible to arrive at a satisfactory family tree. The proliferative of these two names may well conceal several consanguineous marriages of varying degrees, but there is no way of proving this.

17) Cairo stela 20317.

The owner of this stela had children, but did not mention his wife. His sister, however, stands at his side in the place usually reserved for the wife.

18) Cairo stela 20341.

The wife of the owner is said to be hat.f s3t n(t) mwt.f Nbt, his wife, the daughter of his mother, Nbt (see below, Section II, p. 87). The owner would therefore appear to have married his sister, or perhaps his half-sister.

19) Cairo stela 20398.

This stela is divided horizontally into three registers. In the top register the owner appears with his wife Snt-īt.s, her daughter St, and his son ḫwuy. In the third register there is a man called ḫwuy born of Snt-īt.s and his wife St. Thus ḫwuy would appear to have married his sister or half-sister.

20) Cairo stelae 20429/30.

These two stelae belong to the same man, who was the father of six children. Neither stela names his wife, but on both the owner's sister is shown in those areas usually reserved for the wife, and moreover, she
is the only woman on the stela to be entitled pr.bht.

21) Cairo stela 20482.

The inscriptions on this stela are divided into several groups, and some of them are destroyed, but from what remains, it is possible to reconstruct a plausible family tree. A full discussion appears Section II (pp. 103/104), so it is sufficient here to note that if, as seems likely, there was only one woman named Ṭtī then a consanguineous marriage took place, because Ṭtī married two women, Ṭtī and Sht-B, and the son of Ṭtī married the daughter of Sht-B.

22) Cairo stela 20518.

The owner of this stela is Hsw-nḥt born of Ṣt-fy and his wife is named as Ṣnḥ born of Ṣt-fy. The variations in spelling are negligible *(12) and this may be a brother/sister marriage.

23) Cairo stela 20535.

The owner of this stela had a sister called Ṣpy and a second wife of the same name. Since Ṣpy is a common name, this may be a coincidence, or he may have taken his sister as his second wife. The name of the mother of the second wife is not recorded.

24) Cairo stela 20636.

This stela lists the members of the family of the owner without showing the figures of any of them. The first person on the list is snt.f Ṣnḫ-pḥw who was born of Ṣḏw, and was also the mother of his children. The name of the mother of the owner is known to have been Ṣḥ3t-Hr, so, since snt is not used to mean "wife" during the Middle Kingdom, this man must have married his half-sister.

25) At Elephantine (see pl. VI).
S3-Bnpri is the first of Elephantine was born of a woman called S3t-Tn1 and
married a woman of the same name. Since names were commonly re-used within
families he may well have been related to his wife by blood, but since her
parents are not named there is no way of proving this.

26) At Weir (see pl.V).

A.W. Blackman *(13) suggests that Ph-htp, the fifth of his name, may have
married his sister, since the name of his wife is Huy-bry-ib and it is known
that his parents, Mra1 and Ph-htp the third, did have a child of that name
However, since the parents of Huy-bry-ib are not named, this must remain
speculation.

Blackman does not mention the possibility of a second brother/sister
marriage in the same generation. Ph-htp the fourth married a girl called
Hwty-htp who is said to be the daughter of Ph-htp. Since the fourth was
also the son of Mra1 and Ph-htp the third, and since the mother of Mra1 is
also called Hwty-htp, there is a good chance that the second Hwty-htp was
related to her husband, and may have been his sister.

27) J.E.A., 1938. vol.IXXIV, pl.XII.

The arguments concerning the complex family relationships recorded on
the stela of S3-R' are set out in full on pp.230/234, and there are two
marriages of particular interest to be considered.

The owner of S3-R' was married to a woman called S3t-hnt1-hty, and he
is also said to have a sister of the same name. Thus S3-R' may have married
his sister, or at least a near relative.

The brother of S3-R', called Sbk-htp, married a woman called S3t-Sn-wr1
*(14), who appears to have been the daughter of the mother of S3-R' and
Sbk-htp by her second marriage. In this case, therefore, Sbk-htp married
his half-sister.
b) Evidence for mother/son marriages.

Dr. N.A. Murray has argued for the occurrence of mother/son marriages in the various royal families on the basis of the existence of the title "King's Wife, King's Mother" assuming that the king referred to is the same in both instances. This is an unacceptable hypothesis because several queens bore the titles "King's Daughter, King's Sister, King's Wife, King's Mother," and no woman could stand in all these degrees of relationship to one man. It is clear that these royal ladies simply added one title to another as time passed and their status changed. Thus a woman would begin life as a "King's Daughter," become "King's Sister" and "King's Wife" at the accession of her brother, and, if she were lucky, would end her days during the reign of her son as "King's Mother". This is not to deny the possibility of mother/son marriages, but merely to deny the validity of this particular argument. Though there is no convincing evidence available to show that any of the Egyptian Pharaohs married their mothers, some religious justification for such unions might have been drawn from the concept of Kemetef, the "Bull of his mother".

Attention has already been drawn (see above p. 14) to the fact that some men are said to have a "brother" or "sister", born of one of their grandmothers. The stelae involved are:

- sn(t) born of the paternal grandmother - Cairo stelae 20153 and 20549.
- sn(t) born of the maternal grandmother - Cairo stelae 20043, 20141, 20156, 20271, 20338 and 20431; Leuven, C.187, pl.XXXIX; Guimet, C 6, pl.V; Stockholm, ps.1/5, No.14; Verschiedenen Sammlungen, pl.I, no.1; el Arabah, pl.VI, E295.

While not denying that these could be examples of men marrying and having children by their mothers or mothers-in-law, it is more likely that,
in such cases, $sn(t)$ should be translated into English as uncle or aunt. The only incontrovertable proof that could be offered for a mother/son marriage would be the existence of a child of the owner of a stela, designated $sj(t)$, and born of his mother, who would have to be identified by the inclusion of the name of her own mother, and such evidence is not forthcoming.

The Egyptians sometimes employed as names combinations of kin terms, such as $Snt-it.s$ *(15). If this name, which means "The sister of her father", and others of the same type, were to be interpreted literally, they would imply that the bearer was the offspring of a consanguineous union. In the case quoted, that of the name $Snt-it.s$, the woman would have been the daughter of a mother/son marriage, but there is no indication of this on the stelas *(16) on which this name occurs. Such tenuous evidence is insufficient to substantiate the existence of non-royal consanguineous marriages. An Egyptian child was named at birth, and names of this type may reflect no more than a pious hope on the part of the mother that the infant would grow up to be a beloved companion of its progenitor.

There are a certain number of examples of families where a man's wife and mother both had the same name, but, especially where the name concerned is a common one such as $Hpy$, $It$, $El$ or $Snt$, this is probably no more than a simple coincidence. This is illustrated by Cairo stelae 20109 and 20374, where the names of the wives and mothers of the respective owners are the same, but the names of the mothers of all four of these women are known and they are different, thus showing that neither man married his mother.

Examples of stelae on which the wife and mother of the owner both have of the same name may be found in Excursus B, but these, only one deserves consideration as possible example of a mother/son marriage.
In the museum at Avignon there are three stelae belonging to the same man *(17). The name of the owner's mother is given as Ntw3. On the third of these stelae the owner is again said to be born of Ntw3 but no figure of her is shown. There is, however, a figure representing hat.f Ntw3. On two of these stelae the nbt pr 'wy is named and, were it not for the presence of hat.f Ntw3, 'wy would have been accepted as the wife of the owner without question, and indeed, she probably was his wife too. However, Ntw3 is such a rare name *(18) that it is possible that the owner married his mother, and if not, at least a close relative.

Allowing for the fact that Egyptian girls probably married at a relatively early age, there is no inherent difficulty in the idea of a woman having a child by her own son, but, at the present time, there is so little evidence to support such unions that either they did not take place at all, or they were extremely rare events.

c) Evidence of father/daughter marriages.

There are no known examples of father/daughter marriages in the royal families of the Old and Middle Kingdoms, but there is a reasonable amount of evidence to suggest that, in the New Kingdom, Pharaohs such as Amenhotep III, Akhenaten, and Ramesses II each married one or more of their daughters *(19). E. Young has also drawn attention to a non-royal father/daughter marriage during the Ptolemaic Period *(20), and though evidence for earlier non-royal unions of this type is difficult to find, a few possible cases may have occurred in the Middle Kingdom.

It has already been noted that a man may have a sn(t), born of a woman known to be his sister, and that such cases may represent examples of father/daughter marriages (see above p. 15 and fig.9), but it is equally possible that, in these instances, sn(t) was simply being used of nieces and nephews,
and that the words should be translated as such. This is the explanation that has been adopted throughout this study. There are, however, some stelae which do not belong to this category and deserve further consideration.

1) Cairo stela 20455.

'Tjny, the owner of this stela, names his two wives as 'Hnwt born of Snt and Nbt-sht-nt-R' born of 'Hnwt. Three of his daughters by 'Hnwt are said to have been named Nbt-sht-nt-R' but, unfortunately, there is no indication as to which was the first wife of 'Tjny. If he married Nbt-sht-nt-R' first, then, for some reason, he chose to name the daughters of his second marriage after her, even though he had children by her, but there is also a strong possibility that 'Hnwt was the first wife and that, after her death, 'Tjny married one of their daughters, and she named one of her own daughters 'Hnwt after her mother.

2) Cairo stela 20733.

'Intf, the son of the owner 'Mntw-'3, does not name his wife, but he gives a list of his children. The first four entries are quite straightforward and simply name his three sons and a daughter, omitting the name of their mother, though there is room for it. The last entry, concerned with the family of 'Intf reads - s3t.f 'Hnt (and) s3t.f 'It born of 'Hnt. The use of the words s3(t).f alone was not the normal method of identifying the grandchildren of the owner of a stela (see above p. 18). Unless this, and Cairo stela 20749, are the only two exceptions where s3t.f was used of granddaughters, it must either be assumed that s3t.f was written in error for s3t.s, or that 'Intf and 'P3nt, the owners of Cairo stelae 20733 and 20749, both had children by their respective daughters.

3) Cairo stela 20749.
Pšmt, the owner of this stela, is said to have a son and two daughters, named ḫp-nfr, K3-ns and W3t respectively, all born of his wife, Snbtis. He had another daughter called ḫw.s-n.s, and although the name of her mother has been destroyed, she too was probably born of Snbtis, for the hieroglyphs of this name would fit the space available. There are two more women, also said to be his daughters, but the names of their mothers are given as K3-ns and ḫw.s-n.s respectively. The possible explanations for the use of s3t.s here have already been examined in connection with Cairo stela 20733.


The owner of this monument has several brothers, one of whom is called ḫfr-htp. The figure after that of ḫfr-htp is ḫfr ḫm ḫw irt n ḫfr-htp ȝ3 ḫrw, so it would appear that ḫfr-htp married his daughter, born of an unnamed mother.


These two stelae belong to a man called Ḫmj. The British Museum stela gives the name of his wife as ḫmj and their daughter is called ḫfr-tw, but the Cairo stela says his wife was ḫfr-tw and their daughter was ḫmj. It is perfectly possible that the scribe who wrote out the inscriptions, or the sculptors who carved them, made a mistake, reversing the names of mother and daughter of one stela, but it is also possible that these stelae record the two marriages of Ḫmj, one of which was to his own daughter. It would not be surprising if the daughter/wife chose to name her own child after her mother.

6) Abydos, vol. III, pl. LIII.

It has already been observed that names like Snḫ-ḥt.s cannot be taken as evidence of a consanguineous marriage (see above p. 32), but a name of the same type, ḫmr.s-ḥnt.s ȝ(21), which occurs on this stela, deserves some consideration. The details concerning the relationships within this family
will be discussed later (see below ps. 253/257), but there is reason to think that the owner, the King's Mother Tw2t-Ib, may have been married twice, and on the basis of his study of the monuments of this family, M.F.Ismail MacAdam *(22) is prepared to concede the possibility that Tw2t-Ib married her own father, Snb-djw, and that Mwt.I-snt.I was the child of this union.

d) Evidence of aunt/nephew and uncle/niece marriages.

One of the best documented cases of a marriage between an uncle and a niece occurred in the royal family during the Fourth Dynasty when Khafre, the son of Khufu, married Mr.s'-nh, the third, the granddaughter of Khufu *(23).

The New Kingdom produced some well-documented marriages between non-royal uncles and nieces *(24), but examples have not hitherto been quoted for the Middle Kingdom, though a study of the stelae has revealed seven possible cases which deserve serious consideration as examples of uncle/niece and aunt/nephew marriages. They are:

1) Cairo stelae 20043 and 20681.

Cairo stela 20681 belongs to a man called Drwy born of Htwy, and his sister is named as T3-nit-n1 born of Htwy. Among the members of the immediate family also named on the stelae are snt.f Rn.s'-nh born of Snb and s3.s [Ak-k: Rn.s'-nh cannot be the aunt of Drwy and T3-nit-n1 because neither of their grandmothers is called Snb. Nor can she be their niece or cousin, since they have no sisters or aunts called Snb. The only reasonable alternative is, therefore, that she was their half-sister.

The other stela, 20043, belongs to W3b-k3, the son of Rn.s'-nh, and the name of his wife is given as T3-nit-n1 born of Htwy, who, on the evidence of the other stela, was most probably his aunt.

2) Cairo stela 20079. The paternal grandmother and the mother-in-law of the
owner are both said to be named *Ty, so he may have married his aunt. However, *Ty is a not uncommon name, so this could be a simple coincidence.

3) Cairo stela 20092.

Both the maternal grandmother and the mother-in-law of the owner of this stela are named *Hnw-nht, so he may have married his aunt.

4) Cairo stela 20153.

The paternal grandmother and the mother-in-law of the owner of this stela are both named as *Sit-hnti-hty. The spelling of this name varies from place to place on this stela *(25), but it is possible that they refer to the same woman, and that the owner married his aunt.

5) Cairo stela 20535.

The owner of this stela was married twice. One wife, *Sit-Wsr, is portrayed seated with her husband, while the other wife, *Hpy, is shown standing behind them.

The owner also had several sisters, and one of these had a daughter named *Hpy. Since *Hpy is a common name, the re-appearance might be a coincidence, or the girl may have been specially named after the wife of her uncle, but it is also possible that there was only one *Hpy and that she became her uncle's second wife.

6) Heidelberg stela, inv.no.560, pl.12.

The owner *Rdja *(26), and his wife, *Sit-rdja, had two children - a girl called *Nbw-(w)-dit and a boy called *Hnum-daw. The wife of *Hnum-daw is named as *Sit-rdja born of *Nbw-(w)-dit, so he was undoubtedly married to his niece.

7) Florence stela 2521, photograph 33.

*Hnw-hty, the nephew of the owner, who was also called *Hnw-hty, married and had children by a woman called *Djii. Since *Djii would appear to have been the
half-sister of the elder Wnw-htp (see below p. 171), Wnw-htp the younger married his aunt.

e) Evidence of First Cousin Marriages.

1) Cairo stela 20051 - a cross cousin marriage.

The paternal grandfather and maternal grandmother of the owner were both born of Sjt-R', thus the owner's parents were cross cousins.

There is also a strong possibility that the owner and his wife were related in some way since his paternal grandmother and his wife’s maternal grandmother were called Thg₁ the Elder and Thg₂ respectively. This is strengthened by the fact that the mother of Thg₁ the Elder, and the daughter and granddaughter of Thg₂ all share the same name. Thus the owner and his wife would be second cousins.

2) Cairo stela 20161 - a parallel cousin marriage.

The mother and mother-in-law of Hnw-nht were sisters, thus Hnw-nht married his cousin.

3) Cairo stela 20518 - a cross cousin marriage.

The parents of ThgⅠ and Nfry were brother and sister, so this man and his wife were first cousins.

4) Florence stela 2564, photograph 37 - a parallel cousin marriage.

The maternal and paternal grandmothers of the owner were both born of a woman called M-s3₂₆, thus his parents were first cousins.


The discussion here is limited to one register of this interesting stela. On the left, facing inwards, are figures of Sjt-R', his wife, and son. Seated opposite and facing him is Nty, known to be the brother of Sjt-R', and the wife and daughter of Nty. The dedication to the group on the left is made by
s3 s3.f s3-R', that is by S3-R' the grandson of S3-R', while the dedication on the right is made by s3 s3.f S3-R', that is by S3-R' the grandson of Hty. This particular arrangement of figures, and the lack of a named spouse for the son of one man and the daughter of the other, suggests that the two cousins married each other and were the parents of the younger S3-R', who then made dedications to both groups of grandparents.


The many problems connected with the elucidation of the very extensive family tree of Htp are discussed at length on ps. 139/142, and the details concerning parallel cousin marriage will be found there. If the information has been interpreted correctly, then the mother of Htp the Elder and his wife, Hnuw-htp, were sisters, so the couple were first cousins.

7) At Meir - a parallel cousin marriage.

If the deductions of Blackman are correct (27), and `Tas was a son of Snb the first, then `Tas and Wh-htp the second were brothers. Mrs? the daughter of Wh-htp the second married Wh-htp the third, the son of `Tas, who was thus her first cousin.

8) B.I.G.A.O., 1937, vol.XXVII, p.98ff - a parallel cousin marriage. The mother and mother-in-law of the owner were sisters, so he married his first cousin.


If the informative given by this complex stela has been interpreted correctly (see below, p. 255), the parents of the owner were first cousins, born of two sisters.

f) Evidence for marriage among in-laws.

Though not strictly in the same category as the types of marriage discussed
so far, there are four well-documented cases of men marrying women related to them by marriage, which deserve consideration here.

1) Louvre stela C.173, pl.XXXIX.

The owner of this stela had three nephews, one of whom married 'Idw born of Mntw'-nh. Since Mntw'-nh was also the mother-in-law of the brother of the owner, it is clear that the uncle and nephew in question married two sisters, see below, fig.15.
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2) Cairo stela 20025.

The owner of this stela, W34, appears to have been married more than once.

The first wife was Snbt born of Htpt. Her sister, referred to by the unusual designation of *snt.₃ mr₃.f* (see above ps. 20 / 21), was Sbk-nht born of Htpt. The second wife of W34 is named as W'bbt born of Sbk-nht, thus W34 married his niece by marriage.

3) Cairo stela 20270.

The owner of this stela, Shtp-ḥb-R' was married to 'nht-ḥn born of Dhnt *(28).*

The next name to appear on the stela is that of *sht₃.f P₃w* born of Dhnt. From the evidence as it stands, it would appear that Shtp-ḥb-R' had a daughter by his mother-in-law *(29).*


The owner of this stela *Ḥy-snb*, was the son of a woman called Mntw'-nh, and was married to Ṭt. Ṭt had a brother called Mntw-hṭp and he had a son and two daughters, all born of Mntw'-nh. Of course, this might be a coincidence and two women called Mntw'-nh may be involved, but if not, then Mntw-hṭp was
married to his sister's mother-in-law.

The evidence presented in Excursus B shows that the Egyptians made regular practice of re-using names within their families. I am therefore inclined to believe that, if a man's wife bears the same name as one of his female relatives, particularly if it is one of his grandmothers, then provided naturally, it is not a very popular name like ḫfrt, there is a good chance that there was some kinship tie between them, other than the bond of matrimony; though, in most cases, lack of information about the wife's parentage means this is impossible to prove. Thus several consanguineous marriages, particularly between first cousins, may have been unavoidably passed over in the preceding survey.

The evidence as it has been accumulated would suggest that, with the exception of mother/son unions, all forms of consanguineous marriage were permitted outside the royal family by the Middle Kingdom, though it can hardly be said that they were common, for, on the present evidence, they probably accounted for no more than 5% of the total.
SECTION II - ANALYSIS OF FAMILY TREES RECORDED ON THE STELAE OF THE MIDDLE KINGDOM

According to the amount of data they supply concerning the families of the owners, Egyptian stelae of this period may be said to fall into six main categories:

(1) Stelae which record only the name and titles of the owner, together with the standard htp di nsw formula and prayers, and perhaps some added details concerning his public career.

(2) Stelae which, while preserving the form and content of the first group, record in addition the name of the owner's wife, or parents, or both.

(3) Stelae which name several men and women, but omit any kinship terminology or references to mothers' names, thus rendering them useless for the purposes of this study.

(4) Stelae owned by women. These hardly ever record more than the names of the owner's mother and children, and, apart from one or two exceptional cases, the existence of husbands is totally ignored. The dedicatory prayers from these stelae appear in transliteration and translation in Encyclopaedia C, pages 438/502.

(5) Stelae which record the names of the owner and his immediate family. Of these, some tend to concentrate on the parents and siblings, while others prefer the wife and children. The most interesting stelae are those which combine the two groups.

(6) Stelae which record the names of an extended family group.

Some 1500 stelae were examined during the course of this study and any relevant information they yielded was noted and included in the text and on the charts (see ps. 620/627), where appropriate. Some stelae are of little
interest and require no detailed explanations or discussion concerning contents, but there are others, particularly those from the fifth and sixth groups listed above, which are very informative and more difficult to interpret so these will now be discussed in detail, and the conclusions incorporated into the charts.

To avoid the necessity of the reader having to consult the original publications of the more difficult stelae in order to appreciate the organisation of their content, a stylised sketch of these stelae will appear at the beginning of each separate discussion where required. In the interests of clarity, each figure, or group of figures, will be represented by numbers only, with arrows to indicate the direction in which the figures are facing.

Throughout the text and on the plates, all names appear in transliteration, except those of pharaohs, which are so familiar in Anglicised forms that rendering them in transliteration would be to no advantage. If the name of any member of a family is not germane to the main discussion, it will be omitted, and that person will be represented on the family tree only by a symbol appropriate to their sex. A list of the symbols used on the plates appears on p.xii.

Transliterated kinship terms are employed throughout the text, though, with the exception of servants, titles have been omitted, unless they contribute to the identification of the bearer.

When interesting family trees can be reconstructed from the data thus obtained, they have been set out on plates VIII/LXXXIII, where the name of the owner only will be underlined.

Besides the stelae, inscriptions from shrines, offering tables, statues and graffiti have occasionally been included, if they happen to provide
valuable information concerning a particularly interesting family tree.

Cairo stela 20016/17. Owner: Snt-It,s.

Both these stelae belong to the same woman, and they were dedicated to her by her son. Though the names of her mother, an unidentified woman, and a servant are given, no reference is made to her husband or father.

It is especially regrettable, in view of her interesting name *(1)*, that so little information is given about her family connections.

The prayers engraved on the two stelae are translated on ps.489/490.

Cairo stela 20018.

This stela, which comes from North Abydos, was jointly owned by a group of servants and their children. Twenty people are named altogether, but there is no indication as to the name and rank of their employer, or as to whether any of the servants named were married to each other.

---

Cairo stela 20022
Owner: 7bw.
pl.VIII.

---

1) 7bw, the son *(3)* of Hm or and born of Sjt-Intf.
2) The wh3rt, maidservant *(2)*.
3) S3f.
4) hmt.f nbt pr wh3n-k3 - i.e. the wife of the owner.
5) An unidentified man.
6/8) Three women, all said to be גֶּלֶפֶת - i.e. the daughters of חִיִּג.
9) חִיִּג, the son of חִיִּג and born of טִימִי - i.e. the father of the owner.
 חִיִּג is now established as the subject of the second half of the stela, so the kin-terms are given with reference to him.
10) The וּבָיוֹת.
11/13) Three men, all said to be גֶּלֶפ - i.e. the sons of חִיִּג and therefore the brothers of the owner.
14) גֶּלֶפ nbt pr גֶּלֶפ-טִימִי - i.e. the mother of the owner.
15/18) Four women, all said to be גֶּלֶפֶת.
19) גֶּלֶפֶת born of סִנְבּות. The mother of חִיִּג has already been named as טִימִי, so this woman can be no more than his half-sister.
20) A manservant and another וּבָיוֹת.

A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>2.1.3</th>
<th>4-8</th>
<th>9-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cairo stela 20025.
Owner: חִיִּג.
pl. VIII.

1) An inscription naming the owner as חִיִּג born of וּבָיוֹת.
2) וּבָיוֹת born of חִיִּג. Since he is so prominently placed, this may be the father of the owner, or at least some very close relation, but in the absence of any clear indication of his identity, he has been omitted from the family tree.
3) גֶּלֶפֶת.
4) וּבָיוֹת born of חִיִּג-טִימִי.
5) s3t.f Nhti. Since W34 was the mother both of this woman, Nhti and of the owner, lw, they must be brother and sister. It was customary for the kin-terms sn(t).f to be employed for the siblings of the owner, so, the fact that stress has been laid on her relationship to W34, may mean that Nhti stood in a slightly different relationship to the owner, and was his half-sister, the child of W34 by a marriage to a man other than the father of lw.

6/8) s3t.f and two men, both said to be s3t.f, all born of Snbt.

9) hmt.f Snbt born of Htpt.

10/13) Four women, all said to be s3t.f, and all born of Snbt.

B) Eleven lines of inscription naming several men and women. The titles of all but one identify them as servants and dependants of the family. The exception is the first name on the list, that of hntast.f wrt.f Sbk-nht born of Htpt. Htpt has already been named as the mother-in-law of the owner, so Sbk-nht was his sister-in-law, and it is therefore of considerable interest to find her called "his beloved companion".

14) hmt.f W'bbt born of Sbk-nht. There is no male figure to whom this woman can be attached other than the owner, and her figure is shown directly under that of the first wife, Snbt (see below, Exmursus D, p.505, No.7), so it would seem likely that lw was married twice, and that the second wife was the niece of the first.

15) s3t.f Nhti born of Nhti. As with figure 14, the only man to whom the inscription can refer is the owner. The only woman on the stela named Nhti is the half-sister of the owner (figure 5), so lw may have had a child by her, but he does not call her his wife.

16) The wr'tyt, the administratrix *(3). Behind the figure of this woman is an inscription naming s3t.f Nht.
17) **mt.f Hnw'-nh** born of **Nfr-h'w**. The identification of this woman is uncertain. She cannot be the mother or maternal grandmother of the owner as they have already been named, and if **Mbh-š** was the father of the owner, she cannot be the paternal grandmother either. Then only reasonable alternative left would then be step-mother, but, in view of the uncertainty, she has been omitted from the family tree. Behind her is an inscription naming **'Ift-nht** and **s3.s Nht**.

C) More servants' names and prayers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cairo stela 20027.

Owner: **Dšf**

pl.**VIII.**

This is a good example of a stela where the omission of kin-terms for some figures, combined with the use of unusual ones for others, make it impossible to arrive at a wholly satisfactory interpretation, and the family tree presented on pl.**VIII.** only represents one tentative solution.

A) An inscription naming the owner **Dšf** born of **Hš** and **s3.f** born of **Prt**.

1) **Dšf** and the **nbt pr Prt**.

2) A man, presumably the son mentioned in the dedication, making offerings to his parents.

3) **hms.s.f** born of **Prt**. If no other woman named **Prt** appeared on the stela, this man would either have been identified as the "friend" of the owner, and it would have been accepted as a coincidence that his mother and the wife of
Ds' happened to have the same name, or he would have been identified as the step-son of the owner, born to Prt in a previous marriage. As it is, there is another woman called Prt on this stela (figure 4), so considerable doubt must remain as to this man's identity. In view of his prominent position on the stela, he is, perhaps, more likely to have been the owner's step-son, and he has been tentatively presented as such on the family tree. It must be acknowledged, however, that, if he was the child of Prt, one would have expected him to be designated s\_s, rather than the "friend" of Ds'.

4) s\_s Prt. The only female figure to have appeared on the stela so far is Prt, the wife of Ds', so this is likely to have been her daughter, though apparently not the child of her marriage to Ds', for then this girl would have been designated s\_f.

5) H3. H3 has already been named as the mother of Ds'. It is just possible that she was the mother of figure 4, but it was the custom for the figures of children designated s\_t to follow, not precede, that of their mother.

6) An unidentified man. Since his figure follows that of H3, and he bears the same title as Ds', that of Hs\_pr, he may be meant to represent the husband of H3, and so be the father of Ds'.

7) sn.f Ks(n),n.\_I. This could be the brother of either Ds' or of the preceding figure, number 6. In the family tree he has been entered as the brother of the owner.

8) Ks(n),n.\_I born of Prt. There is little to indicate which of the two women called Prt was his mother, but he is placed nearer to the younger Prt on the stela, so he has been tentatively entered as her son on the family tree.

Cairo stelae 20043 and 20681. Owners: W3\_k3 and Dw\_y. pl.IX.

Though Dw\_y was the elder of the two, it is easier if the stela of
**W3h-k3** is analysed first.

Cairo stela 20043.

![Diagram](image)

1) An inscription naming the owner as **W3h-k3** born of **En.s-′nh.**

2) **Snt.f** Bbw born of Bbw. Bbw is later identified as the aunt of **W3h-k3,** so **Snt.f** here is to be translated as cousin.

3) **Snt.f** En.s-′nh.

4) **Hat.f** T3-ntt-n1 born of Ḥtpwy. An examination of the inscriptions of Cairo stela 20681 will show that this woman was probably his aunt.

5) **Snt.f** W3h-k3-ỉw.f-笙bt.

6) **Snt.f** Bbw born of **W3h-k3.** **W3h-k3** is the name of the mother, not the father, since the words **ỉpt-brw** follow her name. It is therefore reasonable to assume that **W3h-k3** was a shortened version of the name **W3h-k3-ỉw.f-笙bt,** and that **Bbw** was the aunt of the owner.

Cairo stela 20681.
1) The owner, Droy born of Htpwy.

2) sn.f Sbk-htp born of T3-ntt-\(n\). T3-ntt-\(n\) is later shown to be the sister of Droy, so sn.f here was apparently being used of a nephew. This is a perfectly acceptable translation for sn (see above p. 15), though it is very unusual for an uncle and nephew to appear as virtual co-owners of a stela.

3) It.f Dtw born of Mr-rw\(d\).

4) smt.f Htpwy born of Hbw. The owner's father and maternal grandmother both bear the name Dtw, but it is a popular name with both sexes and it does not necessarily mean they were related in some way which is not specified here, though they may have been.

5) smt.f Ntw-htp born of Nn(\(d\)) - i.e. the wife of Droy.

6 and 7) smt.f T3-ntt-\(n\) born of Htpwy and smt.s Twt. It is thus established that Droy and T3-ntt-\(n\) were brother and sister, and that T3-ntt-\(n\) had two children, Sbk-htp and Twt. It will be observed that whereas Sbk-htp was given a kin-terms relating to Droy, Twt was given one relating to her mother alone. This was probably because Sbk-htp was the virtual co-owner of the stela and was shown with his uncle in the first register, while Twt is not named until the third register, where her figure follows that of her mother.

8) Nn\(d\) born of Ntw-htp. Ntw-htp has already been named as the wife of Droy, so Nn\(d\) was presumably their daughter, though she is not actually said to be daughter of Droy and might therefore have been his step-daughter only.

9) smt.f Rh.s-\(nh\) born of Snh, together with \(s3.s W3h-k3\). W3h-k3 and his mother Rh.s-\(nh\) are already known from stela 20043, where the name of the mother of Rh.s-\(nh\) was written out in full as W3h-k3-\(iw.s-sn\). Smt here cannot mean the aunt, niece, or cousin of Droy, because he had neither a
grandmother, sister, nor an aunt called Wjb-k3-3w.f-snb, so it is likely
Eh.s'-nh was the half-sister of Drey, and of Tj-att-n3 as well. Wjb-k3
thus married his aunt, and was presumably the father of her two children,
Shk-htp and Twt.

Cairo stela 2004/5. Owner: Nfr2. pl.IX.

Only two figures are shown on this stela. On the left is Nfr2 born of
S'nh, and on the right is ****-snb *(4) born of Hnwt. Under them is an
inscription naming nine people.
1, 2 and 4) Three men, all said to be sn.f.
3) snt.f Kft born of Nfr2. If Kft was the daughter of Nfr2, it is
reasonable to assume that the three men whose names surround hers were also
the children of Nfr2, and that the kin terms refer back to ****-snbf. As
some of the brothers and sisters of ****-snbf are identified by their
fathers' name, while others are identified by the mother's, one parent may
have been married twice.
5) A man born of Hnwt.
6) snt.f Hnwt born of Mr-3ty-sy.
7) Eb1 born of Nbt.
8) s3.f born of Kft. This establishes that Kft was the husband of Eb1
9) An unidentified man.

Cairo stela 2005/1.
Owner: S3-Wj3-h3t.
pl.IX
1) **S3-W3d-h3t** born of **Thk**. The mother of the owner is later named as **Tnp3**, so **Thk** must be his father.

2) **S3.l.**

3) Facing the owner is the seated figure of **Thk** born of **Tnp3**. Since **Tnp3** is later shown to be the mother of the owner, **Thk** was his brother.

   Behind **Thk**, and facing in the opposite direction, is an inscription naming **sn.f S3-W3d-h3t** born of **S3t-Hthr-m3t** *(5)*. This is clearly a close relative of the owner to be named so early on the stela. The **S3t-Hthr-m3t** who is later named as the "wife of the brother of his (i.e. the owner's) father" was probably the mother of this **S3-W3d-h3t**, who was thus the cousin of the owner.

4) **hw.t.f snbt pr S3t-Hthr-hntt** born of **S3t-Hthr** - i.e. the wife of the owner.

5) **hw.t.f Tnp3** born of **Htrt-ny** - i.e. the mother of the owner.

6) **sn.ít.f Snhwr-htp** born of **Thk** *(6)*. If the paternal uncle of the owner was born of **Thk**, then presumably so was the father of the owner, and this is confirmed by the next inscription.

7) **hw.t.f Thk** the elder born of **S3t-Hthr**.

8) **snít.f** born of **S3t-Hthr-m3t**. The kin-term **snít.f** might possibly be understood to mean "the niece of his father", i.e. the cousin of the owner, but the way to record a cousin was to give the kin-term in relation to the owner, not to the owner's father, as with **sn.f S3-W3d-h3t** (see above figure 3). **Snít.f** should therefore be interpreted literally as "the sister (or, in this case, half-sister) of his father", which means that the paternal grandfather of the owner was married more than once. It also means that either there were two women called **S3t-Hthr-m3t**, probably related to one another, or there was only one woman of that name and that, on the death of her husband, she
married and had children by her step-son.

9) an it.f born of $S\text{t}-\text{Hthr}-s\text{t}$ - i.e. the half-brother of the father of the owner.

10) an it.f born of Snbtisy. Apparently the paternal grandfather of the owner had children by three different women.

11/13) Three men, all said to be an.f and all born of $\text{Inp}\text{?}$.

14) an.t.f born of $\text{Inp}\text{?}$.

15) smt hut.f $S\text{t}-\text{Hthr}$ born of $\text{Tk}\text{i}$. Thus the mother-in-law of the owner was born of $\text{Tk}\text{i}$, a name which has already occurred in the family of the owner, and this $\text{Tk}\text{i}$ belongs to the same generation as $\text{Tk}\text{i}$ the elder, the paternal grandmother of the owner. Since Egyptian custom allowed two or more sisters to bear the same name, and since one of these women is specifically said to be "the elder" it is most probable that the two were sisters. This hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that $\text{Tk}\text{i}$ the elder is known to be a daughter of a woman called $S\text{t}-\text{Hthr}$ and this is the name of the daughter of the younger $\text{Tk}\text{i}$, which would be in keeping with the custom of naming a girl after her grandmother. If $\text{Tk}\text{i}$ and $\text{Tk}\text{i}$ the elder were sisters, then the owner and his wife were second cousins.

16) $\text{it a it.f Hckt}$ born of $S\text{t}-\text{R}$.

17) $\text{it smt.f Hckt}$ born of $\text{Kji}$. Since it was not unusual for several children, both male and female, to bear the same name, it is possible that this $\text{Hckt}$ was the brother of $\text{Hckt}$ and $\text{Hckt}$ the elder. $\text{Kji}$ would then be the husband of the eldest $S\text{t}-\text{Hthr}$ and this line of the family would be traced from a man and woman, and not from a man alone, which is very unusual. This would mean that a brother and sister, $\text{Hckt}$ and $\text{Hckt}$ the elder, married a sister and brother, Hckt-ny and Hckt, and the parents of the owner would be related
twice over through these marriages. Attractive as this theory is, it cannot be proved and has not been included in the family tree on pl.X.

18) mwt nt mwt.f Hkk1-ny born of Sjt-R'. It is thus established that the paternal grandfather and the maternal grandmother of the owner were brother and sister, so the parents of the owner were first cousins.

19) hat sn It.f Sjt-Hthr-md. the wife of the brother of his (i.e. the owner's) father. Since she is the only aunt of the owner to be named, it is reasonable to assume that this was the wife of Snfrw-htp, the full brother of the owner's father, rather than of one of the half-brothers. Though there were probably two women called Sjt-Hthr-md. it is possible that Snfrw-htp married and had children by, his step-mother.

20) A nbt pr born of Sjt-Hthr. This is more likely to be the sister-in-law of the owner than his great-aunt.

21) An unidentified woman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Cairo stela 20057.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. 2. 1.</td>
<td>Owners: Nḫtī and Ḫwī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>pl.XI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 9. 8. 7. 12.</td>
<td>A) An offering formulae made on behalf of Nḥtī born of Sjt-hmr, all his children (ḥdw-r f nbw), and Ḫwī born of Nḥm-dtd. It was usual for this type of stela to be jointly dedicated to a father and son, but, in the absence of kin-terms it is difficult to decide which is the father.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The stela is said to be dedicated by š3š $\tilde{\text{t}}\text{y}$. On the evidence of this inscription, $\tilde{\text{t}}\text{y}$ might be the son of either $\text{Nhti}$ or $\tilde{\text{Jw3}}$, but $\tilde{\text{t}}\text{y}$ also bears the title $\text{stv n s3}$, the Controller of a (priestly) phyle, and he appears again on the stela as $\text{stv n s3 t}t\text{v}$ born of $\text{Sjt-Înh}$, proving that he was the brother of $\text{Nhti}$, and so they were presumably the sons of $\tilde{\text{Jw3}}$. $\tilde{\text{Jw3}}$ also is entitled $\text{stv n s3}$, and it is in keeping with the Egyptian ideal that $\tilde{\text{t}}\text{y}$ should have inherited his office from his father.

1) $\text{Nhti}$ born of $\text{Sjt-Înh}$. Although the dedicatory inscription mentions the children of $\text{Nhti}$, they are never named individually on this stela.

2) $\tilde{\text{t}}\text{y}$ born of $\text{Ngs-ddt}$ - i.e. the brother of $\tilde{\text{Jw3}}$ and the uncle of $\text{Nhti}$ and the younger $\tilde{\text{t}}\text{y}$.

3) $\text{snf}$ born of $\text{Sjt-Înh}$ - i.e. the brother of $\text{Nhti}$.

4) $\text{iit n itf}$ $\tilde{\text{t}}\text{y}$ - i.e. the paternal grandfather of $\text{Nhti}$ and $\tilde{\text{t}}\text{y}$ the younger.

5) The $\text{stv n s3 t}t\text{v}$ born of $\text{Sjt-Înh}$ - i.e. the dedicator of the stela.

6) $\text{hat.f Ipi}$ born of $\text{Hpw}$.

7/9) Three men, all said to be $\text{s3š}$ - i.e. the sons of $\tilde{\text{t}}\text{y}$. However, one if not two of these sons is said to have been born of $\text{Hpw}$, while the other is said to have been born of $\text{Nht'-nh}$. $\text{Nht'-nh}$ appears nowhere else on the stela, and no mention is made of her status, but both the mother-in-law of $\tilde{\text{t}}\text{y}$ and a nurse are named $\text{Hpw}$. Thus, though $\tilde{\text{t}}\text{y}$ appears to have had no children by the only woman said to be his wife, he did have children by two other women, whose identity is uncertain, though one of them may have been either the mother of his wife or a servant. It would certainly be in keeping with the general practice of the Middle East for a man to have children by a servant,
if his wife were barren (see Section IV, p. 401), but the evidence here is inconclusive.

10/11 Two women, both said to be smt.f born of Sjt-Inhr.

12) The smt, nurse *(8), Hpw.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Cairo stela 20062.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-10.</td>
<td>pl.II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Pj-nty-mit born of Rsw-nfr *(9).

2) An unidentified man.

3) The figure is that of a woman, but the inscription names a man born of Rsw-nfr.

4 and 5) A woman born of Ty and Sjt.s Rn.s-snub. There is no indication of how these women were related to the family, unless Rn.s-snub is the same woman who married the brother of the owner (see figures 13 and 14 below).

6) An unidentified man.

7) nb.t pr Knn born of Shp-1b. From her title (see Section III, p. 262), and position on the stela, (see Excrsuses D, p. 503) there can be little doubt that this woman is the wife of the owner.

8 and 9) The figures are those of a man and a woman, but the inscriptions refer to both as Sjt.s. Since they are said to be the children of Knn only, they may be her children by a previous marriage.

10) Sjt.f Rn.s-'nh *(10) the younger. This is presumably the son of Pj-nty-mit and Knn.
11 and 12) Rn.f-‘nh the elder and hat.f Esw-nfr. It has already been established that Esw-nfr was the mother of Pt-nfr, so Rn.f-‘nh was his father.

13) sn.f Hr born of Esw-nfr - i.e. the brother of the owner.

14) hat.f Rn.f-snb. The figure representing this woman stands as the beginning of a register, facing the owner, so she may well be his wife. On the other hand, it was usual to show the wives of the owner in close proximity whereas here they are separated by a whole register. Rn.f-snb may therefore be the wife of Hr, even though his figure is shown on the preceding line, and she has been tentatively entered as such on the family tree.

15) sn.f born of Esw-nfr.

16) sn.f Rn.f-snb born of Dt. This man could be the half-brother of the owner as they were born of different mothers.

17) hat.f - i.e. the wife of Rn.f-snb.

18) An unidentified woman.

19) hat.f born of Shy-nb. Besides being the sister of Knn, this woman might also have been the wife of the owner, since she faces him and there is no other male figure in front of her, but her lowly position on the stela makes this most unlikely.

20) A man born of Pt. Although it is more usual for the figure of a husband to precede that of a wife, this is probably the husband of figure 19, who was given precedence over him because of her relationship to Knn and thus to the owner.

21) sn.f born of Esw-nfr.
Cairo stela 20079.
Owner: Sbw.
pl.XI.

A) An inscription naming:

Sbw born of Nht-'nb.

hat.f Sbst born of Itv. Presumably the name of the mother was

Itv or something similar.

Sbst.

It.f Sj-'Inhr born of Itv. As the paternal grandmother and the mother-
in-law of the owner appear to have been both called Itv, Sbw may have
married his aunt, but the name is a common one and the re-appearance could
be a coincidence.

sn.f Nht-'nh born of Hpy.

sn.f born of Nht-'nh.

sn.f.

sn.f.

sn.f Sj-'Imn.

hat.f Iti born of Imn-ddt - i.e. the wife of Sj-'Imn.

1) A seated couple who must represent Sbw and Sbst.

2) The small standing figure of Sj.f 3m-sw born of Hpy. A line of
inscription under the figure of 3m-sw mentions hat.f Hp(y) born of Imt-ib
- i.e. the second wife of Sbw and the mother of his son. Since she has the
same name as the maternal grandmother of the owner, Hpy may have been
related to her husband by blood.
3) The minute figure of ḫ3t.f K3-ṣr-ḥb born of Sbḥy. This is clearly the daughter of Sbw, for she is portrayed holding his leg, and the inscription naming her is placed under his chair. She may have been the daughter of Sbtf, despite the variation of spelling, but she may also have been the daughter of Sbw by yet another wife or a concubine.

4) A line of inscription naming ḫ3t.s ḫwḥt-ḥb born of ḫḥp(y). This is the child of the second wife of the owner, but not necessarily of the owner himself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>→ →</th>
<th>← ←</th>
<th>2. 1. 7. 8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ →</td>
<td>← ←</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 3.</td>
<td>← ←</td>
<td>9-11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 5.</td>
<td>← ←</td>
<td>12-14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cairo stele 20091.
Owners: Nb-ḥt and ḫnpw-ḥtp.
pl. xii.

1) Nb-ḥt.
2) ḫnt.f ḫ3t-ṣkt.
3 and 4) ḫ3t.f Sḥk-s nb and ḫnt.f (i.e. the wife of the son) ḫwṭ.
5) ḫ3t.f ḫṣt-ṣkt born of ḫwṭ.
6) ḫ3t.f born of ḫṣt-ṣkt - i.e. another son of Nb-ḥt.
7) ḫnpw-ḥtp.
8) ḫnt.f ḫmn born of ḫstt.
9) ḫ3t.f born of ḫmn.
10) ḫnt.f ḫṭy *(11).*
11) ḫ3t.f born of ḫmn.
12) s3,t Snw born of Hnį.
13) n3.t.f (i.e. the wife of Snw) S3t-k3 born of ḫpt.
14) s3,t born of Hnį.

The link between the two groups is provided by inscriptions A and B, which were both dedicated by a man called Ṣḫt-iḫr. Inscription A, which refers to Nb-ḫt, since it is behind his figure, says that the dedicator is the s3 sn.f, i.e. his nephew, while inscription B calls the dedicator the brother (sn) of ḫnpw-ḫtp. Thus, if the dedicator and ḫnpw-ḫtp were brothers, and the former was the nephew of Nb-ḫt, ḫnpw-ḥtp must have been his nephew also.

![Diagram of stela](image-url)

Cairo stela 20092.
Owner: ḫnww-ḫtp.
pl.XII.

A) An inscription naming the owner ḫnww-ḫtp born of ḫnḥt and the nbt pr Mnįw born of ḫtfr-į. From her position on the stela, Mnįw would normally be judged to be the wife of ḫnww-ḫtp, but it will be seen (see below, inscription B) that ḫnww-ḫtp had children by ḫtfr-į, so her daughter Mnįw is likely to be the daughter of ḫnww-ḫtp as well.

1) The owner.
2) s3,t ḫtfr-į born of ḫpt. It may be considered a little unusual for a man's son by one woman to bear the same name as his first wife, but this may be a family name, and one or both wives might also be related to ḫnww-ḥtp by blood.
3) Mni, presumably, since the figure appears under the inscription naming her.

4) nbt pr 'Itf-3. Her position and title would confirm her suggested role as one of the wives of Hnw-htp.

B) A long inscription containing the following dedications:

nbt pr 'Ip born of Hnw-htp. 'Ip has already been named as the mother of the owner's son, and her title would indicate that she was his wife. There is no determinative after the name of her parent, so it is difficult to decide whether Hnw-htp was a man or a woman. The words for "born of" used throughout are Ir n for the twenty-three men and women named. As the phrase is definitely followed by the mother's name in twenty cases it would seem reasonable to assume that the other three, all born of Hnw-htp were similarly being identified by their mothers' name.

A man born of 'Ip, presumably another son of the owner.

The 'Nw pr Htp born of 'Itf-3, presumably another son of the owner.

The nbt pr Hnw-snh born of 'Iy.

Sjt 'Nw pr Snb born of 'Itf-3 - i.e. the daughter of the steward, Snb born of 'Itf-3. This is an unusual way of expressing kinship, but the meaning is reasonably clear, if one can identify the 'Nw pr in question. There are only two men so far named who bear this title. One is the owner and the other is the third man named in inscription B. The latter, however, is himself said to be born of 'Itf-3, so unless a mother/son union is postulated, the owner, Hnw-htp must be the father of this girl, and also of Mni, who was also said to be born of 'Itf-3.

Sjt 'Nw pr Hnw-htp born of 'Itf-3.

Snt.f Nhtl-snh and Snt.f 'Iy, both born of 'Ip. As 'Ip is known to have been
the mother of one of the owner's sons, it is a little surprising to find others of her children being referred to as his "sisters". Of course, the unnamed father of Hnum-htp might have been married to a woman called 'nht, before or after his marriage to 'nht, the mother of Hnum-htp, in which case, it must be accepted that, by coincidence, father and son both married twice, and each had a wife called 'lip, which was, after all, a common name. However, the mother of 'lip and the owner's maternal grandmother were both named Hnum-nht, it is possible that 'lip and Hnum-htp were aunt and nephew. If she had been married to another, unnamed man, before Hnum-htp, the two daughters born of the first union would then be the cousins of Hnum-htp and the Egyptian kin-terms snt would be used to describe them.

Two unidentified men.

'nht born of Hnum-nht. There is no doubt concerning the sex of this Hnum-nht as the female determinative, , is used here.

?my-r pr ?tf-1 born of Hyw. In view of his title, his name, and the fact it is recorded directly after that of the known mother of the owner, it is possible that this is his otherwise unidentified father. A man and a woman born of Hnum-snb - i.e. the brother and sister of ?tf-1, the wife of the owner.

Two men, both said to be ?j ?my-r pr and born of ?tf-1, so they too must be sons of the owner.

A man born of Mniw.

Two men born of Hnum-nht.
Cairo stela 20105. Owners: 'b-k5w and Htp.

'b-k5w and Htp were brothers, or at least half-brothers since they were both born of the same mother. What makes this stela unusual is that they were also both married to Hwrt. This is such a rare name *(12) that it would seem likely that one man married his brother's widow. There is no known compulsory law of levirate in Egypt, but this case shows that marriage to a brother's widow was not prohibited.

Cairo stela 20109. Owner: Nfr. pl.XIII.

This stela bears inscriptions only.

Nfr born of Tt.

hst.f Tt born of Twy.

It.f Twt.HTF.HTP born of Ddi.

mwt.f Tt born of Htp.

sn.f Tw born of Tt.

mwt at mwt.f Htp t born of Pfr.

An mwt.f born of ... The name is illegible but is presumably Htp.

An mwt.f Bibi born of Htp.

An.m.f ... The name is partially illegible but ends in tw.

An.s born of Bibi - i.e. the niece of the preceding woman.

An.s T born of ...tw.

Cairo stela 20123.

Owner: Pfr. pl.XIII.

1) Pfr born of Sal.
2) Mnt born of Iym. One would usually expect to find the figure of the owner's wife or mother here, but this is an exceptional case, for Mnt is later shown to be the maternal grandmother of Pt.  
3) Itf born of Mnt.  
4) An unidentified man.  
5 and 6) Sn-Wsrt born of Itf and Sm1 born of Mnt. This couple face each other and as Sm1 has already been named as the mother of the owner, Sn-Wsrt may be identified as his father. All the other figures on this stela are identified by their mothers' names, so Itf, the parent of Sn-Wsrt, was probably his mother, rather than his father.  
7 and 8) Two men, both born of Mnt.  
9) A man born of D'1.  
10) Itf born of Mnt, whose identity is uncertain. Itf might be one of the grandfathers of the owner, possibly the maternal grandfather because the maternal uncle of the owner is also named Itf.  
11) A woman born of Sm1.  
12) D'1 born of Mnt i.e. the aunt of the owner.

Cairo stela 20126  
Owner: Hf1  
pl.XIII.
3) The Ṝḥḥ pr ẖrē born of ẖrē.

4) ẖrē born of ḫlg.

5, 7, 8 and 9) One man and three women, all born of ẖrē.

6 and 10) A man and a woman born of ḫlg.

Although ḫrē is the owner of this stela, the interest is focused almost entirely on the family of his wife.

Cairo stela 20134. Owner: Ṣnb.f. pl.XIII.

Though a considerable amount of information may be gathered from the inscriptions on this stela, because the names of the mothers of the various people mentioned have been included, nevertheless, the omission of all kin-terms has rendered a complete reconstruction of the family tree impossible.

The names are recorded on this stela in four groups, and though those in the third column have been written the wrong way round, it is quite clear what was intended, for any interpretation, other than the one presented here, would be unsatisfactory.

First group: Ṣnb.f born of ḫrē.

ḥrē born of ḫnw-ḥtp.

Ṭḥ ḫē born of ḫḥ-hṣ. Since his name follows directly after the name of the mother of the owner, it is possible that Ṭḥ ḫē was the father of the owner.

Prṭ ḫē ḫ and another woman, both born of ḫrē.

Second group: An unidentified man.

Two men born of ḫṣn ḫē.

Two unidentified men.
Third group: A woman born of Mntw-htp.

An unidentified man.

Two men, both born of Mntw-htp.

An unidentified woman.

Wi3yt born of Sjt-Ptyt.

'Isi born of Wi3yt.

A woman born of 'Isi.

An unidentified woman.

Fourth group: Hr, the younger born of Mntw-htp.

A man born of Ptyt.

A man born of Wi3yt.

An unidentified man.

A man born of Ptyt.

No woman is said to be the wife of Sub.f, but families are recorded for his sister Ptyt and for his paternal aunt, Wi3yt.

Cairo stela 20138.

Owner: Hkr.

1 and 2) ḫkr born of Htp and ḫst.f Dst.f.

3) sjt.f.

4 and 5) ḫn.w and ḫst.f Rhyt-tw.t.

6) sjt.f.
The rest of the stela is occupied by the figures and names of eleven people, each said to be $s3(t).f$. Since they all face in the same direction of $\dot{Thr}$, they may all be his children.

Among those named are $\text{Hnw}$ and $\text{Hpwt-twt}$. If these are identified as the same people as figures 4 and 5, then this is an example as a brother/sister marriage. $\text{Hnw}$ and $\text{Hpwt-twt}$ cannot be the parents of $\dot{Thr}$ because the mother of $\dot{Thr}$ has already been named as $\text{Htp}$. $\text{Hnw}$ could be the brother of $\dot{Thr}$, but in that case, it is strange that no kin-term was given and the name of $\text{Htp}$ was not repeated. These omissions would be accounted for if $\text{Hnw}$ and $\text{Hpwt-twt}$ were the son and daughter of $\dot{Thr}$ whose names, but not figures, appear elsewhere on the stela.

Cairo stela 20139.
Owner: $\text{S3-Ddlt}$.
pl. XIV.

1 and 2) $\text{S3-Ddlt}$ born of $\text{S3t-Wsr}$ and $\text{hst.f Mkt}$.
3) $\text{sn.f}$.
4/6) Three men, all said to be $\text{s3.f}$, including one called $\text{Shk-nht}$.
7 and 8) $\text{sn.f}$ and $\text{ant.f}$.
9) $\text{Shk-nht}$. This is presumably the son of the owner, named above, who now gives details of his own family. He is shown with $\text{hst.f Nbt-\text{\textsuperscript{it}f}}$.
10) $\text{hst.f Myt}$ - i.e. the second wife of $\text{Shk-nht}$.
11) $\text{s3.f S3-Ddlt}$ and $\text{hst.f Htp}$ - i.e. the son of $\text{Shk-nht}$, though by which
wife is not stated.

12) The figures of sn.f, s3t.f and sn.f. The siblings of Shk-nht have already been named as the sons of the elder S3-Ddit, these children and brother are therefore almost certainly to be connected with the younger S3-Ddit.

Cairo stela 20141.
Owner: Sn-mri-hpr-k3-R'.
pl. XIV.

1) Sn-mri-hpr-k3-R' born of H3t-špswt.
2) sn.f born of H3t-špswt.
3) H3t-špswt born of ḫy.
4) smt nṯ mwt.f ḫy.
5) sn.f born of ḫy. Unless ḫy had a child by her son-in-law, sn.f must be understood to mean "his uncle" here.
6) sn.f born of ḫbw. This man can be no more than the half-brother of the owner, in which case, the unnamed father of the owner must have been married twice, or perhaps had a concubine.
7) smt.f born of mwt.f. This might be another child of ḫbw, but insufficient data is supplied.

Cairo stela 20153. Owner: Pth-s'nh-pr3. pl. XIV.

Only figures of the owner and his wife are shown at the top of the stela.
The other members of the family are recorded by name only:

Pth'-s'nh-ni born of Sjt-sm.

Hat.f Mrt-ìw born of Sjt-ntî-hty.

It.t.f born of Sjt-ntî-hty *(13). Since the mother-in-law and the paternal grandmother of the owner have the same name, there is a possibility that he married his aunt, or at least that he was related to Mrt-ìw by blood as well as by marriage.

Mwt.f Sjt-sm.

Three women, all said to be sît.f, and a man said to be sî.t.f.

Snt.tf.

Mnt.f born of Sjt-ntî-hty. On the family tree this man has been shown as the uncle of the owner, but he might be his brother-in-law.

An unidentified woman.

A woman born of Sjt-ntî-hty. This woman is not said to be the snt of the owner, so she has been entered in the family tree as his sister-in-law, rather than his aunt.

Cairo stela 20156.

Owner: Sbk-htp.

pl. XV.

1) Sbk-htp born of Mr-sgr.
2) It.f 'íms born of 'j-nt-nk-k³.
3) Mwt.f Mr-sgr born of Hýwý.
4) *ant.f *Katn born of *Mr-sgr.
5 and 6) Two men, both said to be *ant.f and both born of *Mr-sgr.
7 and 8) Two women, both born of *Katn.
9) *ant.f *Emi born of *Hpwy - i.e. the aunt of the owner.
10) *ant.f born of *Emi. - i.e. the cousin of the owner.
11) *ant.f *Nfrw born of *Hpwy - i.e. the aunt of the owner.

The owner of this stela does not mention the existence of a wife or children, and interest is focused on the families of his mother and sister. No husband is named for his sister *Katn, although her two daughters are included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5.</td>
<td>6 - 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cairo stela 20158.
Owner: *Nfr-rwd.
pl. XV.

1) **Nfr-rwd** born of **Htp**.
2) The *imat *Iy-m-htp. *(14).*
3 and 4) Two men, both said to be *a3.f, one of whom was named *Wb-k3.*
5) *Hpt.f nbt pr *Htp. Since *Htp(t) is a very common name there is no reason to suppose that the owner's wife and mother were the same woman, though they may have been related.
6) *a3.f *Hty.
7 and 8) Two women, both said to be *ant.f, one born of *Tt, the other of *Rn-s'nh. Since neither of the owner's grandmothers is named, it is impossible
to decide whether these two women were his half-sisters or his aunts, or some other relation. However, one is called Wšp-k3, the name of one of his sons, so clearly she must have been a close relative of Nfr-rwḥ for him to name a child after her.

9) nbt pr Hty born of Htp. Since this is a stela where kin-terms were regularly used, it is probably of some importance that this one woman is identified by her mother's name only. She might well be the child of the owner's wife *(15) by a previous husband, whom he did not choose to name.

10 and 11) Two women, both said to be stt,f, one of whom is named Htp.

---

Cairo stela. 20159.

Owner: Mā'.

pl. XV.

1) Mā' born of Frjt.

2) The nbt pr Frj born of Re-anbtisr. By position and title, this woman is to be identified as the wife of the owner.

3 and 4) it,f S3-Sbk and the nbt pr Frjt - i.e. the parents of the owner.

Inscription A: Five men and a woman, all born of Frjt.

A man born of S3-Sbk. The fact that this man alone is identified by the name of his father, suggests that he stood in a different degree of kinship to the owner from his other brothers and sister, and is probably to be identified as a half-brother, the child of a concubine or previous marriage of S3-Sbk.
A man born of Rs-snbt. Rs-snbt is presumably a shortened writing of Rs-snbtisy, so this is the brother-in-law of the owner.

Inscription B: Ebḥ born of Rs-snbt, together with s3s.

A man and woman born of ḫḫi - i.e. the children of the owner.

An unidentified man and his two sons.

A man born of Snbtisy. This is presumably another writing of the name Rs-snbtisy.

Cairo stela 20161. Owner: Name destroyed. pls.XVI/XVII.

This stela bears 68 lines of dedications, arranged in two columns. Most unfortunately, the stela had been damaged and there are several illegible passages, including the crucial opening lines, so it has only been possible to reconstruct parts of the family tree. One of the groups thus formed can be traced back through seven generations, but it is impossible to say whether the groups were roughly contemporary branches of the family, or whether they were successive generations. If the latter is the correct explanation then the family would have traced their ancestors back for something like twenty generations, which is, perhaps, a little unlikely.

Column A:

1) Name destroyed.
2)ḥst.f name destroyed.
3) s3s.f born of Ḥnsw-nḥt. The name of the owner's wife must, therefore, have been Ḥnsw-nḥt.
4 and 5) Two men, both said to be s3s.f born of Ḥnsw-nḥt.
6) s3s.f born of Ḥtpi. If this was the son of one of the owner's sons, Ḥtpi would have been named separately as his wife. The way this is arranged
here suggests that this is the son of the owner by a second wife or concubine.

7) s3.t.f born of Htp-

8) A new subject is now introduced with the ɪm3hw ɪm-y-r pr, the revered one, the steward, Nht born of ɪp-

9) hmt.f nbt pr T'y born of ɪp-

There is thus the strong possibility that

T'y married her brother or half-brother.

10) s3.t.f Tp born of T'y.

11) s3.t.f Eb1 born of T'y.

12 and 13) Two men, both called Hnum-nht, and both said to be s3.t.f born of T'y.

14) hmt.f Nb born of Hn... . The rest of the mother's name has been destroyed, but, as one of the granddaughters of this woman is called Hnum, this was probably the reading of this name.

The introduction of the new wife probably indicates that she is to be associated with Hnum-nht, rather than with his father Nht.

15/20) Three women named Tpi, Hnum and T'y, all said to be s3.t.f and all born of Tp. Also three men, all said to be s3.t.f born of Tp. The third son is another Hnum-nht.

21) hmt.f Hnum-'3 born of Nb - i.e. probably the wife of Hnum-nht born of Tp.

22) s3.t.f Nht born of Hnum-'3.

23) s3.t.f Eb1 born of T'y. No clear change of subject has been introduced and T'y is not said to be the wife of anyone. Eb1 is probably therefore to be identified as the child of Hnum-nht rather than of Nht. The last woman to be named as T'y was the sister of Hnum-nht, so he may have had children by her as well as by Hnum-'3.
24 and 25) Two women, both said to be 3it.s 3pi born of Bbi.
26) 3t.s Hnsw-nht born of Bbi.
27) 3it.f Dw born of 3pi - i.e. another child of Hnsw-nht and his sister.
28) The subject now changes to 3thw Hnsw-nht born of Bbi, the revered one
    Hnsw-nht born of Bbi, who has already been mentioned once in line 26.
29) Hat.f 3pi born of Ddw. Ddw and Bbi were sisters (lines 23 and 27 above)
    so 3pi and her husband were first cousins.
30 and 31) 3it.f and 3it.f both born of 3pi.
32) The subject changes again to the 3thyt Ddw born of Ksw. The repetition
    of names already popular in this family, shows that the following group
    were related to them, but how, is uncertain.
33 and 34) 3it.s Dn born of Ddw, and 3t.s Nht born of ..... name destroyed.
Column B:
1) Partially destroyed, but the last name is (K)sw born of Mrr(t).
2) Also partially destroyed. There is a woman born of 3b, then 3t.s Hnsw-nht
    born of (K)sw.
3) Ddw born of Ddw and Hnsw-nht born of Ksw.
4) 3t.s born of Ddw, a man born of Ksw, and a man born of Tt-nfr. This
    last man cannot be identified, but he is probably the husband of one of
    the women.
5) Two men born of Ddw and Ksw respectively.
6) Another daughter of Ddw, also called Ddw, and an unidentified man born
    of 3it.f, who was probably the husband of one of the women, but there is
    no indication as to which.
7) A man and woman born of Ddw. There is nothing to indicate that all
    these men and women who are said to be born of Ddw were not the children
of Ddw born of Ksw and they have been entered as such in the family tree on pl.XVII. There is a possibility, however, that one or two may have been born of the two daughters of Ddw, who are both called Ddw.

8) ḫmḥ-r pr ḫnsw-nḥt born of Ddw – presumably one of the two sons of the elder Ddw, two of whom were called ḫnsw-nḥt. There is also an inscription naming s3t-ša born of ḫnt.

9) s3.t ḫnsw-nḥt born of ḫnt and ḫnt born of ḫnb-....., name destroyed.

10) s3t.s Ddw born of ḫnt and ḫnt born of ḫnb.

11) s3t.s ḫnb born of ḫnt and a man born of Ddw.

12) s3.t ḫnt born of ḫnt and a man born of Ksw.

13) s3t-ša born of Ddw and an unidentified man.

Lines 14/28 contain too many lacunae to make a reconstruction possible.

29) ḫmḥt ḫpt born of ḫwy, and an unidentified man.

30) s3t.s ḫm.i-ʾnh, a man born of ḫm.i-ʾnh, and a man born of ḫpt.

31) ḫpy born of ḫwy and s3.t ḫnt born of ḫnyt. The man must be the son of one of the men named in line 30.

Lines 32/34 refer back to people mentioned in the illegible passage, so they cannot be fitted into the tree.

On the basis of the names, I am inclined to believe that this is another branch of the family who owned Cairo stela 20092 (see above ps. 60/62), but no individual can be shown to appear on both.

Cairo stela 20167. Owner: ḫnsw. pl.XVIII.

This stela bears a single column of inscriptions.

Ḥnsw.

ḏḥ.t šn ḫnw born of ḫnb.
Prt born of ḫn.
An unidentified man, possibly the husband of Prt.
Ṛn.f-anh born of ḫt and Ṣn.f-anh born of Ṣn.w.
Two women born of Ṣn.b.s, one called ṭiti.
Two women and four men, all unidentified.
Ṛp born of Ṣn.w and ṭat.f ṭrī born of ḫn.b.s.
An unidentified man.
Ṛp.b born of ṭiti.
Prt born of ṭiti and ṭrī born of Prt.
Two unidentified men.
/firebase born of Prt.
Sbk-ḥtp born of Ṣn.w.

Although these names are not presented in any particular sequence, many of them are identified by the names of the mothers and they form an important female line of five generations, culminating in the daughter-in-law of Ṣn.w.

Of the unidentified men, several were probably married to the women of the family, but in the absence of kin-terms, there is no way of clarifying the relationships.

Cairo stela 20219. Owner: ḫw.t.

This stela was dedicated to the nbt pr ḫw.t by her son. There are also reference to her six daughters (ṣ3t.s), four granddaughters (ṣ3t ṣ3t.s), and one grandson (ṣ3 ṣ3t.s), but no husband is named for ḫw.t or any of her daughters.

The dedicatory prayer appears on p. 490.
Cairo stela 20242. Owner: S3-Hnsw.

This is a typical example of a stela where a potentially interesting family tree cannot be reconstructed because of lack of detailed information. There are ten men and nine women on the stela, but half of them are said only to be born of mwt.f or mwt.m, and there are no kin-terms. Even so, of the remaining figures, one line can be traced through four generations.

Cairo stela 20244. Owner: Sbk-rd(,wi). pl.XVIII.

Sbk-rd(,wi) born of Tit and Ismy born of S3t-Mntw. No kinship term is given, but his prominent position suggests that Ismy was the father of the owner.

S3t-Mntw born of Hs.

Ismy born of S3t-Hthr and S3t-Hthr born of Hs.

Two men born of Hs and a man born of S3t-Mntw.

If Ismy the son of S3t-Mntw has been correctly identified, then the interest here is centred on the paternal line, but only on the women, since the names of their husbands have been omitted.

Cairo stela 20245. Owner: It-n.1. pl. XVIII.

1) It-n.1 born of Mwt-htp and hmt.f Ty3 born of Nht1.
2) s3t.f Mrsw and s3t.f Mwt-htp.
3) s3t.f Twt and an.f Mrsw born of Nbt-Itf. Since the names of the mothers
of the owner and this "brother" are different, they can only be half-brothers.
4) Nhtī born of ḫntī - i.e. the mother-in-law of the owner, and Sn-ḫnh born of Kḥrt, who, by his position, must be regarded as the husband of Nhtī.

5/6) Four women, all said to be born of Sn-ḫnh. Since all the other people on this stela are identified by their mothers' names, these may be the half-sisters of Tyj, born of a marriage to a woman other than Nhtī.

9) sn.f Twt born of Mwt-hṭp - i.e. the brother of the owner, and sn.f Mṛsw born of ḫntī. The possessive pronouns are still referring back to the owner, so sn.f is also being used of the uncle of the owner's wife.

10) and 11) Mṛsw born of ḫntī and two men, both said to be ḫns.f

Since the name Mṛsw is found in the families of the owner and his wife, they may be related in some way other than the one given here.

Cairo stela 20255.

Owner: Bḥī.

pl. XIX.

1) Bḥī born of ḫṭf (,ṣ)-nh. By this inscription is another, naming sḥ.f born of Ṣṭt.

2) Kneeling before him is an unidentified man.

3 and 4) ḫṭf Ṣḥḥ born of Bḥī and ḫḥt.f ḫṭf.s-ḏnh born of Mḥt.

5 and 6) Two men, both said to be sn.f, but born of two unidentified women, so they can only be his half-brothers.

7) ḫḥt.f Bḥī born of Ṣḥḥ.
8) **ntr, Bbl** born of **Itf(s)-nh.**
9) **ntr, Bbl** born of **Bbl.** This is the daughter of his first wife.
10) **ntr, Bbl** born of **Itf(s)-nh.**
11) **hst, Stt** born of **Mayt - i.e.** the second wife of the owner and the mother of his son.
12) **s3t.s** born of **Stt.** Stt may have been married prior to her marriage to **Bbl,** which would account for this girl not being called the daughter of the owner.

Cairo stela 20257. **Owner: S3t-Hthr.**

The owner of this stela was a singer, **hstt,** and she records the names of her two daughters (**s3t.s**), her son (**s3.s**), and two women, whose relationship is not defined. There is no mention of a husband.

The dedicatory prayer appears on p. 490.

Cairo stela 20260. **Owner: Snw.**

**Snw** born of **Inh.**

Three men, all said to be **s3.f,** and all born of **Wt.** No other reference is made to **Wt** on the stela.

**hst s3.f** Hdrt born of **W3dt.** There is no indication which of the three sons was married to **Hdrt.**

**s3t s3.f** born of **Hdrt - i.e.** the granddaughter of the owner.

**hst s3.f.**

Cairo stela 20265. **Owner: Name illegible.**

In the dozen lines of inscription on this stela, every man and woman, with only two exceptions, is called either **Hty, Hty-nh,** or **Inpw-htp,**
making it impossible to reconstruct the family tree.

Cairo stela 20270.    Owner: Shtp-ib-R'.   pl.XIX.

Shtp-ib-R' born of Titi.

hst.f 'nh-t-rn born of Dunt.

s3t.f Pwy born of Dunt.

A man born of 'nh-rn.

Two men born of Dunt, one of whom, like the owner, is called Shtp-ib-R'.

The name Dunt is spelt three different ways on this stela *(16), but they
are only variants of the same name. According to Rankic *(17), the name is
not a common one.

The last two men, who are said to be born of Dunt, may be the brothers
of 'nh-rn, but the real problem is presented by the girl Pwy, who is said to
be the daughter of the owner, and yet is born of Dunt. Either Shtp-ib-R' had
a daughter by his mother-in-law, or his second wife was the daughter of his
first wife, and may or may not have been his daughter too, or, on the evidence
of the unusual name, his second wife must have been closely related in some
other way to his first wife.

Cairo stela 20271.    Owner: Sbk-htp.   pl.X.

Sbk-htp born of Nfr-h'y.

mwt.f Nfr-h'y born of Mwt-ddt.

s3t.f.

hst.f Ddl.

s3t.f Mwt-ddt. The name of this girl appears in the middle of a group of
children, all of whom, except for this girl, are specifically said to be the
sons and daughters of the owner. This girl, however, is identified as the
daughter of the wife of the owner, so she may be the child of Diš, born to
a husband other than Sbk-ḥtp. It is true that she bears the same name as
the maternal grandmother of Sbk-ḥtp, but it is not an uncommon name and
could be coincidence, though Diš might herself have been descended from
Mwt-ddt in some way not recorded here.

sīt.f.
sāf.
sāf.
sīt.f.
sīt.f.
sīt.f.
sāf born of Nfr-h'y.
sāt.f and sāf both born of Mwt-ḥtp - i.e. the maternal aunt and uncle of
the owner.

Cairo stela 20273. Owner: Šny. pl.XIX.
Šny born of Wjd-wi-sy.

ḥat.f ḫnw.t.sn and sīs Snbš. As Snbš is specifically said to be the child
of ḫnw.t.sn, he may have been born to her in a previous marriage.

ḥat.f Buš. This could be the wife of either Šny or Snbš, but Šny is more
likely, since Snbš is not given enough prominence to warrant a change of
subject.

sāt.f Fndt and smt.s Mḥ(w)-ddt. Fndt can only be the half-sister of Šny
as they have different mothers.

Cairo stela 20287. Owner: Sbk-ddw.

This stela is divided horizontally into two. In the top register there
are dedications to Sbk-ddw born of Snt, his wife and son. The lower register names another wife, three sisters, and two brothers. If this second wife had any children, their names are not recorded on this stela.

Cairo stela 20290. Owner: S3t-Wdyt-īw-snb.

This stela shows the owner, who was born of ḫwt, together with his three sons. All these men are said to be born of Snh-ḥtp, but she is not shown on the stela, nor is she said specifically to be his wife.

A) The dedication was made to Snb born of Ḫpw by s3.s born of S3t-šfr.

S3t-šfr is not mentioned again on the stela, though there is a wife called S3t-šaf shown with Snb.

1) Snb and ha.t. S3t-šaf born of ṭṭt.

2 and 3) Ḫftn born of mrtn and the šb pr Ḫpw. Ḫpw is known to be the mother of Snb, so Ḫftn is to be identified as his father. With Ḫpw is s3.s who may be the child of another marriage.

4) Kxt born of Ḫpw.

5/7) A woman and two men born of Kxt.

8) A man born of Ḫpw.

9) A list of unidentified relatives and servants. It is possible that the
husband of Kat is among these names.

Cairo stela 20307. Owner: In(?)-sw.

The interesting feature of this small stela is that it was dedicated to In(?)-sw by his sister *(18).

Cairo stela 20310. Owner: Ty-hr-nfr.t.

1) Ty-hr-nfr.t born of Hns.w.
2) A man born of Sbk-m-s3.s. Sbk-m-s3.s is nowhere referred to as the wife of the owner, but no kin-terms are used on this stela at all. Her son is standing where one would expect to find either the son or father of the owner, and since her other children play such an important role on the stela, they are likely to be the children of the owner, rather than his aunts and uncles.
3 and 4) Two unidentified men, presumably closely related to the owner.
5 and 12) A man and woman born of S3t-Hthr.
6) Sbk-m-s3.s born of Hp.
7, 9 and 10) Three men, all born of Sbk-m-s3.s.
8) S3t-Hthr born of Sbk-m-s3.s.
11) An unidentified man.

Cairo stela 20140 also belonged to Ty-hr-nfr.t, but it gives no further details concerning the family.
1) **Khk-mwt.f** born of Shk-htp.

2) **hst.f nbt pr Hwyt** born of Ipt.

3) s1t.s Nny, perhaps her child by a previous husband because Nny is not said to be the daughter of the owner.

4) s3.f born of Hwyt.

5/10) A man, and his wife, and her two sons and two daughters. These people cannot be integrated into the family of the owner on the information supplied here, but their prominent position on the stela indicates their importance to Khk-mwt.f.

11/13) Three men, all born of Hwyt.

14) **Mwt-htp** born of Nni. As Nni is only a variant of Nny *(19)*, this is a granddaughter of Hwyt.

15) An unidentified man, possibly the husband of Nny or Mwt-htp.

16) A man born of Mwt-htp - i.e. the great-grandson of Hwyt.

Cairo stela 20325. Owner: **Hnt3-hty-htp.** pl.XXI.

Apart from the owner and his brothers, no men are mentioned on this stela which bears inscriptions only.
Hnti-hty-htp born of Sjt-hnti-hty.

Sjt-hnti-hty born of Wkt.

A woman whose name is illegible, born of Ttt, and a woman born of her and called Sjt-hnti-hty. In view of their important position on the stela, and the fact that the girl is named after the owner's mother (for the significance of this, see Exoursus E, p. 473), it is most likely that these were the owner's wife and daughter.

An unidentified woman.

A woman born of Wkt.

Two men, and a woman called Wss, all born of Sjt-hnti-hty.

A woman born of Wkt.

A woman born of Wss and an unidentified woman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cairo stela 20331.

Owner: 'nhf.

pl. XXII.

1) 'nhf. born of Nbt-wnw.

2 and 3) A man born of Wnt-wnw and the nbt pr Wnt-wnw born of Kh.n.

The prominent position occupied by these two figures, the woman's title, and the fact that the man is making an offering, all combine to make it certain that these are the wife and son of the owner.

4/6) Two men and a woman, all born of Wnt-wnw.
7 and 8) A man born of Rn.s-sn.b and Rn.s-sn.b born of Rn.s-sn.b. There is no information given as to how these two were related to the rest.

Cairo stela 20338.
Owner: ḫnpy.
pl. XIII.

1) ḫnpy born of ḫt.
2) ḫt.f Snfrw born of Kyw.
3) ḫnpy born of ḫt - i.e. the brother of the owner.

A) Eight lines of inscription naming:

mt.f ḫt born of Wrt.

Three women, all said to be sjit.s and two men said to be sjit.s.

It is more usual for the siblings of the owner to be designated sn(t).f, so these five may be the children of ḫt by another marriage.

Two men, both said to be sn.f and both born of Wrt. Unless a marriage is proposed between Snfrw and his mother-in-law, sn.f here means "maternal uncle".

sjit.s born of Kyw. All the other kin-terms refer back to the owner, so this is presumably his daughter. Kyw is not mentioned anywhere else on the stela, but, as she bears the same name as the owner’s paternal grandmother (see Excurssus B, p. 473), she may have been a relative of his, as well as bearing him a child.

It.f ḫnpy and pat.f Wrt. It has already been established that the father of the owner was Snfrw and that Wrt was the maternal grandfather, so it.f here means "his grandfather".
\[ s3t.s \text{ and } s3.s - \text{i.e. the children of } Mrt, \text{ though not necessarily by } \text{Iyny.} \]

Several unidentified men and women, and a man born of \( \text{It} \).

Cairo stela 20341.
Owner: \( \text{Nht-'nh} \).
pl. XXII.

1) \( \text{Nht-'nh} \) born of \( \text{3-k3.s} \).

2) \( \text{mrw.f } \check{\text{sd}} \) - \text{i.e. his beloved } \check{\text{sd}}. \text{ This is not his wife, and she is named nowhere else on the stela and given no kin-term, so it is possible that she was a concubine (see below, Section III, ps.234/303). At her feet is an inscription naming an otherwise unidentified woman, whose name has the determinative of a kneeling, pregnant woman.}

A) Inscriptions naming:

\( \text{It.f 'nhi} \) born of \( \text{Ns-Fth}. \)

\( \text{mrw.f } \check{\text{3-k3.s}} \) born of \( \text{Hpt}. \)

\( \text{s3t.f Hpt-snt} \) born of \( s3t \; n(t) \; \text{mrw.f } Nbt(t). \)

\( \text{s3t.f } \check{\text{3-k3.s}} \) and \( \text{s3.f } \text{Iyny}. \)

\( \text{s3t.f } S3t-tty. \)

\( \text{mrw.f } s3t \; n(t) \; \text{mrw.f } Nbt(t). \) Rankes *20) reads the name as \( S3t-nt-mrw.f \) and omits the \( Nbt \), but he is evidently unhappy with that solution and puts a question mark beside it. The word \( Nbt(t) \) is followed by the female determinative, making it clear that, though the \( t \) has been omitted, as happens several times on this stela, \( Nbt \) was part of, or the whole, name.

After the name come the words \( s3'(t)-\text{brw } \text{nb(t) 1m3p(yt). If } Nbt \) is the name then the preceding inscription may be intended as a literal comment on the status of this woman, who bore \( \text{Nht-'nh} \) (continued on next page)
at least one child, and she should be identified as "his wife, the daughter of his mother, Nbt", so Nbt would be the sister, or half-sister, of her husband *(21). Banke *(20) reads the name as S3t-nt-mwt.f and omits the Nbt, but he is evidently unhappy with that solution and puts a question mark beside it.

Two women, both said to be snt.f.

The rest of the inscription is a htp di new formula for the owner.

This stela is interesting because of the number of generations it records, but its value is diminished by lack of clarity in the inscriptions,

A) An inscription naming S3-hd-htp born of S3t-Wsr-nbt.

1 and 2) It.f Hnti-hty-wr born of It.t and seated with him is the mother of the owner.

3) s3.f Hnti-hty-wr. This man is so firmly attached to the parents of the owner, that he is probably their son, rather than the son of S3-hd-htp.

4) A woman piling offerings on a table is named as S3t-Hthr born of Tkt.t. No reference is made to her status within the family, but her prominent position would suggest that it was an important one.

5) The owner.
6 and 7) The seated figures of an unnamed man and ḫmt.f ḫtt born of S3t-k3. ḫtt has already been named as the paternal grandmother of the owner, and this may represent her, together with her husband. If this is so, however, it seems strange that his name has been omitted. It is therefore probable that this represents the owner again, whose name would not then need to be repeated, and his wife, who, as she bears the same name as the grandmother, may be related to the family by blood, as well as by marriage. She has been tentatively entered as the wife of the owner on the family tree.

8) The figure is of a woman, but the inscription is for ṣ3.s ḡn̄ti-htí- wr. Even if this is the child of the wife of the owner, but not of Š3-hd-ḥtp himself, the re-use of the name ḡn̄ti-htí- wr would be perfectly reasonable if, as has been suggested, the wife of the owner was also a blood relation.

9) ṣmt.f Š3-w3j born of ḡrit and an inscription naming another son of ḡrit.

10,11,12) ṣ3.f and two women said to be ṣ3t.f. These are presumably the children of the owner.

13) ṣn.f.

14 and 15) Two men said to be ṣ3.s, but it is not clear which woman is to be identified as their mother.

16) An inscription naming the owner.

17/19) An unidentified woman and two men said to be ṣ3.f. Since they are connected to the inscription naming Š3-hd-ḥtp again, this could represent more of his children, perhaps by this woman, but this is uncertain, so all three have been omitted from the family tree.

Cairo stela 20351. Owner Š3-'ẖnt. pl.XXIII.

The inscription on this stela can be interpreted in two ways, both of which are equally valid.
S3-'nḥt born of Ṣḥwt-'nḥ.

s3.f Ḥnḫr-hṭp born of Ḋkm.

ḥat.f Ṣḥm-dt. There is no way of ascertaining whether this woman is the wife of the owner or of his son. Certainly the owner’s son is said to be born of a different woman, but she is named nowhere else on the stela and may have been a long-dead or divorced wife, or even a concubine, while Ṣḥm-dt was the wife at the time of erecting the stela. On the other hand, the name of Ṣḥm-dt does follow that of Ḥnḫr-hṭp, so she may well be his wife rather than his father’s wife.

s3.f born of Ṣḥm-dt. This is either the second son of the owner or his grandson, according to the status one accords to Ṣḥm-dt. I have presented both solutions on pl.XXIII.

Cairo stela 20357. Owner: Ḥpy.

This stela belongs to the woman Ḥpy, and names no-one else except her mother. A translation of the dedicatory prayer will be found on p.491.

Cairo stela 20371. Owner: Ḥw.

There are three men designated Ḥt.f on this stela, all apparently referring to the owner, so two of them must be either grandfathers or step-fathers.

Cairo stela 20393. Owner: Ḥmḥ. pl.XXIV.

The figure of Ḥmḥ born of Ṣḥ-ḥḥḥt appears at the top of this stela and underneath are two columns of inscriptions naming his relatives.

First column - nḥt pr Pḥḫ-s‘nḥt born of Ḍnt. Judging by her title and
and prominent position, this must be the wife of the owner.

A woman born of Pth-s’nh.

Mnt born of Nfrw.

’nhw born of Rn.f’-nh. ’nhw bears the same title as the owner, that of hpwty, "runner", and since he appears in such an important position on the stela he may be the father. The name Rn.f’-nh ought to be an exclusively masculine one, but this is not so, and Rankes *(22) quotes several examples of its use by women. All other branches of this family are traced back to a female, so it would appear likely that, in this case, Rn.f’-nh was also a woman.

Second column – Nb-k3w born of Rn.f’-nh.

nbt pr Sn-Wart born of ʾIpt-W3ḏ(t) – i.e. the mother of the owner. Since her name appears in close proximity to that of Nb-k3w it may be that he, not ’nhw, was the father of the owner, and ’nhw would thus be the paternal uncle of ʾImy. This is the solution adopted in the family tree presented on pl.XXIV.

The hpwty Sn-Wart born of Sn-Wart – i.e. the brother of the owner.

Nfrw born of ʾ3ṯ-Hthr. Nfrw had already been named as the maternal grandmother of the wife of the owner.

Cairo stela 20394. Owner Nšs’-nh-ʾw.

According to his stela, the only title born by Nšs’-nh-ʾw was that of wʾrtw n tt ḫk3, "Administrator of the Ruler’s Table", but he was evidently a man of great importance because he was married to the ʾ3ṯ nsw (King’s Daughter) Ḥ3ṯ-ʾpswt, born of the ḫnt nsw (King’s Wife) Nfrt. The inscriptions referring
to the other figures are partly destroyed, but the couple appear to have had
three daughters, none of whom were accorded a title other than nbt pr.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cairo stela 20398.

Owner: Hty.

pl. XXIV.

1) Hty born of Sjt-Hthr, together with hat.f Snt-It.s and Sjt.s St.
There is no good reason why, if St was also the daughter of Hty, she should
not have been said to be Sjt.f, so, in view of the fact she is said specifically
to be the daughter of his wife, she may have been the child of a previous
marriage of Snt-it.s.

2) Sjt.f.

3) A male servant.

4) The wbyt, maidservant.

5) Sjt.f Hnsw - i.e. the son of the owner - together with his wife and his
son, Mry. These three are grouped together, forming a family unit.

6) The wbyt Mry.

7) A male servant.

8) Hnsw-Hty, his wife, and their son. There is no indication as to how this
group were related to the rest.

9) Hty. This may be the owner again.

10) Mry born of Snt-it.s and hat.f St/has already been named as the daughter
    of Snt-it.s, so this would appear to be a marriage of brother and sister,
or half-brother and sister.
11/13) Three women, two of whom cannot be identified. The other (no. 12) is said to be **s3t.f** - i.e. the daughter of Hty or Hry.

Cairo stelae 20429 and 20430.

Owner of both: **Tn-i’w-intf**, which is sometimes abbreviated to **Tn-i’w**.

pl.XXIV.

Cairo stela 20429.

1) **Tn-i’w** born of **Nb(w)-dd(t)**. The name of the mother on this stela and on 20430 is written without plural strokes, thus - 冥 , Nb(w)-dd(t), the t being omitted on stela 20429 but included on 20430.

Since there are certainly three women in this family all called **Nb(w)-ddt**, it would be of great assistance if it could be shown that the names were spelt consistently throughout, and this does appear to be so in the case of the mother.

2) **mn.tf T3-nt-h†w** born of **Nb(w)-dd†**, the mother's name being written without plural strokes as in no.1 above. **T3-nt-h†w** is shown in that part of the stela where one would normally expect to find the wife of the owner, and on the other stela, she is accorded the title of **nbt pr**, the only woman on either stela so designated. The prominent position occupied by this woman gives her more obvious importance than the owner's mother or other sister, and moreover, the owner has six children, but no named wife. It is therefore likely that **T3-nt-h†w** was both sister and wife of the owner.

3/8 Two men, both said to be **s3.tf** and four women, all said to be **s3.t.f** - i.e. the children of the owner.
9) **Nb(w)-ddt**, written without plural strokes, born of Dit - i.e. the mother of the owner.

10) **It.f 'nh-hw-inf'.**

11) **Swt.f Nb(w)-ddt** born of Hpy. When a man and woman are labelled It.f and Swt.f and are shown facing each other, as these two are here, they would normally be the parents of the owner, in this case, however, **Nb(w)-ddt** born of Dit is shown in a more prominent position and is therefore more likely to be the mother of the owner. Moreover, the name of **Nb(w)-ddt** born of Hpy is written with plural strokes, whereas the name of the mother of the owner appears to have always been written without. The second **Nb(w)-ddt** is therefore probably to be identified as the mother of 'nh-hw-inf', and she was thus the paternal grandmother of the owner. The words Swt.f are either to be interpreted as referring to 'nh-hw-inf', or are to be translated as grandmother.

12) **Sn.f**. Since the name of his mother is not given, this might be either the brother or the uncle of the owner.

13) **Tj-nt-nb(w)** born of **Nb(w)-ddt**, which is written without plural strokes - i.e. the sister of the owner.

14) The names of several people, none of whom can be identified, and who have therefore been omitted from the family tree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>8. 7. 6. 5. 4.</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cairo stela 20430.

1) The owner, born of **Nb(w)-ddt**. The name of the mother is once again written without plural strokes.
2) ant.f nb t pr T3-nt-htw. This woman has already been named as the sister of the owner, born of the same mother (see stela 20429, figure 2). As on the previous stela, she occupies the place, usually reserved for the wife of the owner.

Besides this figure, there is also an inscription naming Ddt born of Nb(w)-ddt. Nb(w)-ddt is here written with plural strokes. Ddt has already been identified on the previous stela as the maternal grandmother of the owner.

3) it.f 'nh-hw born of Hpyw. This is the father of the owner, the name being written in an abbreviated form.

The name Hpyw is followed by the words 3j' hrw - i.e. the masculine form. The determinative employed here is . This combination of masculine determinative and inscription indicate that Hpyw was a man, thus the names of the father and mother of the owner's father are now known.

4/8) Two men and three women, the children of the owner.

9) ant.f. This is the same man who appears on the previous stela (figure 12).

10) A list of names: 3j.t.f - i.e. the fourth daughter of the owner whose name was omitted above.

Nb(w)-ddt (written with plural strokes) born of Hpy - i.e. the paternal grandmother of the owner (see previous stela, figure 11)

Nb(w)-ddt (written without plural strokes) born of Ddt. She has already been identified as the mother of the owner.

T3-nt-nb(w) born of Nb(w)-ddt (written without plural strokes) - i.e. the sister of the owner.

An unidentified man.
Cairo stela 20431.
Owners: W3h-k3-sn and W3h-k3.
pl. XXV.

1) W3h-k3-sn born of Htpwy and hst.f S3t-Inhr.
2) W3h-k3 born of Htpwy and hst.f Htpwy. W3h-k3-sn is thus the son of W3h-k3, as might be deduced from his name, "W3h-k3 is healthy", which is a suitable name for the son of a man called W3h-k3. The name of the mother of W3h-k3-sn and the wife of W3h-k3 is written , whereas the name of the mother of W3h-k3 is written .

There then follows two registers of figures and another of inscription. The figures all face the same way as W3h-k3-sn so all the kin-terms ought to refer to him, but it must be admitted that the picture which can be evolved is complicated.

3) snt nt snt.f Hps - i.e. his maternal grandmother.
4) sn.f born of Hps - i.e. his maternal uncle.
5) snt.f Tbi and sn.f born of Tbi. If Tbi was the sister of W3h-k3-sn then her son would be his nephew, but she might be his aunt, in which case her son would be his cousin. In the absence of the name of her mother, either interpretation is possible.
6) snt.f Ksw.
7) sn.f born of Ksw. These two figures present the same problem as that discussed for 5 above.
8) snt.f Kfrt.
9) snw born of Nfrt, thus posing the same problem again.

The rest of the stela has figures and inscriptions naming ten men, all said to be snw and six women, all said to be antw. There is no indication as to which generation these persons belonged, and there is therefore not enough information to permit a complete and reliable reconstruction of the family tree from this stela, so only a tentative version is offered on pl.XIV.

Cairo stela 20445. Owner: Ti.

This stela belongs to the nbt pr Ti born of Snbt. There are separate representations of s3s and s3t:s, but there is no mention of a husband. This does not necessarily mean that she was not married, but that for some reason, perhaps divorce or early widowhood, she chose to have her own separate funerary monument. The dedicatory prayer appears on p.492.

Cairo stela 20452. Owners: sm born of 'm1, sm born of Hdr1 and Hnsw born of 'm1. pl.XIV.

In the absence of kin-terms, it is not possible to decide whether three or four generations are named here. The alternatives are represented on pl.XV.

A man and his wife are also shown on the stela, but there is no indication as to their relationship to the three women. A translation of the dedicatory prayer appears on p.492.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>20.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cairo stela 20455. Owner: 'smyn. pl.XVI.

1) 'smyn.
2) ifn-em-h3t born of S3t-H3t
3) smt.f Hr-em-hb born of Hn.s-em-hb.
4) smt.f S3t-H3t born of Hr-em-hb.
5) smt.f born of Hr-em-hb.
6) smt.f born of Hr-em-hb.
7) smt.f Hwst born of Hr-em-hb.
8) smt.f born of Hr-em-hb.
9) smt.f Itmy-Hpswt born of Hr-em-hb.
10) smt.f born of Hr-em-hb.

11 and 12) hat.f Nbt-sht-nR born of Hwst and hat.f Hwst born of Snt.

Itmy therefore had two wives, but it is uncertain which was the first wife, for the fact that the name of Nbt-sht-nR precedes that of Hwst, does not necessarily mean she was the first wife, but may indicate rather that she was the wife at the time the stela was erected.

Itmy had a sister called Hwst and it is possible that Nbt-sht-nR was her daughter and therefore his niece as well as his wife. However, there is another alternative which ought to be considered. Nbt-sht-nR was the daughter of a woman called Hwst, which was the name of the other wife of Itmy, and she is known to have had daughters called Nbt-sht-nR. Either Hwst was the second wife of Itmy and chose to name three of her daughters after her predecessor, or Nbt-sht-nR was the second wife and it was just coincidence that her predecessor's daughters had the same name as herself *(23), or Nbt-sht-nR was the daughter of the first wife of Itmy and she married her father.

In view of the fact that Nbt-sht-nR is a very uncommon name, it is likely that she was either the niece or the daughter of Itmy, and since
her figure is in a different row from that of the sister of ?Imy, the second solution has been preferred and is presented on pl.IXVI.

13) s3t.f Sh-m-hb born of Nbt-sh-t-nt-R'.

14 and 16) Two men, both said to be s3.f. Their mother's name is not given, but since they are surrounded by girls born of Nbt-sh-t-nt-R', it is reasonable to assume that they were her children too.

15) s3t.f Hnwt born of Nbt. Nbt is merely a shortened version of Nbt-sh-t-nt-R'.

17) s3t.f ?Imy-§pswt born of Nbt.

18) s3t.f Nbt-sh-t-nt-R' the younger.

19) s3t.f born of Nbt.

20) s3t.f Nbt-sh-t-nt-R' born of Hnwt - i.e. possibly the second wife of ?Imy.

21) s3t.f born of Hnwt.

22) s3.f born of Hnwt.

23) s3t.f born of Hnwt.

24) sn.f Sn-Wart born of 13-k3.s. 13-k3.s is not mentioned anywhere else on the stela so the exact relationship of her son to the owner must remain uncertain. Since he could be neither uncle or nephew on the evidence as presented, he must have been either a half-brother or a cousin and it is as the former that he has been tentatively included on the tree on pl.IXVI. One of the owner's sons (figure 16) was named after this Sn-Wart, so he is likely to have been quite closely related to the owner.

25) sn.f. No other details are given, so his exact relationship to the owner must remain very doubtful and he has been omitted from the family tree.
The value of this large stela is greatly diminished by the fact that some vital inscriptions, including that naming the mother of the owner, are illegible, while elsewhere certain necessary details are withheld.

1) Nhti born of ....... Name illegible.

2) sn.f Tt born of "Iny. Since this woman stands facing the owner it would be logical to assume that she really was his sister, born of the same mother, but later his "friend" (hnms.f) is also said to be born of "Iny and hnms would not normally be used of a brother.

3 and 4) Two men said to be sn.f born of Nhti.

5, 8, 11 and 12) Four men, all said to be hnms.f. They all have different mothers, none of whom are otherwise known. Perhaps among these men are to be found some of the husbands of the owner's numerous "sisters".

6) sn.f Iny born of Tt. There is no way of telling whether this is the daughter or the mother of figure 2.

7) sn.f Stlt born of In(y).

9) sn.f Htp-ddt born of Tt.

10) sn.f Tt born of Htp-ddt.

13) hnms.f born of In(y).

14) hnms.f born of Htp-ddt.

26) A man born of Htp-ddt.
These are the only people named on this stela, who can be arranged in a family tree in a coherent sequence, though even so, it was necessary to omit the name of the owner since three generations of women were all said to be anw.f., and it is impossible to deduce his exact relationship to each of them.

It is also a remarkable feature of this stela that the daughters of Htp-djt and ḏny are each said to be the "sister" of the owner, while the sons of Htp-djt and ḏny are designated the "friend" of the owner, and there is no evidence available to explain this change of terminology.

Several groups of women and their children, many designated sn(t).f, appear further down on the stela, but they cannot be convincingly identified.

Figure 22 represents the nurse, sn.t, of the owner, Ttī born of Ttī, and her son is said to be sn.f born of Ttī, so sn is used here of a foster-brother.

Cairo stela 20473/4.
Owner: Ḥr.
pl.XXVII.

Many of the figures on stela 20473 cannot be identified, and some crucial inscriptions have been destroyed, so 20474 will be used here, supplemented where possible by 20473.

1) The owner Ḥr.
2) It.f Sn-mrf.
3) Ewt.f Snt.
4 and 5) Two women, both said to be s3t.s, named Sn and Ty respectively

6) s3t.s Tmy.

7) snt.s.

8) snt.s. This is one of the few people on this stela, identified by their relationship to the owner, rather than to his mother.

9) snt.s Snt.

10) s3t.s - i.e. probably the daughter of figure 9.

11/16) snt.s, sn.s Fr, sn.s S3-B3stt, snt.s S3t-Fr, sn.s and sn.s.

17) An unidentified man.

18 and 19) Two men, both said to be sn.s, presumably referring to the owner.

20 and 21) Two unidentified men.

Stela 20473 names another man called Hr, who is said to be born of Ty and is thus the nephew of the owner.

There are two stelae, which belong to Hr, in the Louvre (numbers C.2 and C.34), but they only name him and his mother.

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
1. & 3. & 2. \\
\end{array}\]

Cairo stela 20476.

Owner: "Iwtn".

1) The owner.

2) The dedicator, whose relationship to the owner was probably recorded on that portion of the stela which has been broken off.

3) Facing the owner across the offering table is the 'h'yt * (24) S3t-Pth, who is presenting her master with incense and an alabaster unguent vase. The exclusion of all members of the family, with the possible exception of the dedicator, gives added importance to the prominent position accorded this domestic servant. This suggests that she was an especial
favourite of her master, possibly even his concubine. The importance of her role is further emphasised by the fact that she is not shown carrying food, or the personal possessions of her master, as is usual for servants, but is shown with incense and unguent, as if she were performing an offering ritual.

Most unfortunately, this very interesting stela is damaged and is illegible in several places, including the entire bottom register.

1) **Nḥt** born of **3ty**.
2) **sȝt.f Hnsw**... born of **Ʌpl**.
3) **ḥnt.f Ʌpl** born of **3ḥw**.
4) **wst.f 3ty** born of **Ṣbk-ḥtp**.
5) **Hnsw-nḥt** born of **Ṭl**. He is later shown to be the nephew of Nḥt.
6) **ḥnt.f Ḥtp** born of **Ṣṣt-ḥp** - i.e. the wife of **Hnsw-nḥt**.
7) **Ṭl** born of **3ty** and **sȝs Nḥt-šnḥ**. This woman was the sister of the owner, and her sons were therefore his nephews.
8) **Hnsw-nḥt** born of **Ṭl**.
9) **Nḥt** born of **Ṭl** and the name of a man who cannot be identified, because the name of his mother is illegible.
10) A block of partially destroyed inscriptions, which cannot be incorporate into the family tree as it is too fragmentary.
11) Nhti born of 'nh-ns. There is another name at his side but it is illegible.

12) A block of inscriptions, apparently referring to figure 11.

bnt.f S3t-R' born of B,.... (name illegible). S3t-R' has already been identified as the mother-in-law of the owner's nephew.

s3.f Ttf-3 born of Tti. Nhti must, therefore, have had two wives, S3t-R' and Tti, who has also been identified as the sister of the owner.

The relationships are further complicated by the fact that Hnw-nht born of Tti married Htp born of S3t-R'. Since Tti and S3t-R' were married to the same man, Hnw-nht must have married his half-sister.

s3.f born of S3t-R' - i.e. the son of Nhti.

13) A block of inscriptions, which apparently refer back to the figure in the register above them, Nht born of Tdi.

sn.f Ttf-3 born of Tdi.

s3.f Hnw-nht born of Tdw - i.e. the son of Nht born of Tdi. Tdw has already been named as the mother-in-law of the owner, so Nht born of Tdi must be his father-in-law.

s3t.f Hnw born of Tdw.

s3j.f Hnw-htp born of Tdw.

The rest of the stela is illegible.

Cairo stelae 20515, 20526 and 20751. Owners: Nhti and Nht. pl.XXVIII.

These three stelae all belong to the same family.

Stela 20751.

This stela will be considered first because the owner Nhti, was the father of Nht, the owner of 20515 and 20526.
1 and 2) Nhti born of Hwnt and hst.f Htp.

3) s3.f Nht - i.e. his grandson, the dedicator.

4) s3.f Nht - i.e. the son of Nhti and probably the father of Nht.

5) s3.f Htp.

6 and 7) snt.f Hky and sn.f.

Stela 20515.

The owner, Nht born of Htp - i.e. the son of the owner of 20751, and hst.f Tnw.

They are followed by fourteen men and women, all said to be s3.f or s3.t.f.

The sons are named Nht, Snt.wrt, Htp, Hwnt.dh, Nht, Nht-3, Rn.s'-nh,

Wp-w3wt-htp, Rn.s'-nh, and Nht. The daughters are named Tti, S3t-Htp, Htp

and Hky.

In the bottom register there is another representation of Nht, the owner,
together with hst *(25) S3t-hnti-hty, s3.s 'Imn? and s3.s Nfr. This arrangement
suggests that Nht himself may have been the father of the children of
S3t-hnti-hty. Behind them come a male servant, another hst and s3.f.

Stela 20526.

The figures on this stela are divided into six groups.

Group 1 - Nht and hst.f Tnw, with a dedication by s3.f Nht.

Group 2 - s3.f Nht - i.e. the man who dedicated the stela, with hst.f Htp,
and their children: Wp-w3wt-htp, Hpr-k3-t', Sn-wrt, Htp and Hky.

Group 3 - s3.f Rn.s'-nh - i.e. the son of Nht and Tnw, together with hst.f Htp,
and their sons Rn.s'-nh, Nht, and Nht. Htp is a very common name, so Rn.s'-nh
was not necessarily married to his sister or niece, though he may have been.

Group 4 - Nht - i.e. probably another son of Nht and Tnw, together with
hat.f Smw-nht born of Rn.s-nht.

Group 5 - s3.f Nft - i.e. presumably the third of the four sons of Nft and Nkw to bear this name, together with s3.f Sn-Wart and s3t.f Eky.

There is no wife named for this Nft, so Sn-Wart and Eky may not be his children, but more of the children of Nft and Nkw.

Group 6 - A list of eighteen people, the last seven of whom, though clearly related to the family, cannot be integrated into it, as insufficient data is supplied. The rest apparently represent the other children of Nft and Nkw. There are certain discrepancies between this list, and the names supplied by stela 20515, but this may be attributed to births and deaths within this large family between the erection of the two monuments, one of which seems to have been commissioned by Nft born of Htp, while the other was the work of his son, Nft born of Nkw.

These three stelae are especially valuable, because they give an indication of how often a name could be re-used within a family, even among siblings (see Excursus B and Chart 2).

Cairo stela 20518.
Owner: Hnum-nht.
pl.XXX.

1) Hnum-nht born of Nfry.
2) s3.f born of Snr.
3) Hmst born of Nfry - i.e. the sister of the owner.
4) Snr born of Nfr - i.e. the mother of the son of the owner and presumably his wife. The name Nfrt and its variants were so popular that the
similarity of the names of the owner's mother and mother-in-law could be a coincidence, but it is possible, the variation of spelling being so slight, that they were the same woman, and that ḫnumw-nḥt had a child by his sister.

5) Tt born of Ṣfr.

6) Tṣi born of ḫnḥt - i.e. the nephew of the owner.

7) Ṣfr born of Ṣny - i.e. the daughter of the owner. Ṣfr is shown seated beside Tṣi, with her arm around him, and is definitely intended to be identified as his wife, since only married couples were shown this way (see Exoursus D). Tṣi and his wife were first cousins because his mother and her father were sister and brother.

This is a typical example of those stelae which are shared by a man and his son.

1) Ṣḥ-'3 born of Ṣṣt-Hḥr.

2) ḫt.§ Ṣṣt-hnti-hṭy born of Ṣi.

3) Ṣ.§ Wr-nḥ.

4) Ṣ.§.

5) Wr born of Ṣṣt-hnti-hṭy. Wr is probably an abbreviated writing of Wr-nḥ.

6) ḫt.§ Ṣṣt-Hḥr. The second occurrence of the name Ṣṣt-Hḥr may be of little significance since it was so common, though it may be that she was related to her husband by blood.
7) \textit{sjit.f}.

8) A man born of Sjit-Hthr. Since he is not specifically said to be the son of Wr-\textit{nh}, this could be the son of the elder Sjit-Hthr and he has been tentatively entered as such in the family tree. Alternatively he might be the step-son of Wr-\textit{nh}.

Cairo stela 20525. Owner: Tbi. pl.XXX.

This simple stela is a perfect example of its type. The special interest lies in the fact that the owner has ignored the existence of the husbands of his daughters, and it also provides a good example of the way a man usually expressed the kinship of his grandchildren.

Tbi and hait.f Sjt-Wart.

Three men, all said to be \textit{sjit.f}.

\textit{sjit.f Hpt} and two men, both said to be \textit{sjit.s}.

\textit{sjt.f Sn-\textit{nh} and sjit.s}.

An unidentified woman, possibly the mother of Tbi.

\begin{center}
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Cairo stela 20534. Owner: Mntw-\textit{htp}. pl. xxx

1) Mntw-\textit{htp} born of K3yt.

2) hait.f ...... - name illegible.
3) **Mnt.w-htp**.

4) **s3.t.f.** Her name appears in such close proximity to that of Hthr-htp that she is probably her daughter.

5) **s3.f 'Intf.** There is no indication as to which of the owner's two wives was his mother.

6 and 7) Mntw-htp and Mnt.s K3yt. It has already been established that K3yt was the mother of the owner, so Mntw-htp must have been his father. A change of subject has now been effected, and the kin-terms are now given with reference to the father of the owner.

8 and 9) Two men, both said to be **s3.f**, one of whom is called **Mntw-htp**, and is presumably to be identified as the owner.

10) **snt.f S3t-Hthr** - i.e. the sister of the elder Mntw-htp.

11) **s3.r**.

12) **snt.f 'Intf.**

13/15) **snt.f Hipt** with **s3.r Mntw-htp** and **s3.t.s S3t-Hthr**.

This stela also ignores the existence of the husbands of two women, although they have children.

Cairo stela 20535.

Owner: **'Intf**.

pl. **XXX**

1) **'Intf** born of **Tt**.
2 and 3)ḥnte S3t-W4rt and ḥnte Hpy. The figure representing S3t-W4rt is shown seated beside her husband, but Ḥpy stands behind their chair, a pose which somehow conveys the idea that she was of less importance than S3t-W4rt.

4/7) Two men, both said to be 3ṣt.ḥ, and two women, both said to be 3ṣt.ḥ. There is no indication which of the two wives was the mother of these children.

8 and 9) Nḥṭi born of Ḥpt and ḥnte Ṭṭ. Ṭṭ has already been identified as the mother of the owner, so Nḥṭi must be his father. This is confirmed by the dedication to him: in 3ṣt.ḥ snḥ mn.ḥ 3ntf, his name is made to live by by his son 3ntf.

10) 3ṣt.ḥ – i.e. the son of Nḥṭi.

11 and 12) 3ṣt.ḥ Ṭṭ and 3ṣt.ḥ Hpy.

13 and 14) Two women, both said to be 3ṣt.ḥ.

15) Servants of both sexes, including three women, all said to be ḥnte.

The name Ḥpy is a common one, and the niece of the owner may have been named for his wife. On the other hand, Ḥpy may have married her uncle.

Cairo stelae 20542 and 20561, and Louvre st lsc G.167, pl.LV and G.168, pl. LVI. Owner: 3ntf. pl. XXX.

These four stelae were all owned by the same man. One is of little use since it has been badly broken, but the other three give interesting and different accounts of his family.

Cairo stela 20561 is undated and shows only 3ntf born of Ṣṣt-ḥm, and ḥnte Ṣṣt-Hḥṣr receiving offerings from their son Ṣn-W4rt and a group of four servants. Two of the female servants are entitled ḫṛṭ ṭerras (26), and the other is the ḫbṣṭ Sṣt-ḥm.
A) An inscription which includes the date year 24 of Senusret I.

1 and 2) ḫntft and ḫmt.f S3t-Hthr.

3) s3.t.f.

4 and 5) s3t.f S3t-ɪm n and s3.t.f Sbk-ddw.

6) sn.f Sbk-ddw.

7 and 8) ḫt.f Nb-ḥw and ḫmt.f S3t-ɪm n.

9) Servants and dependants, including an ḫh'yt.

A) An inscription dating the stela to year 26, presumably of Senusret I.

1) ḫntft.

2 and 3) ḫmt.f S3t-Hthr and ḫmt.f ḫrtyt.

4/6) Three men, all said to be s3.t.f, named Sn-Wsr, Nb-kȝw, and Sbk-ddw.

7 and 8) Two women, both said to be s3t.f, both named S3t-ɪm n.

9) Servants including two women entitled ḫrtyt pr. One of these women is called S3t-ɪm n, after the owner's mother and daughters, the other is
Sjt-Nb-k3w. Unfortunately, there is not enough evidence available to
decide whether this girl was simply named after one of the sons of the owner,
or whether she was, literally, "the daughter of Nb-k3w".

Louvre, C.168.

This stela is damaged, and of the family, only the name of ʻIntf born of
Sjt-Imn has survived. Among the procession of servants, however, it is
possible to identify three nurses (mn't), an ʻkyt *(27), and a w'rytyt.

In year 24, ʻIntf erected a stela, on which he named one wife, a daughter,
and one, or possibly two sons. Within three years, another stela had been
commissioned, on which appeared a second wife, a second daughter, and a
third son. The children on both stelae are shown as adults, but this need
only have been a polite fiction, and it would have been possible, in three
years, for ʻIntf to have lost one wife, married another, and to have had two
children. ʻIntf, however, had four, perhaps even more, stelae, and the
inscriptions on one of them are missing. He may have chosen to erect one
stela showing himself with Sjt-Hthr and their children, another for himself,
Wryt, and their children, and a third showing himself with both women and
their combined offspring. The fact that Sjt-Hthr also appears with him and
their son on the undated Cairo stela, makes her appear the more important,
or favourite wife, but such judgements must be avoided as there is no way of
knowing how many stelae originally belonged to this group, but are now
destroyed. There may have been others showing him with Wryt alone.
1) Ṣimpw-š3 born of Ttšt.
2) 'nhš-t-rn born of Ḥmnty-m-ḥ3t. To judge by her position on the stela, this must be the wife of the owner.
3 and 4) Two men, called Ṣimpw-š3 the elder and the younger, both said to be the son (a3) of Ṣntšt.
5 and 6) Two men, called Ḥmsw and Ḥmsw the elder, both said to be the son (a3) of Ṣntšt.
7) Ṣntšt the daughter (a3t) of Ṣimpw-š3, born of Ṣntšt. Ṣntšt is thus the daughter of the owner, and he must have had two wives, 'nhš-t-rn and Ṣntšt.
8) Ṣntšt born of Ṣntšt - i.e. the second wife of the owner.
9) Ṣntšt born of Ḥwtasions - i.e. the mother of the owner.
10) Ḥmnty-m-ḥ3t born of Ḥwtasions - i.e. one of the mothers-in-law of the owner.
11) A woman born of Ṣimpw-š3. Since the children of Ṣntšt are specifically said to be born of her, this may be the only child of 'nhš-t-rn.
12) Ḥmnty-m-ḥ3t born of Ḥmnty-m-ḥ3t.
13 and 14) An unidentified brother and sister.
15) Ḥrw-nht, her mother's name is illegible.
16) Ṣimpw-š3 born of Ḥrw-nht. To judge by the name alone, this might be the otherwise unnamed father of the owner, but, if it is, he has been
relegated to an obscure place on the stela.

Cairo stela 20545.
Owner: Nb-pw.
pl. XXXI.

1) Nb-pw born of 'nk and Twt.
2) Another Nb-pw born of the same parents.
3) Nfr-htp born of Nb-pw and Ryt.
4) 'nk born of Hr. The words "born of" are here written as n, so Hr is a woman.
5) The nbt pr Ryt born of Nb(w)-di.
6) An unidentified woman.
7) The nbt pr Twt born of S3-1pw and Dsr.
8) Three unidentified men, an unidentified woman, and a man born of S3-1pw and Dsr.

A) A list of seventeen men and women, some of whom cannot be identified because the inscriptions are illegible. Of those who can be identified there are four women (Bbl, Tpw, Ipw, and Twt) and a man, all born of Dsr, and a woman entitled the hwnpt n(t) Tmn *28, who was born of Nb(w)-di.

After these comes the name of Dsr born of 'nk, presumably the sister of the owner, though she may have only been his half-sister since she is identified by their father's name only. There is another woman said to be born of Nb-pw, who must either be the daughter or the niece of the owner, and two
men, who can be identified as the cousins of the owner, born of his aunts Ḥpw and Ṭpw, respectively.

Cairo stela 20546, British Museum stela, vol. IV, pl. 33, Louvre stela C.35 and Copenhagen stela AAd.13, pl.XII. Owner Ḥmy.

These four stela all appear to have belonged to a General, Ḥmy-ḥ Ṣwtr, called Ḥmy. The stelae in Cairo and the British Museum were clearly designed as a pair and seen to have been produced by the same sculptor. The other two are in different styles. The interesting feature about these stelae is that the first three name three different women as the wife of the owner, while the fourth names a daughter born of yet another woman, though this one is not said to be a wife. Regrettably it is impossible to deduce from the evidence available whether Ḥmy was married to more than one wife at a time.

Cairo stela 20546.

The owner is named as Ḥmy born of Ḥbw and his wife as Ṣn=f-ḥḥ born of Ḥnh=f-ṛn. Several servants and retainers are also named.

British Museum stela, vol. IV, pl. 33.

The owner is again named as Ḥmy born of Ḥbw, but this time his wife is Ḥḥw born of Ḥmy, Ḥmy here being a woman. A brother and several more servants and retainers are shown.

Louvre stela C.35.

This simply shows the figures of Ḥmy born of Ḥbw and Ḥḥw Ṣḥt born of Ṣḥt-ḥʷn.
Copenhagen Asd.13.

This stela has been damaged, but it shows ḫmnw seated with s3t.f Sḥtp-ib-nḥḥ born of Snbtšy.

 Cairo stela 20547.
Owner: Kšy.
pl. XXXII.

1) Kšy born of Nfr-hr.
2) s3t.f Rn.f-ʾnh born of Hty. Ḥty is not mentioned anywhere else on the stela and is awarded no title or kin-term, so she might be a concubine.
3) s3.t Snhwš born of Ḥty.
4) ḫns.t Ḥty born of Ḥmr.
5) Ḥmti born of Ḥty.
6) A boy born of Ḥty.
7) ḫns.t Ḥmti born of Ḥmr. A change of subject clearly begins with the new register.
8) A boy born of Ḥmt - i.e. the brother of Ḥmti.
9) ḫns.t Nfr-hr born of Rn.f-ʾnh - i.e. the wife of Ḥmti and the mother of Kšy.
10 and 11) Two women, s3t.f Ḥmr and s3t.f Ḥপl, both born of Nfr-hr.
12) s3t s3t.f Ḥtp born of Ḥmr - i.e. the granddaughter of Ḥmti.
13) A boy born of Ḥmr. He is probably the grandson of Ḥmti.
14) nsw born of Ipt. Another change of subject takes place here.

15) hat.t f Ipt born of Nfr-hr. This woman has already been named once as the daughter of Nhti, and she now appears in the role of a wife. This is one of the rare stela, which gives a prominent position to an in-law.

16/19) Four women, all said to be s3t.f. and all born of Ipt.

20) Bwbb born of It. It has already been identified as the granddaughter of Nhti.

21) G3w born of Nbt. Another change of subject takes place here.

22) hat.t Nuy born of Wk. Nuy has already been identified as the mother-in-law of K3y, so G3w was his father-in-law.

23/25) Two men and a woman called Nbt, all born of Nuy.

26 and 27) Two women, both born of Nuy. It seems strange that these girls are separated from the figure of their mother in this way, but this might be because there was no room for them in the upper register, or they might have been children who died young and so, though their parents wanted to commemorate their names, they had not played any part in family affairs.

28) An unidentified man.

Cairo stela 20549.

Owner: W3q-k3.

pl. XXXI.

1 and 2) W3q-k3 born of Htpw and hat.t f Htpw. The owner's wife and mother have the same name, but it is a very common one, so no significance can be
attached to its re-appearance.

3 and 4) ıt-[3h-k3] m-wsḥt born of Mwty and hmt.f Htpwų.

5) The '3mt W3h-k3, clearly named after the family she served.

6 and 7) sn.f W3h-k3 born of Mwty and mwt.f Mwty - i.e. the paternal uncle and grandmother of the owner. The possessive pronoun applied to the uncle refers back to the owner, but that applied to the woman could either apply to the owner, in which case mwt.f here must be understood to mean "grandmother", or it refers to the owner's uncle, in which case mwt.f retains its more usual meaning of "mother".

8/10) Three men, each said to be sn.f. These could be the brothers or the uncles of the owner.

11, 12, 13, 17 and 19) Five women, all said to be sn.t.f. One is named Mwty, the two others are called Htpwų.

14 and 15) Two men, both said to be 3j.f. One is called W3h-k3 m-wsḥt and the other is called W3h-k3- nh, an appropriate name for a son of W3h-k3.

16 and 18) Two men, both said to be sn.f.

20) The '3mt Ț1 and 3(3.) W3h-k3. This boy could have been named after his mother's employer, which was a regular practice, and does not necessarily indicate that he was also his son, though he may have been.

21) Seven female servants, entitled hmt and '3mt. Two of them are named Htpwų.

Cairo stela 20553.

Owner: Ḥpr-k3-R'.

pl.IXIII.

Two pairs of figures appear across the top of this stela.
1 and 2) Hpr-k3-R' born of Ḥwy and the nbt pr Ḥtp born of Ṣn.s-'nh.

3 and 4) Ḥyms born of Ḥtp and the nbt pr D3g born of Sjt- Ip - i.e. the son of the owner and his wife.

A) A list of seven names, which includes three women and two men born of an Sjt- Ip, and/or unidentified woman.

B) A list of six names, of an unidentified woman, a man born of Ṣn.s-'nh, a man and woman born of Ḥtp, and two women born of D3g.

| 1. | 2-9. |
| 10. | 11-18. |
| 19. | 20-27. |

Cairo stela 20555.

Owner: Name illegible.

pl. XXXIII.

1) The owner and ḫnt.Ḥwy born of Wrt.

2 and 3) ḫnt.Ḥy born of Ṣjt-k3w and Ṣnt.Ḥntf-'nh born of Ḥp.

4a and 5) ḫnt. and Ṣnt.Ḥntf, both born of Ḥntf-'nh.

6) An unidentified man.

7 and 8) Two women, born of Ḥkw, later identified as his granddaughters.

9) A man whose name is illegible.

10) With the new register a change of subject takes place, and kin-terms now refer to Ḫmn-m-h'w'f born of Ḥwyt - i.e. the son of the owner, and (ḥnt.Ḥ)'bn Ṣnt-ns born of Ḥntf-ns. i.

11/18) Five men, all said to be Ṣnj, and two women, both said to be Ṣntj, all born of ḫbn Ṣnt-ns. Also a man whose name is illegible. One of
the daughters is named ḫnw-šn-šnb, which is presumably the full writing of ḫnw, who was named as the mother of figures 7 and 8.

19) Another change of subject begins with ḫnn-ḥw born of ḫny and hmt. of ṟn.s-šnb.

20/26) Four men and three women, all said to be setq or s3t.f and all born of ṟn.s-šnb.

27) ḫnyt born of ḫtf-šn,top.

Cairo stela 20562.

Owner: ḫmy.

pl. XXXIV.

This stela appears to have been owned by the same man who erected Cairo stelae 20015 and 20101. The only information to be gathered from the other two stelae, however, is that he was born of ḫmtt.

1) ḫmy.

2) The nbt pr ḫwt-st-tp born of ṟ-nī. This woman is later identified as the maternal grandmother of the owner. It is most unusual for a grandmother to take precedence in this way over a wife and mother.

3) Thenbt pr ḫyt-n-hb. From her position this may be the wife of the owner, but, if so, they had no children.

4) An unidentified man. To be placed so high up on the stela, he must be important, and could be the father of the owner.

5) A man born of ḫyt-špwt. If the owner had children, especially a son, he would usually be shown close to his father, so it is possible that this
is the son of 'Imny. He could also be the father of 'Imny, though it was
the custom to show the figures of the father and mother in close proximity,
so, in this case, it is more likely that he is to be identified as a son.

6) The nbt pr Snbt born of ḫ3t-špswt.

7/9) Three women, all born of Gwšt-tp - i.e. the maternal aunts of the
owner. One of these women is called 'Iwršt.

10/11) Two unidentified men.

12) A man born of ‘Iršt - i.e. the cousin of the owner.

13) The nbt pr ḫstt born of Gwšt-tp. This is the woman named on Cairo
stelae 20025 and 20101 as the mother of ‘Imny.

14/19) An unidentified woman and five unidentified men, among whom may
be the father of the owner.

The absence of kin-terms make it impossible to show conclusively whether
or not the owner was married and had children.

Cairo stela 20564. Owner: ḫ3ny.

The owner of this stela recorded no information concerning her family.
The interesting dedicatory inscription appears on p. 493.

Cairo stelae 20567/8. Owners: ḫ3y and Nb(w)-n-Pth. pl. XXXIV.

These two stelae yield little information of interest since neither
supply enough details to permit a thorough evaluation. The owner of 20567
was ḫ3y, whose wife was named D3r. He is said to have had two sons besides
Nb(w)-n-Pth who dedicated the stela, two daughters, and two brothers.

Thirteen other men and women are mentioned in inscriptions but no
indication is given as to how they fit into the family of ḫ3y.
The owner of 20568 was Nb(w)-n-Pth, the son of K3y, and his wife is named as H3n. He had a son called Itf, who was himself married to a woman called It, and they had three sons. The stela also names three men, all said to be hyma.f, adding the names of the mother of one and the wife of another. There is no indication how they were related to Nb(w)-n-Pth.

The last register is dedicated to Bbl-'nh, s3t.s, s3t.s Snt, s3t.s, Hpy born of Dit and Dit born of Snt. This represents four generations of women, but detailed information concerning their relationship to the owner is omitted.

Cairo stelae 20571 and 20748. Owner: 'nh. pl.LXXV.

These two monuments belong to the same man. Stela 20748 names only 'nh born of Iti, but several other relatives are included on 20571.

The family and servants recorded on 20571 are as follows:

Two male servants.

Ity born of Spst-sjt. From the prominence of his position, this man ought to be either the father or the son of the owner. Since a woman born of Spst-sjt is later said to be snt.f (i.e. his sister or aunt), Ity cannot be the son of 'nh. The mother of 'nh is known to be Iti, so Spst-sjt is likely to have been the grandmother of the owner and her children his father and aunt.

An unidentified man.

sn.f born of Spst the younger. Spst is later named as a sister of the owner, so sn.f here is to be interpreted as "his nephew".

snt.f born of Bib. Her exact relationship to the family is uncertain.

snt.f born of Spst-sjt - i.e. the paternal aunt of the owner.

Two women, both said to be snt.f and named Spst the elder and the younger.
These two women are the sisters of the owner since they are said to be born of ḫtī.

An unidentified man.

Cairo stela 20581. Owner: Ḯmny-ḏrt-ṛṣ. pl.XXXV.

At the top of the stela are the figures of Ḯmny-ḏrt-ṛṣ born of ḫntī and ḥmt.f Bnrt born of Ṣḏt-Rḥt-r-mšt, receiving offerings from sš.f born of Bnrt. The rest of the family are named in an inscription under these figures.

Two men, both said to be sš.f and born of Bnrt.

sš.t.f born of Bnrt.

mšt.f ḩnh Ṣḏt-Rḥt.

mšt.f Ṣḏt-Sḥtšy born of Ḫntī.

mšt.f Ṣḏt-Sḥtšy born of Ḫntī. However, the text is incomplete.

mšt.f Ḫmt-bḥ born of Ḫntī. An illegible name follows.

An ḥmt.f born of Ṣḏt-Rḥt-r-mšt - i.e. the owner's brother-in-law.

ẖmt sš.f born of Ḫr-m-hḥ - i.e. the daughter-in-law of the owner.

ẖmt sš.f Ṣḏt-Sḥtšy born of Ḫnh-mn. Since this woman bears the same name as the sister of the owner, she may be related to the family by blood as well as marriage.

The Ṣḏt ḫrti born of Ḫntī.

Cairo stela 20590. Owner: Ḫns. pl.XXXVI.

A simple stela, typical of the type that name a limited number of the relatives of the owner, all on the female side.

1) Ḫns born of Ḫtī.

2) Ḫy-nfrī born of Ḫwnt.
3) *Iti* born of *Ty-nfr.*
4) *Tamy-Ty-nfr.* This should read *Tamy* born of *Ty-nfr.*, but the words "born of" have been omitted in error. Thus Kaš named his maternal uncle, but not his father, unless, of course, they happened to be the same man, but there is nothing to suggest this.

Cairo stela 20592. Owner: Sbk-ḥtpw. pl. XXXVI.

Sbk-ḥtpw born of Ḥmn-snt.

ḥat.f Ṣnt.

Three men, all said to be ṣjt.f, named Drf, Ḥnt, and Sn-Wst.

Three women, all said to be ṣjt.f, named Ḥmn-snt, Ḥnt-st and Ḥnt.

ḥt.f Drf and Ḥat.f Ḥmn-snt.

Two men, both said to be ṣnt.f, and Ḥat sn.f Ḥnt-snt.

Three women, all said to be ṣnt.f.

Two male servants, the ḫyt Snt and the ḫyḥt Ḥnt-snt.

Cairo stela 20595. Owner: Ḫn-kš. pl. XXXVI.

1) Ḫn-kš born of Ḫšt.

2) ḫw born of Ḫšt. ḫw occupies the position normally reserved for the wife, but there is nothing else on this stela to suggest that she was married to her brother.
3) A man born of šmr. This man dedicated the stela, and all the other
kin-terms are given with reference to him.

4) snt.f ḫa.t born of šmr - i.e., the sister of the dedicator and the mother
of ḫa.t-k3.

5) snt.f ḫr.

Cairo stela 20612; Simpson, The Terrace of the Great God at Abydos,
pl.81; Metropolitan Museum stela 63.154; and Carlsberg, A690, AE.I.N.964,
pl.XCIX *(29). Owner: Rn-snb. pl.XXXVI.

The stela in Cairo names only Rn-snb and his mother and father.
On the basis of this information, it might have been assumed that Rn-snb
died as a young, unmarried man. The two other stelae, however, reveal that
he was married and had a large family.

Metropolitan Museum of Art, 63.154.

1) Rn- nb born of Snt.
2) ḫnt.f nbt pr ḫy.
3) Three men, all said to be s3t.f.
4) Three women, all said to be s3t.f.
5) The owner again.
6) Six servants, including the '3mt Snb-Rn-snb and S3t-k3-twnt.
7) It.t 'nh-hw and wmt.f Snt.
8) s3.f - i.e. the son of 'nh-hw.
9) Four unidentified men.

Carlsberg stela §690 gives the names of Rn-snb, his wife, parents, three sons and, this time four daughters. Also included are two brothers, two sisters, sn.f n wmt.f, and several servants, including two named on the Metropolitan stela.

 Cairo stela 20617.
 Owner: Kns.
 pl.XXXVII.

A) An inscription naming an unidentified woman. Clearly she must have been very close to the owner, or their names would not have been linked in this way.

B and 1) The owner Kns born of Hr-w-hb.
2) hmt.f Hthr-htp born of S3tsy.
3) s3t.f born of Hthr-(htp). It would be more usual to find a son heading the list of children of the owner, but here the daughter has been preferred.
4/8) Five men, all said to be s3.f, and all born of Hthr-htp. In each case the words born of have been mistakenly written ïrt n, as if for women.
9 and 10) Two women, both born of Hthr-htp, and named Kns and Pryt respectively.
11) Sn.f born of Hr-m-hb.
12 and 13) It.f Snb born of Pryt and usw.f Hr-m-hb born of P3ty.
14) An unidentified man.

This is one of several stela where children appear separated from their parents and their siblings for no apparent reason. It may be of little significance, though it might indicate that they died as children and therefore played little part in the life of the family.

17) Kns born of S3tsy - i.e. the sister of Hthr-htp.
18) An unidentified woman.

---

Cairo stela 20619.
Owner: Pth-s'nh.
pl. xxxvii.

1) Pth-s'nh born of Gft.
2) hat.f Ty born of Rw.t.
3) A man born of Gft.
4) D3 born of Gft.
5 and 6) A man and woman born of Ty.
A) An inscription listing:
Two men and two women, all born of Ty. One of the women is called D3 after her paternal aunt.
Two women born of D3 - i.e. the granddaughters of the owner. One of them is called Ty after her maternal grandmother.

Two unidentified women.

Cairo stela 20636. Owner: W3h-k3. pl.XXVIII.

Across the top of the stela are four horizontal lines of an offering formula, made out for W3h-k3 born of Hr-sh3t, while underneath are thirteen vertical lines of inscriptions naming:

1) snt.f Nfr-hw born of šdw. The owner has neither a grandmother, aunt, or sister named šdw, so Nfr-hw cannot be his aunt, cousin, or niece. It is therefore reasonable to assume that she was his half-sister, since they had different mothers, but she would also appear to have been his wife, because she bore him at least two children.

2) An unidentified woman and s3.f. The name of the mother of this son has been omitted through lack of space. His mother could be this unidentified woman, in which case W3h-k3 had two wives, Nfr-hw was the mother, but there was no room to include her name.

3) s3.f born of Nfr-hw.

4) s3.t.f Hr-sh3t born of Nfr-hw.

5) l.t.f Nfr-rwd born of Smw-nh(w).

6) ḫst.f Hr-sh3t born of ṭbbw. ṭbbw is probably a mistaken writing of ṭbbi, a name which occurs several times on this stela.

7) s3.t.f Nfrt born of Hr-sh3t - i.e. the daughter of Nfr-rwd.

8) s3.s born of Hr-sh3t. There is no good reason why this boy, and the girl whose name follows his, should be specifically designated the children.
of Hr-sh3t alone, when the children around them are said to be the offspring
of both Nfr-rwd and Hr-sh3t, unless it was to indicate that these two were
of different status from the rest. It is therefore possible that they were
the children of Hr-sh3t by a second marriage, which was otherwise not
referred to on this stela.
9) s3t.s Snw-'nh(w) born of Hr-sh3t. If these two were the children of
Hr-sh3t by a husband other than Nfr-rwd, it is a little surprising that one
of them was named after the mother of her first husband. The name is not
uncommon, however, and it is also possible that Hr-sh3t was related to
Snw-'nh(w) in some way, besides the one given here.
10) s3t.f 'bb1 born of Hr-sh3t - i.e. the daughter of Nfr-rwd.
11) s3t.f Nfrt born of Hr-sh3t and mwt.f Snw-'nh(w) born of H3y-i.e. the
daughter and mother of Nfr-rwd.
12) s3t.s S3t-hd-wr born of H3y and s3t.s Snw-'nh(w) born of S3t-hd-wr.
S3t-hd-wr is the sister, not the daughter of Snw-'nh(w), so the first kin-
term on this line ought to read snt.s.
13) s3.s born of S3t-hd-wr and s3.s born of S3t-Sbk. S3t-Sbk is named no-
where else on the stela, so she and her son cannot be integrated into the
family tree.

Cairo stela 20637. Owner: Name destroyed. pl.XXXVIII.

It is most unfortunate that this stela is so badly damaged, since it
belongs to the father of the owner of Cairo stela 20092. The name of the
owner of this stela has been destroyed, but he is shown facing mwt.f 'nh
born of Hnw-nht, and Hr3-ixr born of 'nht.
In the second register are two men, both said to be s3.t.f born of 'nht, and one of these men is ḫnsw-ḥtp, the owner of 20092.

An unidentified man.

s3.t.f ḫnsw-nḥt born of 'nht – i.e. the daughter of the owner and the sister of ḫnsw-ḥtp, who named one of his daughters after her.

s3.t.f ḫnsw-nḥt born of 'nht.

Hwl-1kr born of 'nht.

s3.t.s Sn-Wrt and s3.t.s ḫnsw-s'nh.

The rest of this inscription is too fragmentary to be of any use, though names occur that are known from 20092.

Cairo stela 20643. Owner: ḫnsw-ḥtp. pl.XXXIX.

The owner of the stela is named as ḫnsw-ḥtp born of Ṣnš-š'nh, and he is shown in the first register of the stela, together with ḫat.f ḫdrt and s3.t.f.

The second register names ḫnsw-ḥt born of Sjt-k3 and ḫat.f Ṣnš-š'nh – i.e. the parents of the owner, together with s3.t.f. There then follows an inscription naming:

Sjt-k3 born of Ṣnš-š'nh – i.e. the sister of the owner.

Four men and a woman, all born of Ṣnš-š'nh.

Two men and a woman, all born of Ttš.

Two unidentified men.

Ip(d) born of Ṣnš-š'nh.

Ttš born of Ip(d).

Ipš born of Sjt-k3. This is probably the younger Sjt-k3, not her grandmother of the same name, because all the dedications around her are for members of
the younger generation.

A man born of ḫnsw.

Two unidentified men.

A man born of ḫni.

On the evidence, as it is presented here, at the time of his death, ḫnsw-ḥtp had only one direct descendant, his son, but he had several great-nieces and great-nephews, born of his sisters. The husbands of his sisters are probably to be located among the unidentified men on the stela.

Cairo stela 20677.

Owner: Snb.f-n.i.

pl. XXXIX.

1) Snb.f-n.i born of ḫnš and Snbtšay.
2) ḫntf ḫdr.tw-ni-sn.
3) ḫni born of ḫny-ib.
4) ḫntf Snbtšay.
5) The owner making an offering to his parents.
6) A man born of Snbtšay.
7) A man born of ḫb(.1)-i(w)
8) An unidentified man.
9) A man born of ḫb(.1)-i(w).
10/13) Four women, all said to be s3t.f and all born of Edl.tw-n3-sn.

One of the four is Tb(i)-l'(w), the mother of figures 7 and 9.

From his position on the stela, the unidentified man, number 8, may be the husband of Tb(i)-l'(w).

Cairo stela 20679.
Owner: Inhr-ddw.

pl.XL.

Inhr-ddw also owner Cairo stela 20055, and this will be used to supply additional material which is missing from 20679.

1) Inhr-ddw born of ....... The name of the mother of the owner is illegible here, but on 20055 she is named as Nšm-ddt. Stela 20055 also names the father of Inhr-ddw as ēfr.

2) (Nšm)-ddt born of Hyw. On 20055 the maternal grandmother is named Hyw, but they are clearly the same woman, and are probably both variant writings of Hyw.

3/6) Three men and one woman, all born of Nšm-ddt.

7) Tb(i) born of ḫmn. This must be the woman, who, on 20055, is said to be born of ḫnl. Consistency in the spelling of names was evidently not too important to those responsible for this stela.

8) Hyw - i.e. the maternal grandmother of the owner. On 20055 she is simply said to be born of "her mother" (w.t.s).
9) Ḥpw born of Naš-ddt. On 20055 her name is spelt Ḥpy.

10) Wšt born of Ḥr. Stela 20055 says that Ḥr was also the father of Ḫm-ddw, so Wšt must be the sister of the owner, or, rather perhaps the half-sister, since neither stela claims that Naš-ddt was her mother.

11) sḫ.t.s Ṣb(w)-ddt.

12 and 17) Two men, both said to be born of Ḥpw. These are likely to be the nephews, rather than the uncles of the owner, since all the figures on this part of the stela belong to the younger generation.

13) An unidentified woman.

14) Ḫmm born of Wšt. It has already been suggested that Ḫmm is the woman who on 20055 is called Ḥnl.

15) Another Ḫmm.

16) An unidentified man.

Cairo stela 20706. Owner: The nbt pr Ḥr-m.

Ḥr-m appears on her stela with sḫ.t.s Ḫmm-ḫb, a girl, a woman, and two men who cannot be identified.

The dedicatory prayer appears on p.495.

---

Cairo stela 20713.

Owner: Nb-kšw-R'.

pl.XL.

1) Nb-kšw-R' born of Ḥšt.
2) The nbt pr S3t-hnti-hty born of K3yt - i.e. the wife of the owner.

3) s3t.f Snbtisy.

4) s3t.f Shtp-ib-R' born of S3t-hnti-hty.

5 and 6) It.f Shtp-ib-R' born of Snbtisy and mw.f Tit born of Tlt-n-hb.

7) s3t.s Tit. Since she is said to be the child of Tit, she may have been born to a husband other than Shtp-ib-R'.

8) s3t.f Shtp-ib-R' - i.e. the son of the father of the owner.

9 and 10) The figures of a small boy and girl. No kin-terms are given these two, but they were probably the children of Shtp-ib-R' and Tit, because they appear so close to them.

11/14) Two men, both said to be sn.f, and two women, both said to be sn.t.f. These could be either the siblings or the uncles and aunts of the owner. It is the second solution which is presented in the family tree, because the main interest on this stela, does seem to centre on the owner's parents.

15) The new register begins with 'nhw born of Th.

16) K3yt born of Tnti. K3yt has already been named as the mother-in-law of the owner, and her position on the stela strongly suggests that she was the wife of 'nhw.

17 and 18) sn.t.f Shtp-ib-R' and sn.f Sn-Wart. Their position would suggest that they were the brother and sister of 'nhw. The appearance of the name Shtp-ib-R' in the family of S3t-hnti-hty does not necessarily mean she was a blood relative of her husband, because the use of the royal prenomen, Shtp-ib-R', was very common in the early Twelfth Dynasty.

19/21) Unidentified men.

22) hym.t.f born of K3yt. The possessive pronoun must refer back to the owner, because a son would not be referred to as the "friend" of his father.
23) An unidentified man.

Cairo stela 20733. Owner: Mntyw-3 pl.XLI.

Across the top of this stela are five lines of dedicatory prayers in the name of Mntyw-3 born of Mryt. The rest of the stela is divided into two columns, each of twenty lines.

Column 1: s3.f Tsm-m-h3t.

s3.f Inrf.

s3.f Mntyw-h3t.

s3t.f Mryt.

s3t.f 33-k3.s.

s3(t).f Snt.

mwt.f Mryt.

hmt.f R3w.

it.f Inrf.

snt.f.

snt.f.

The relationships of the people named so far are perfectly straight forward, but then comes the name of R3w, followed by snt.f Mryt, it.f Mntyw-3 and it.f En-h3r, who cannot be placed, though the names suggest that they were close members of the family.

Intf born of R3w - i.e. the son of the owner, who has already been named. He is the subject of the next few inscriptions.

s3.f Mntyw-3.

s3.f Tsm-m-h3t.

s3.f Mntyw-ms-sw.

s3t.f R3w.
Column 2: s3t.f Hat and s3t.f It born of Hat. No wife has been named for Intf, but it will be observed that the last of the five children is said to be born of Hat. Normally one would have assumed that Hat was the name of the wife, and that one of the daughters was named after her. In this case, however, there are some special features which must be examined more closely.

Firstly, none of the other children’s names are followed by the name of their mother, though there is adequate space after each one. Secondly, It and Hat are the only two whose names appear on the same line. On the one line, therefore, where space is somewhat restricted, a mother’s name has been added. Hat and It were thus linked together and the obvious conclusion is that they were mother and daughter, making It the granddaughter of Intf. But It is specifically said to be his daughter, and s3(t).f is not the term generally employed for recording a man’s grandchild (see above ps. 18/19).

Since the wife of Intf is not specifically named, conclusive proof cannot be offered, but there is at least the possibility, that in this instance, Intf had a child by one of his own daughters.

s3t.f 3Im-n3t. The brother of Intf has already been named as a son of Mntw-’3 and It. On the same line is the name of s3.t.f Mntw-’3.

s3t.f Tkt and Bnt-msyt. Bnt-msyt is otherwise unnamed. She might be either the daughter of 3Im-n3t or even his wife, but in either case the kin-term has been omitted.

s3t.f ’3-k3.s and s3t.f Hn yt.

s3t.f Hn yt and Mntw-’3 born of It. Mntw-’3 thus belongs to the other branch of the family since he would appear to be the son of It born of Hat.

hat.f Hn yt born of ’n. This must be the wife of Mntw-’3, since his named ended the line of 3Im-n3t and introduced a new subject. The
frequency with which the name 

Kryt appears throughout this family suggests that this woman may have been related to her husband by blood.

s3t.f Snbtisy.

s3.f Intf and s3.f Mntw-'i3.

sn.f Mntw-ns-sw. Since the kin-terms now refer to Mntw-'i3 born of It, this must be his brother and another son of It.

Five men, all said to be s3.f, and a girl who is said to be s3t.f. The first two of these children were born of Kryt, so the others were presumab.

hers as well, though the inscriptions are now illegible.

1) An inscription naming a man who is not mentioned again, and whose relationship to the rest of the family is unknown.

2 and 3) P3wn.t born of Tw.s-n.i and hat.f Snbtisy born of K3-ns.

4) s3.f born of Snbtisy.

5) s3t.f born of K3-ns. - i.e. the daughter of the owner. The identification of her mother is discussed below.

6) s3t.f Tw.s-n.i born of ....... Her mother's name has been destroyed but there is enough space to supply the name of the logical choice, Snbtisy.

7) s3t.f K3-ns born of Snbtisy.

8) s3t.f W3dt born of Snbtisy.
9) $s3t.f$ Nfr-htp born of $Iw.s-n.f$.

10) $s3.f$ born of $Snbtisy$.

It was not the custom to use the words $s3(t).f$ to record a man's grandchildren. In this case, therefore, either the sculptor broke with the usual practice, or he made a mistake, or $Ptwnb$ had two daughters by consanguineous unions. These unions were either with his mother and mother-in-law, which would seem unlikely, or with two of his daughters.

Cairo stela 20750. Owner: $Tr$. pl. XLIII.

$Tr$, the owner of this stela, is shown with $wst.f$ $S3t-ni-sw$, $hat.f$ $Intf$, and $s3.f$ born of $Intf$. He has two more sons, but these are born of a woman called $Hwy$, who is given no title or kin-terms, and may therefore possibly be a concubine.

Cairo stelae 20778 and 20373: Owners: A father and son called $Sbk-htp$. pl. XLIII.

Cairo stela 20778.

This is taken first because it is the smaller of the two. The owner is $Sbk-htp$ and he is shown with $hat.f$ $hkrt msew $Nbw$-m-$hb$. Then follows the figure of $sn.f$ $n$ $wst.f$, $It.f$, whose name is missing, and a woman who must be the owner's mother. There is also $sn.f$, whose name has been destroyed, and another unidentified woman.

Cairo stela 20373.
1) Sbk-htp.
2) s3t f sjt nsw Nfrw.
3) sjt f Sbk-htp - i.e. probably the owner of 20778.
4) sjt f Inpw.
5) sjt f Sbk-m-hb.
6) An unidentified man.
7 and 8) sn.f Nn3 and sjt.f Sbk......
9 and 10) It.f Dd,i-rs and snw.f hkrtnw Pth-k3.

Three generations of the men of this family bore the title
İny-r wtw n hst ntw Inpw, Overseer of the embalmers of the temple of Anubis.
Clearly this was a position of some importance as one member of the family
a King's daughter (sjt nsw). The grandfather and grandson, Dd,i-rs and
Sbk-htp the younger, both married hkrtnw *(30).

British Museum stelae, vol. I, pl. 56 and vol. II, pls. 43/43.
Owners: The brothers Tgr wr and Tgr 3r.i. pl. LXXXIII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. 2.</th>
<th>9. 8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. 4.</td>
<td>12. 11. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>7. 16. 15. 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Tgr wr born of Pst.
2) sjt f Tgr born of Hmwt-htp, sjt f Gw f born of Hmwt-htp, and sjt f Pst.
3) The nbt pr Hmwt-htp born of Tb - i.e. the wife of the owner.
4) Two boys and a girl, all said to be born of Hnmsw-htp, and therefore also presumably the children of the owner.

5) The nbt pr Tb born of Hnmsw-htp. The children of the owner are all shown as children. This woman is an adult and is to be identified as the mother-in-law of the owner.

6 and 7) Two men born of Tb - i.e. the brothers of the wife of the owner. One is Gwr, after whom she named one of her sons.

8) Tpr born of Tnt. This is the father of the owner, though the name of his mother is spelt as Tint, whereas in two other places it is Tft.

9) st of Tpr fr born of Prt. This is the brother of Tpr wr and the owner of the second stela.

10) The nbt pr Prt born of Hnmsw-htp. Prt is the wife of Tpr and the mother of Tpr wr and Tpr fr. Both Prt and Tb are said to be born of Hnmsw-htp, so they were sisters, and the owner and his wife were thus first cousins.

11) The nbt pr Hnmsw-htp born of Prt - i.e. the sister of the owner.

12) The nbt pr Hnmsw-htp born of Nnfr. This is the mother of Prt, whose figure she faces, and Tb too.

13) Four men, all said to be born of Hnmsw-htp. Since they appear in the register directly under the figure of Hnmsw-htp born of Nnfr, they probably were her sons.

14) The nbt pr Hnmsw-htp born of S3t-Hthr. In the context of this stela it is not possible to identify this woman, but the stela of Tpr fr shows that she is a cousin of the two brothers.

15) Three women, all said to be S3t's born of Hnmsw-htp.

16) An unidentified man. His position on the stela suggests that he might be the husband of Hnmsw-htp born of S3t-Hthr.

17) A man born of S3t-Hthr.
18) A group of six persons who, on the evidence presented here, cannot be identified. The stela of umbled, however, shows that they were the grandparents and aunts of the two brothers. The names are given as born of hat.t tit born of W3dt-htp, and four women, all said to be s3t.f born of Tit.

1) um, born of Frt - i.e. the younger brother of the owner of the previous stela.
2) hat.t hmw-htp born of hmw-htp. To judge by her name, this woman was probably related to her husband.
3 and 4) s3.t born of hmw-htp and s3t.s. There appears to be no good reason why this girl should be said to be the daughter of hmw-htp rather than of um, unless, of course, she was the child of a previous marriage of hmw-htp.
5 and 6) The figures at the bottom of the stela are of the owner, um, and another of his sons, um-snt.
7) tit. tit born of Tit - i.e. the father of the two brothers. It also confirms that Tit, not Tit, was the correct writing of the name of their
paternal grandmother.

8) s3.f Hfr šrti born of Prt - i.e. the owner again, shown this time as a small boy.

9) mwt.f Prt born of Hnum-htp - i.e. the mother of the owner.

10), mwt.s Hnum-htp. The previous stela named this woman's mother as Nnl.

Regrettably the rest of the stela is of little value because the kin-terms, where given, are not precise enough, and everyone is said to be born of a Hnum-htp, a Prt or an šrt.

Only a few more figures can be identified with any degree of certainty.

13) Hfr šrt born of Prt, that is the owner again, but there he faces, and is said to be the son of, a man called Ḫm born of Hnum-htp, which may indicate that Prt married a second time and that this is the second husband.

14 and 15) Two women, both entitled mwt. One of them has two sons, who appear as figures 16 and 17. They appear within the family group, and were clearly regarded as important members of the family.

18) Sjt-Rthr born of Tit. This must be the woman who, on the previous stela, was said to be the mother of a woman called Hnum-htp. She is the paternal aunt of the two brothers.

19) Hwt born of Sjt-Rthr.

20) A man born of Hwt-pr - i.e. the son of the woman named Hwt, which is here recorded in an extended writing.

21) Ḫw.f-snb born of Sjt-Rthr.

22) mwt.f Jbt-li born of Prdt - i.e. the wife of Ḫw.f-snb.

British Museum stelae, vol.II, pl.25 and Cairo stela 20588. Owner: Sn-Wart-snbw. pl.XLIV.
1) Sn-Wsrt-anbw born of Nbt-²wnt.

2) Four women, all said to be s3t.f, and named Nfrw, S3t-²Imn, Nbt-²wnt, and S3t-Hthr.

3) lts.f Inhr-nht born of S3t-²Imn.

4) mwt.f Nbt-²wnt.

5) sn.f Inhr-nht born of Nbt-²wnt.

The missing daughter, S3t-Hthr, might have died between the commissioning of the two stelae, which would account for her absence, as she might have a separate monument.
1) Sn-Wart-snsw born of Nbt-I1m.
2) The same three daughters who appear on the second stela.
3) It.f Inhr-nht born of Sjt-I1m.
4) mwtf Nbt-I1m born of Tbt.

It will be observed that not one of these three stelae mentions the wife of Sn-Wart-snsw. She may have been dead for many years and provided with a monument of her own long before these were commissioned, or she may have been divorced, or become ineligible for some other reason, but no indication is given as to the correct explanation.


British Museum stela, vol.II, pl.12

1) 'nh-rn born of Sjt-thi.
2) Ewi born of Nfr-rnpt.
3) s3t.f Nfr-rnpt.

4) hnt.f Sb-t-ḥ. This name is most uncommon *(31)*, and since it is born by both the mother and the wife of the owner, it is certain that 'nh-ḥn must have married a near relative. A figure of the wife is included, but there is no figure of the mother, unless, of course, they were actually the same person, though this is unlikely, in view of the general lack of evidence of mother/son marriages.

5) ḫtpw born of 'nh-ḥn. This might be the father of the owner.

Cairo stela 20033.

This stela was also owned by 'nh-ḥn and on it he named sn.f, snt.f Rn.f-'nh, snt.f Pḥy-wnn.f, Bst and ḫwyt. ḫwyt is evidently the ḫw, who was named on the British Museum stela as the grand-daughter of 'nh-ḥn.

Cairo stela 20458.

This stela was owned by ṯmny-'nh-ḥn born of ḫwyt, and the name of his father is given as Dw-ḥrt. ḫwyt and Dw-ḥrt appeared together on the first of the Cairo stelas, for Bst and Dw-ḥrt are two writings of the same name. Since ḫwyt is the grand-daughter of 'nh-ḥn, ṯmny-'nh-ḥn was his great-grandson.

Also named on this stela are the two sisters of the owner, Rn.f-'nh and Pḥy-wnn.f, who were evidently named for the two sisters of 'nh-ḥn. The other people named cannot be identified with certainty.
British Museum stela, vol. II, pl. 16.

Owner: ḫwt and her two husbands.

pl. XLIV.

See also p. 496.

1) S3-Hthr.
2) ḫmt.f ḫwt.
3) A man-servant.

4 and 5) Two men, one of whom is said to be s3.f, so the other is likely to be the son of S3-Hthr too.

6) S3-ḥm.
7) ḫmt.f ḫwt.
8) ḫms.s ḫntf.
9) A man-servant.

10 and 11) s3.f with ḫmt.f.
12) and 13) s3.f with ḫmt.f.

14) s3.f.
15) mwt.f Bt3.
16) Servants bringing offerings.


This stela belongs to a woman called Nfrt-tw, and is dedicated to her by her son, who owned British Museum stela, vol. II, pl. 13, 123(187).
The father, mother, husband and two sons of Nfr-tw are all named on this stela, but the only figures shown are those representing Nfr-tw herself, her two daughters, her hairdresser *(32), and another female servant.

The father, husband and son of Nfr-tw all held the office of adju ntr, seal-bearer of the god. The dedicatory prayers are on p.496.


This stela belongs to a woman entitled Mnw wrḥyt *(33), the Watcher of Min, and her son. No husband is mentioned. The prayers are on p.497.


Besides Nhti, only three figures are shown on this stela - his wife, his mother, and his nurse, whose name he chose to perpetuate, even though his father's name was omitted.

British Museum stela, vol.III, pl.7.
Owner: Nfr-rwd-ṣnb.
pl. XLV.

1) Nfr-rwd-ṣnb born of Ṣ3ḥ-k3.
2) Ṣ3.f Ṣ3ḥ-k3.
3) sn.f Ṣ3ḥ-k3.
4) mwt.f Ṣ3ḥ-k3.
5 and 6) Two men, both said to be snbisy.

7) hat.f Snbtisy born of W3h-k3. As the owner and his wife appear to have had the same mother, they were at least half-brother and half-sister.

8) s3t.f W3h-k3.

Image removed due to third party copyright

British Museum stela, vol. III, pl. 15.

Owner: Hpms

pl. XLV.

1) Hpms born of Ky.

2) The nbt.pr Thi born of Ky. This is obviously the sister of the owner, but her title and her position on the stela suggest that she might also be his wife. Performing an

3) A man offering to the owner. This would normally be the son of the owner, and may be so here, but the kin-term has been omitted.

4) Five women, all entitled nbt.pr and all born of Thf.

5) Five unidentified men, possibly the husbands of the five girls.

Although the arrangement of this stela suggests that Hpms married his sister and had five daughters and perhaps a son by her, it is also possible that he died childless, and that his sister and her children were his only heirs. There is a stela in Turin (no. 161) which also belongs to Hpms, but has no additional information to offer.

This stela was dedicated to E̱dit by her son. She is shown standing facing her son, and another man, who might be her husband. The prayers are on p. 497.

pl. XLV.

1) ḫw.f-snb.
2) s3t.f. The figure representing this girl is shown at a smaller size than the other figures, and it is in the place where one would normally expect to find his wife.
3 and 4) Two men, both said to be sn.f, one of whom dedicated the stela. If ḫw.f-snb died young, leaving only one small daughter, his brother might have assumed responsibility for the funeral cult.
5) mwt.f ḫpwt-snb(w).
6) mwt nt mwt.f nb t pr ḱwnt. The maternal grandmother of the owner is named, but there is no reference to his father.
7) snf.
8) The nb t pr ḱwnt. This might be the otherwise unnamed wife of the owner, but, if so, she is relegated to a position of comparative obscurity. She bears the same name as the maternal grandmother of the owner, and so she may be one of her descendants.
1) M3-t3-s3-t3-hty born of S3t-hntl-hty.
2) M3-t3-s3-t3-hty born of S3t-hntl-hty.
3) M3-t3-s3-t3-hty born of S3t-hntl-hty.
4) M3-t3-s3-t3-hty born of S3t-hntl-hty.
5) M3-t3-s3-t3-hty born of S3t-hntl-hty.
6) M3-t3-s3-t3-hty born of S3t-hntl-hty.
7) M3-t3-s3-t3-hty born of S3t-hntl-hty.
8) M3-t3-s3-t3-hty born of S3t-hntl-hty.
9) M3-t3-s3-t3-hty born of S3t-hntl-hty.
10) M3-t3-s3-t3-hty born of S3t-hntl-hty.

1) The owner.
2) The owner.
3) The owner.
4) The owner.
5) The owner.
6) The owner.
7) The owner.
8) The owner.
9) The owner.
10) The owner.

It is very unusual to find the figure of a girl designated S3t-s3 preceding the figure of her mother, but this is what happens here, and there is no doubt as to the relationship.
5) **sšt.f.** **Mnh.t** - i.e. the daughter of the owner.

6) **sšt.s.** **Inty.**

7) **sš(t).f. Mkt-Bštšt.**

8) **sšt.s. Sšt-hnti-hty.**

9) **sšt.t.**

10) **mšt.s. Sšt-hnti-hty.** Though she was the mother of at least two, and probably all, his children, Sšt-hnti-hty is not said to be the wife of the owner, so she may not have held this rank.

---

**British Museum stela, vol. III, pl. 38.**

**Owner:** **Snfrw.**

pl. XLVI.

---

1) **Snfrw** born of **Sšt-IFW.**

2) **Sn.f** born of **Sšt-IFW.**

3) **Sn.t.f Sn-'nh** born of **Sšt-IFW.**

4) **Hšt.t.s. Snt.**

5) **It.t.f Snfrw** born of **'nhyt.**

A) The inscriptions lists the following:

An unidentified woman.

Three men, all born of **Sn-'nh**.

An unidentified man.

**'nhyt** born of **ššt.**

A man born of **ššt.** - i.e. a gre t-uncle of the owner.
An unidentified man.

Tit born of S3t-ifw. I think that this is probably another sister of the owner, though it could be his paternal great-grand other and her mother.

A man born of Pty.

Pty born of S3t-ifw.

A man born of Pty.

A man born of S3t-ifw.

A man born of Pty.
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British Museum stela, vol.III, pl.40

Owner: Dhwty.

pl. XLVII.

1) Dhwty born of Dhwty-htp.

2 and 3) Dhwty-htp born of Tit and Dhwty-htp born of Tit. These are undoubtedly the parents of the owner.

4) Tit born of Dhwty-htp - i.e. the sister of the owner.

5) Snb₁ born of S3t-Hr. This man sits facing Tit, and there is little doubt that he is to be identified as her husband.

6) s3-r - i.e. the son of Tit and Snb₁.

British Museum stela, vol.III, pl.50.

This stela belongs to two women, but it has been so badly damaged that nothing can be learnt from it, except that one of the women was the nbt pr Hft.
British Museum stela, vol.IV.
pls. 12/13.
Owners: Sbk-htp and Sn-Wsrt.
pl.XLVII.

A) An inscription naming Sbk-htp born of ḫt and Snb-ḥnh.
1) Sbk-htp born of ḫt - i.e. the owner again. In front of his seated figure is an inscription naming it n ħt.f Sbk-htp born of mwt.f - i.e. the paternal grandfather of Sbk-htp, while under the chair there is a dedication to mn.t.f, his nurse.
2) Sn-Wsrt born of S3t-S3sšt. In order to share a stela with him, it may be assumed that this man was closely related to Sbk-htp, and father, son, or brother would be the usual degree of kinship. In this case, however, it will be shown that this is a rare stela, in that Sn-Wsrt was the uncle of Sbk-htp.

Under the chair of Sn-Wsrt is the name of an unknown woman, while in front of it is a dedication to snt.f ḫt born of ḫt *(34).* Since it is later revealed that this woman is the great aunt of Sbk-htp but only remotely connected by marriage to Sn-Wsrt, the possessive pronoun must refer back to Sbk-htp.
3) Sbk-htp born of ḫt. This would appear to be the owner again, or a brother of the same name.

Under his chair is the name of B3-R ḫt. I have taken this to be a brother of Sbk-htp, though he could be a maternal uncle.
4) mwt.f It born of It *(35) - i.e. the mother of Sbk-htp. In front of her is the name of mwt nt It.f S3t-B3stt. The father of Sbk-htp was thus the son of S3t-B3stt and her other son, Sn-Wsr, was therefore the paternal uncle of Sbk-htp.

Under her chair is the name of sn.f S3t-B3stt. It.t is later shown to be the maternal great grandmother of Sbk-htp, so this man must be his great uncle.

B) An inscription listing several more members of the family:

Three women, all said to be sn.f It born of It. These have been accepted as the sisters of Sbk-htp, though one or more could have been an aunt.

- sn.f It born of It.
- sn.f It born of It. Since It is later said to be his sister, this must be the nephew of Sbk-htp.
- sn.f Sn-Wsr and sn.f Sn-Wsr the younger, both born of It.
- sn.f It born of It.
- mwt nt mwt.f It born of It *(36).
- it mwt.f Hsp(w) *(37) born of S3t-pht.


This stela is owned by a woman who bears the titles rht nsw and hat ntr Hthr *(38). She is shown with her eldest daughter and with two men whose relationship to her is not given, but as they make offerings to her, they may have been her sons.

A translation of the dedicatory prayers appears on p.498.

British Museum stela, vol.IV, pls.36/37. Owner: Sbk-ddw, pl.XLVIII.

On the first of these stela Sbk-ddw makes offerings to It.f Itntf and
Also shown are his two brothers (sn.f) and his two daughters (s3t.f).

Sbk-ddw appears on the second stela, but this time accompanied by hat.f Hat born of ḫty, who would therefore have been his sister, or at least half-sister, as well as his wife, unless, of course, she was born of a completely different woman, who, by coincidence, had the same name as the mother of Sbk-ddw.

British Museum stela, vol. IV, pl. 39
Owner: ˹Inpw-hṭp.
pl. XLVIII.

The stela is unfortunately of poor workmanship, so some details are lost.

1) ˹Inpw-hṭp.
2) hat.f ˫Inpw-a-s3.s.
3) 3 and 4) s3.f and s3t.f.
5) ḫṭ.f ˫Inpw-hṭp.
6) mwt.f ˫Inpw-a-s3(s).
7) 7 and 8) ant.f S3t-ḥṭḥr and ant.f Ntrw.
8) 9 and 10) sn.f Snb with hat.f S3t-mnt born of ḫṭḥ.
11) 11 and 12) Two men, both said to be sn.f.
13) An unidentified man.

14) sn.f born of ḫpt - i.e. the paternal uncle of the owner.

15) sn.f 33t-ḥḥr. One sister of the owner called 33t-ḥḥr has already been named, so this woman is either another sister of the same name, or perhaps a niece, since she is followed by figures of two nieces of the owner.

16 and 17) sn.f born of ḥr w and sn.f born of 33t-ḥḥr. The mothers of these two women are the sisters of the owner, so sn.f here is being used for "niece".

18 and 19) Two unidentified men.

20) sn.f born of 33t-ḥḥr - i.e. the nephew of the owner.

21) sn.f. Since no mother's name is given, there is no certainty whether this is the brother, uncle or nephew of the owner.

22) sn.f born of ....... The mother's name has been destroyed so she cannot be satisfactorily identified.

Louvre stela, C.6, pl.X.

Owner: No one man appears to be more prominent than the rest.

pl.XIX.

I am greatly indebted to the authorities of the Egyptian Department of the Louvre, who supplied me with photographs of this, and stela C.173 (see below p.159 /163 ), to supplement the rather inaccurate copy published by Gayet.

1 and 2) ḫmn and nḥt pr Snb born of ḫwtn-ḥt. The names of ḫmn and Snb face each other and they are presumably to be identified as husband and wife.
3 and 4) Ly-ruw born of Wnt and M3t born of Pwt. Again this couple are evidently husband and wife.
5 and 6) Two men born of M3t.
7 and 8) ....... sw born of Ta and nbt pr Snbtisy born of Hwrt-pw. Yet another husband and wife. Snbtisy was the sister of Snb (see above number 2); unless, of course, Snb is a shortened writing of Snbtisy, but in that case she would have had two husbands.
9 and 10) A man born of Snbtisy and Hwrt-pw born of wnt.s. Hwrt-pw has already been established as the mother of Snbtisy and Snb.
11 and 12) A man born of J3w and nbt pr Mrt born of Snbtis(y). This is another married couple.
13 and 14) nbt pr J3w born of Pwt and the nbt pr Nbt-Imnt born of Mrt.
15/18) Two unidentified men and two unidentified women. As everyone else on this stela is connected by marriage, these four people were also undoubtedly members of the family, but their position cannot be determined as insufficient information is supplied.
19/21) The nbt pr Nfrt born of J3w, s3.s born of Nfrt, and a man born of Titi, who is to be identified as her husband.
22) The nbt pr Hwrt born of Pwt.
23) The nbt pr Titi born of Hwrt and the nbt pr Pwt.
24) Gb born of S3t-Hwy.
25) The nbt pr Pwt born of S3t-Hwy.

Louvre stela C.22, pl.XII. Owner: Sn-Wart. pl.L.

At the top of the stela are the figures of Sn-Wart born of Dit and S3t-Htry born of Nfrt, who, from her position, would normally be the wife.
of the owner. Below them, however, is a dedication by a man called Imny 
the younger, who claims to be the son of Sn-Wart and the brother of Sst-Hthr, 
so here a father and daughter share a stela.

Louvre stela C.40, pl.XIII.  
Owner: Snb.  
pl.L.

1) Snb.

2/6) The first figure is that of a child, probably a girl, then there are 
three adult males and one small boy. Since the last two are both said to be 
s3.t it is reasonable to assume that these were all his children. At the 
very top of the stela there is an inscription naming s3.t born of špt. 
špt is mentioned nowhere else on the stela, nor is she anywhere named as 
the owner’s wife. She may have been a wife or a concubine.

7) hst.f Snb.s-n! born of Sst-Hthr.

8) s3.t.f ḫy-ib born of Snb.s-n!.

9) An unidentified man. However, ḫy-ib is later shown to have had a son, 
so, from his position on the stela, figure 9 may be the husband of ḫy-ib.

10) Sst-Hthr born of ḫk.

11) A man born of ḫy-ib, the writing of the mother’s name being abbreviated.

12) A man born of ḫk.

13 and 14) Two men born of Sst-Hthr, and an inscription naming a man born 
of ḫyt.
15) A woman born of S3t-Inhr.

16) An unidentified woman.

17) A man born of (as n) S3t-Inhr and engendered by (Irr n) Shtp-ib-R'=snb. S3t-Inhr has been established previously as the mother-in-law of the owner, so Shtp-ib-R'=snb must be his father-in-law.

18) An unidentified man.

19) Shtp-ib-R'=snb born of W........ To judge by the name, this woman must somehow be related to the father-in-law of the owner.

20) An unidentified woman.

21) Tyt born of Ty.

Louvre stela 0.173, pl.XXIX.

Owner: S3-Inhr.

pl. LI.

1) S3-Inhr born of Kprrt.

2) hat.f W3h-k3 born of Nbt.

3) hat.f S3t-Inhr *(39) born of Hw.

4) s3.f Hk3-ib born of S3t-Inhr.

5) s3.f S'nh born of W3h-k3.

6) s3.f Tam-m-hkt born of W3h-k3 *(40).

7) and 8) It.f Hk3-ib born of S3-Inhr and hat.f Kprrt born of Ty.

9 and 10) Inhr-acht born of Kprrt, that is the brother of the owner,
together with hmt.f lkw born of Mnt:\'-nh.

The rest of the information is provided by three blocks of inscriptions, but, due to damage, particularly of the bottom of the stela, some vital details have been lost. Thus there are three family groups formed, which must originally have been connected, but which now cannot be re-united.

Column A: Sjt-Inhr born of Kprrt.
Sjt-Inhr born of Kprrt.
Inhr-mary born of Kprrt.
A woman born of Kprrt.

\text{\textit{lkw}} born of \ldots The name of her mother has been omitted, but, since she appears in the middle of a list of the children of Kprrt, it is likely that she too was her child.

A woman born of Kprrt.

\text{\textit{sm\text{\textit{t.f}}}} - i.e. the nurse of the owner Qat born of Hmt.

Name missing, but born of Hmt.

Inhr-nr=\text{\textit{mry}} born of Sjt-Inhr. This could be a child of one of the owner's wives, but their offspring appear at the top of the stela, so this is probably the child of his sister.

Sjt-Inhr born of Sjt-Inhr - another nephew of the owner.

Inhr-nht born of Hyw - i.e. the owner's brother-in-law.

An unidentified man.

Inhr-nht born of Sjt-Inhr.

An unidentified man.

Column B should logically be read next, but in fact, it makes more sense if column C and D are taken first.

Column C: \text{\textit{mwt.f Sjt-Inhr}} born of Kprrt. This has to refer back to the man
already accepted as one of the nephews of the owner, because his is the only name in the vicinity to be followed by the words "born of Sjt-Inhr".

\[\text{hat.} \text{f} \text{Ilw} \text{born of Mntw'-nh}. \text{It has already been established that Mntw'-nh was the mother of figure 10, the owner's sister-in-law. The young Inhr-nht therefore married the sister of his aunt by marriage. The family under consideration here is such a large one that there need have been very little difference in the ages of this couple, even though they officially belonged to different generations.}

Their sons, two men born of \(\text{Ilw}\).

The subject then changes with the introduction of \(\text{Mniw} \text{born of Hrt-k3}\).

\[\text{s3.f} \text{ S3-Inhr} \text{born of Mntw'-nh}. \text{Mniw is thus shown to have been the husband of Mntw'-nh, so he was the father-in-law of both the brother and one of the nephews of the owner.}

\[\text{s3.f.}\]

\[\text{s3.f Mniw.}\]

An unidentified man said to be \(\text{sn.f}\).

A man and woman said to be \(\text{sn.f} \text{ and sn.m}\), both born of \(\text{Gnst}\). Since \(\text{Gnst}\) has been named as the nurse of the owner, these two were his foster-brother and foster-sister, unless, of course, \(\text{Gnst}\) had been the concubine of the owner's father, in which case her children would also be the half-brother and half-sister of the owner.

\[\text{s t.s Hrt-Itf.s born of Hat}. \text{This woman was the sister of the owner's nurse, so the term "sister" is here being used of a very remote connection.}

\[\text{s3.s and s3t.s.}\]

\[\text{sf born of Hat - i.e., the brother of the owner's nurse.}\]
The next six lines are badly damaged, but they contain references to at least two servants.

Column D:  
*ht.f Sjt-Inhr born of Hw - i.e. the second of the wives of the owner, shown at the top of the stela.*

s3.f Hk3-Ib born of Sjt-Inhr.
s3.f S'nh born of W3h-k3.
s3.f Im-ta-h3t, known to be born of W3h-k3, see above figure 6.
sn.f S3-Inhr the younger.

Inhr-htp born of Kprrt - i.e. another brother of the owner.

An unidentified man.

sn.f Inhr-nht. The name of his mother is not given, but he is presumably the brother of the owner, see above figure 9.

Inhr-nry born of Hkw. Hkw is known to have been the wife of the owner's brother Inhr-nht, so this is the owner's nephew.

t.f Sjt-Inhr born of Hkw.

sn.f Hk3-Ib born of It.

nt.f Nhtw born of It.

t.f It born of Sn-'nh. The only person named Sn-'nh on this stela is later shown to be a man, so this is presumably his daughter.

An unidentified man.

Inhr-nry born of Hw - i.e. the brother-in-law of the owner.

sn.f Snw-'nh born of Hw - i.e. another brother-in-law of the owner, and apparently the father and grandfather of some of the people named above.

ant.f S3t-Im born of Hw.

sn.f born of Hw.
mwt.an F nw born of S3tamines - i.e. the mother of the four preceding people.

A man born of Snw-emNh.

Illegible.

Column B: Twenty lines of inscriptions and prayers. Some at least of those named were servants and related to each other, but the rest, though they must have been connected to the family in some way, cannot be identified.

Louvre stela, C.179, pl.XXIV.
Owner: Tmny.
pl. LII.

1 and 2) Tmny and hastf Htp.
3 and 4) S3f Pth-s'nh and S3tf Htp.
5 and 6) Pth-s'nh and hastf Htp. Either this couple are close relatives of the owner, after whom he named his two children, or the son and daughter of the owner married each other. If the couple are someone other than the owner's children, it is surprising that kin-terms have been omitted, for they are applied to everyone else on the stela.
7) S3tf - i.e. the daughter of Pth-s'nh.
8/10) Three men, all said to be s3tf.

Louvre stela, C.187, pl.XXXIX. Owner: Wsr-htp. pl.LII.

The only figures shown are of Wsr-htp born of It and Tmnt born of It. The rest of the family are named in an inscription.
sn.f born of S3t-Pth. Later identified as the cousin of the owner.

sn.f born of It.

It.f Imy born of Spt.

mt.f It born of Gft.

sn.f S3t-Pth born of Gft - i.e. the aunt of the owner.

sn.f

mt nt mt.f Gft born of Fr *(41) - i.e. the maternal grandmother of the owner.

sn.f born of S3t-Pth - i.e. the cousin of the owner.

sn.f born of Gft - i.e. the maternal uncle of the owner.

Guimet stela, C.5, pl.IV. Owner: Imy. pl.LIII.

The first part of the inscription names Imy born of S3t-Imn, together with s3.f Sn-Wart born of Mryt, though she is not said to be his wife. The name of Sn-Wart is followed by the words m3'l-hy, the justified. If this is an indication that Sn-Wart pre-deceased his father, it would explain why the dedication of the stela was not made by him, but:

![Hieroglyphs]

In s3.f mr.f s3 an.f n mt.f Imy-r pr hl lnpr-nht Ir n Nbt-Iwnt
m3't-hy nbt i3hyt.

- by his beloved son, the son of his brother of his mother, the Overseer of the Treasury, lnpr-nht born of Nbt-Iwnt, the justified, the blessed.

If the son of the owner were already dead, then, as the nearest surviving male relative, his cousin would assume the role of the
"Beloved Son" for the funeral cult.

Guimet stela, C.6, pl.V. Owner: **Sn-Wart-ỉnh.** pl.LIII.

1) **Sn-Wart-ỉnh** born of **K3w.**
2) **K3w** born of **Mggỉ.**
3) **mwt nt mwt.f Mggỉ** born of **ǐmy.**
4) **sn.f.**
5) **sn.f** born of **Mggỉ** - i.e. his maternal uncle.
6) **sn.f and ant.f.**
7) **ant.f Snk-nfrw** born of **ǐmy** and **ant.f ǐmy** - i.e. the niece of the owner and her mother.
8) **ǐ.t.f Nfr-ỉw** born of **nt-ỉb.** The father is thus relegated to an unimportant role on the stela, compared with the maternal relations.

Guimet stela, C.9, pl.VII. Owner: **Snk-ḥtp.** pl.LIII.

At some time in the past, this stela has been smashed into many pieces, and, although it has been mended, only a small number of the inscriptions are now legible. This is particularly unfortunate because this stela makes extensive use of multiple kin-terms. Still legible are: **Snk-ḥtp** born of **Rn.s-rs.**

**sn3 an n ỉt n mwt.f,** the son of the brother of the father of his mother - i.e. the cousin of the owner's mother.

**mwt nt mwt nt mwt.f ỉnttỉ** - i.e. the great-grandmother of the owner.

**ant mwt.f** - i.e. the owner's maternal aunt.

**sn3t.s.**
Guimet stela, C.11, pl.X. Owner: Hr-w4(?)-rhw *(42).

Among the members of his family the owner names Hmt.f Hr-s-hb and s3t.f, who was born of Hr-s-hb. He also claims to have had a son (s3t.f), born of a woman called Rn.s-anb, who is not mentioned elsewhere on the stela, and who is not called either the wife of the owner, or entitled Nbt pr. It is possible that she had previously been his wife, but there is also the possibility that she was his concubine.

Florence stela 2504, photograph 23, supplemented by Cairo stela 20064.
Owner: Hntf. pl.JIV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Florence stela 2504.

1) Hntf born of Hmwt.sn.
2) Hmt.f S3t-H1 born of Mn2.
3) s3t.f Hntf born of S3t-H1. In front of the figure of the owner's son, there is a line of inscription naming S3-Mnw born of 'Inhy, while behind him is the name of 'Inhy born of Rns-1nh. A third line of inscription is located under the chair of S3t-H1, where the name of Nbt-1tf born of 'Inhy appears. The relationship of Rns-1nh and her descendants to the owner is not given here, but they will be identified on the second stela.
4) s3t.f born of Innw. Innw is not said to be the wife of the owner, nor is she entitled Nbt pr.
Three men, all said to be s3.t.f, and all born of S3t-H2.

Three women, all said to be s3.t.f and all born of S3t-H2.

Cairo stela 20064.

At the top of the stela, the owner Ini transparently shown receiving offerings from Ini, evidently the son who made the offering on Florence stela. An inscription beneath the offering table names a man born of Wn(i), who is to be identified as the brother of the wife of the owner, S3t-H2. Behind the son is an unidentified man.

Underneath this scene are 9 vertical lines of inscriptions naming:

S3t-gthr.

Rn.f-'nh born of S3t-gthr - i.e., the woman named on the Florence stela.

s3.t.f (erroneously written s3t.f) S3-Mnw born of Rn.f-'nh.

s3.t.f Ps'k born of Rn.f-'nh. This stela was erected for the elder Ini and his is the dominant figure. There is little doubt that these kin-terms refer to him, and this means that he was the father of ten children, born of three different women. The only one to be actually called his wife, S3t-H2, is credited with four sons and three daughters. Rn.f-'nh, whose family takes precedence on this stela, though she is not said to be his wife, had a son and a daughter, and Imnw is named on the Florence stela only, as the mother of a son, but does not appear in person. All three women may have been his wives at various times, in which case, S3t-H2 was probably the third wife, to whom he was married the longest. There is, however, a possibility that Imnw at least, whose existence is only mentioned
in connection with her son, may have been a concubine.

Mayt born of S3t-Htp.

The last four lines name a woman called Kk[i] and her three sons. The possibility must be considered that, as she appears with Rn.f-'nh and her children, Kk[i] too may have born children to the elder Int.f.

These two stelae, whose inscriptions complement each other, illustrate clearly the importance of re-uniting stelae, statues and offering tables, which were intended to be together in a family tomb or cenotaph, or group of such monuments, but which have become separated subsequent to discovery. Without this, valuable information concerning family groups and affiliations can never be recovered.

Florence stela 2553, photograph 27. Owner: Ddt.

This stela belongs to a woman. The inscriptions, which were painted on, are now illegible, except for her name.

1) Mnw-htp born of Nht. Under his chair is the name of the '3mt W3p-k3.
2) mw.f Nht[i]. Nht[i] is simply an expanded writing of Nht. Under her chair is the name of S3t.s Snt, who may have been her child by another marriage as all the other siblings of Mnw-htp are recorded as snt(t).f born of Nht.
3) \( \text{nt.} \) \( \text{Rjy} \) born of \( \text{Nfrt} \).

4) \( \text{nt.} \) \( \text{Sn-} \) \( \text{nh} \) born of \( \text{Nht} \).

5) \( \text{nt.} \) \( \text{Nfryt} \) *(43) born of \( \text{Nht} \).

6) \( \text{sn.} \) \( \text{Hay} \) born of \( \text{Nht} \). Behind him is the name, but no figure of \( \text{ht.} \) \( \text{Sbk-} \) \( \text{htp} \) - i.e. the wife of \( \text{Hay} \).

7) \( \text{sn.} \) born of \( \text{Nfryt} \) - i.e. the nephew of \( \text{Mnw-} \) \( \text{htp} \).

8) \( \text{sn.} \) born of \( \text{'nhtl} \). The following inscription identifies this man as a nephew of the owner.

9) \( \text{nt.} \) \( \text{Nht-} \) \( \text{'nhtl} \). There are three men on this stela who are said to be born of \( \text{'nhtl} \), but there is no figure of a woman of this name. However, \( \text{'nhtl} \) may be an abbreviated writing of \( \text{Nht-} \) \( \text{'nhtl} \), which would explain why figure 8 was said to be \( \text{sn.} \), because, if \( \text{Nht-} \) \( \text{'nhtl} \) was the owner's sister, then her son would be his nephew. Moreover, his figure appears with that of another of the owner's nephews.

The inscription naming \( \text{Nht-} \) \( \text{'nhtl} \) is cramped in front of the figure of the woman, and it is conceivable that, in fact, it was a mis-writing of \( \text{Nht-} \) \( \text{(drt m)} \) \( \text{'nhtl} \) *(44). Although it is not beyond dispute, I have accepted \( \text{Nht-} \) \( \text{'nhtl} \) as a sister of the owner and have tentatively included her as such on the family tree on pl.19.

10) In front of this female figure is an inscription naming \( \text{nt.} \) \( \text{Ddi} \) born of \( \text{Snt} \), while behind her is the name of \( \text{nt.} \) \( \text{Bbi-} \) \( \text{nh} \) born of \( \text{Nht} \). Since \( \text{Snt-} \) \( \text{nh} \) has already been named as the sister, or half-sister of the owner, \( \text{Ddi} \) is probably her daughter and thus the niece of the owner.

11) A series of inscriptions naming:

\( \text{Sbk-ddw} \) born of \( \text{Mnw-} \) \( \text{htp} \) *(45) who was born of \( \text{Bbi-} \) \( \text{nh} \). The owner
of the stela was thus the great-uncle of Shk-ddw.

Shk-ddw born of Npt, who was presumably another brother of the owner.

Then come the names of two women and three men. One of the men is said to be born of 'nhti', but lack of information prevents the integration of the others into the family.

12) A list of names inscribed from behind the figure of the owner's mother, down to the base of the stela.

-sntf Htpy born of Dit. The relationship of this man to the owner is not clear, though he might have been a half-brother.

-sntf Snt-‘nhti. In her case too, the degree of relationship is uncertain.

-sntf Mwt-htp. This may be the niece of the owner, already referred to above.

-s3,f Btw born of ‘nhti. This kin-term must refer back to Htpy, since there is no other plausible candidate, except the owner himself and it is not likely that his only named son would be relegated to so obscure a role.

Thus Htpy and ‘nhti must have been man and wife, besides probably being half-brother and half-sister. Since this kin term refers back to Htpy the two women named in this column may have been his sisters.

13) Another column of inscriptions, this one stretching from behind the figure of Mnw-htp to the bottom of the stela: sntf Ddî born of Dit. This establishes that there were two women called Ddî, the other being the child of Snt. The actual identification of Ddî born of Dit is uncertain, though her name appears so close to that of the owner that she may have been his half-sister, their respective mothers being different.

Mnw-htp born of Nfryt - i.e. another nephew of the owner.

-s3,f Shk-ddw - i.e. the son of Mnw-htp born of Nfryt. Since the names of
Mmw-htp and Ddš are listed together they may have been man and wife. If
Mmw-htp and Ddš were not married, then the name of the mother of his sons
has been omitted.

s₃.f Htpi. Evidently Ddš named one of her sons after her brother, Htpy.

Florence stelas 2561, photograph 32 (36 in text) and 2559, photograph 35,
and Cairo stela 20520. Owner Nh₂.

The first of the stela in Florence bears a simple inscription naming
Nh₂ born of Ḥ₁-hpr-R'-snb and the 'nhṯ nt niwt *(46) Ṙn.s-snb.

The second stela in Florence was erected by Nh₂ for several members of
his family.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Ḥ₁-hpr-R'-snb.
2) s₃.f Nh₂ - i.e. the owner of the previous stela.
3) The 'nhṯ nt niwt Ṙn.s-snb.
4) s₃.s Nh₂. This might be the same man as figure 2, or a brother of the
   same name.
5) Nh₂.h-RḤ-hḥ.
6) Ṙn.s Nh₂.
7) s₃.f Snb the younger and two unidentified men.
8) ant.t S3t-hnti and three women named Mkt(.i)-pr-hb, Rn.s-snb, and 'Inf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. 2-5</th>
<th>9. 8. 7. 6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. 11.</td>
<td>13. 12.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cairo stela 20520.

1) Nhy. Behind him there is an inscription naming the nbt nr Nfr-mlw. Though she only plays an unimportant role on this one stela, this may be the otherwise unmentioned mother of his son.

2 and 3) An unidentified woman and man.

4) Mkt(.i)-pr-hb the younger, probably a sister of the owner.

5) Snb.t the younger. This may be the son of the owner who was named Snb on the previous stela.

6) H3i-pr-R'-snb.

7) The nbt nr niwt Rn.s-snb.

8) An unidentified man.

9) Mkt(.i)-pr-hb.

A line of inscription names a man born of Inl.

10) H3i-pr-R'-snb.

11) An and woman born of Rn.s- b - i.e. a brother d sister of the owner. There then follow three men an three women, all unidentified.

12) Nhy.

13) Four n and three women, none of whom can be identified.

Although a considerable number of members of his family are named, a few kin-terms are given, and the mothers' names are so frequently omitted, that little of interest may be learnt from them.
Florence stela 2564, photograph 37. Owner Ḥntī-hṭy. pl.LVI.

This rectangular stela has a series of inscriptions, arranged in two columns.

Column 1: Ḥntī-hṭy born of Mnt.

ḥmt.f Snbtisy born of Ṭtī.

ṣ3t.f Mnt born of Snbtisy.

ṣ3.f born of Snbtisy.

ṣ3t.f Mnt the younger born of Snbtisy.

ṣ3t.f Ṭtī born of Snbtisy.

ṣ3.f born of Snbtisy.

ṣ3.f born of Snbtisy.

ḥmt.f Ṭtī born of Ṭtī. *(47).

mwt.f Mnt born of Ṣ3t-Tp.

ṣnt.f Ṭtī born of Mnt.

ḥmt.f Ṭtī born of Ṣ3t-R'f. The next five inscriptions relate to Ṭtī.

ḥmt.f Ṭtī born of Ṣ3-s₂.s.

ṣ3.f born of Ṭtī.

ṣ3.f born of Ṭtī and Snfrw, o cannot be identified, as his other's name has been omitted.

ṣf born of Ṭ-R', who was born of Ṣ3-s₂.s. Ṣ3-s₂. Ṭtī's name is written consistently throughout, and who belongs to a younger generation.

ṣnt.f born of Ṣ3t-R'f.

ḥmt.f Ḥntī-hṭy-hṭp born of Ṣḥw. This kin-term relates
to the owner and is followed by six inscriptions which are related to 
\text{Hntl-ty-hp}.

\text{hi.t.f S3t-Ip} born of M-s3.s. \text{S3t-Ip} had already been named as the owner's maternal grandmother. This inscription shows that she and \text{Tit\i}, the owner's paternal grandmother, were sisters, so the parents of the owner were first cousins.

\text{s3t.f born of S3t-Ip.}

Column 2: \text{s3t.f born of S3t-Ip.}

\text{s3.f born of S3t-Ip.}

\text{s3t.f 'nhtsy born of S3t-Ip.}

\text{s3t.s born of 'nhtsy.}

\text{snt.f mwt.f S3t-Ip} the younger born of M-s3.s. It has been suggested by some commentators, that \text{sn(t).f mwt.f} should be translated as "his brother (or sister, born of) his mother", implying perhaps a man's half-brother or half-sister, with whom the owner shared a common mother. However, this inscription shows that particular interpretation to be erroneous. If the kin-terms refer to \text{Hntl-hy-hp}, this woman is undoubtedly his sister-in-law, not his half-sister, and the names of their mothers are known and are different. The kin-term must, therefore, refer back to the owner, and \text{S3t-Ip} the younger can be shown conclusively to be his great-aunt, so \text{sn(t).f mwt.f (or It.f)} does not refer to half-brothers and Half-sisters, but to the brothers and sisters, or even uncles and aunts, of the defined parent. (see above, Section I, ps.17/8).

\text{sn.f S3-Hthr} born of Hthr-hp.

\text{hat.f Tit\i} born of Mnt. \text{Tit\i} has already been named as the mother of the wife of the owner, so her husband, \text{S3-Hthr} is the
father-in-law of the owner, yet the term sn.f was applied to him, clearly
demonstrating that this one kin-term may be applied to many and various
degrees of kinship. The mother of the owner and the grandmother of his
wife are both called Mnt, so the two families may have been related prior
to the marriage of Mnt-hty and Snbtisy.

s3t.f born of Titi.
s3.f born of Titi.
s3t.f born of Titi.
sn.f 'as born of Mrti.

hm.t.f Mnt born of S3t-mrt-Hr. This Mnt must be the maternal
grandmother of Snbtisy, so 'as must be her maternal grandfather, and sn.f
is once more used of a relative by marriage of the owner, and in this case,
a remote connection.

sn.f. The name of his mother has been destroyed, so he cannot be
integrated into the family tree.

sn.f Mrt the elder.

hm.t.f Hr-pw born of S3t-Rmwt.t.

sn.t S3t-Rmwt.t, born of Hrt-k3. This woman is presumably the
nurse of the owner, thus Mrt is referred to as the sn of the owner on the
strength of having married the foster-sister of the owner.

s3t.s and s3.s. The family of S3t-Rmwt.t appear on pl.LIV.

Florence stela 7600, photograph 42. Owner: Nb(s)-hr-hnty.

This stela belongs to a woman. The dedicatory prayers appear on p.49.
Florence stele 2512, photograph 45. Owner: Tbl. pl.LIV.

Tbl born of Kikw.

Itu Ksw born of Ipl.

mwt.f Kikw born of Ipl. The parents of the owner were thus brother and sister, or half-brother and half-sister.

snt.f Rn.f-snb.

snt.f.

snt.f.

s3 ant.f En.f-snb.

Owner: K3y.
pl. LVII.

1) K3y born of Mkt-B3att.

2 and 3) Itu Mnr-snb and mwt.f Mkt-B3att.

4) n ant.f n mwt.f - i.e. the maternal uncle of the owner.

5) s3t.f Mkt-B3att i.e. the daughter of K3y. K3y has two children, but does not name their mother.

6) s3t.f S3t-my.

7) S3t-s Mht.

8/12) ant.f S3t-htp followed by S3t-s, s3t.s Mkt-B3att, s3t.s S3(t)-htp, and S3t.s Mkt-B3att.
13) s3t ant.f nt mw.t.f S3t-Sn-ur1 - i.e. the first cousin of the owner.

14) s3t.s Mkt-B3st.

Owner: Nf'rt.
pl. LVIII.

1) Nf'rt born of Dit.
2) Dit born of S3t-Hthr.
3) S3t-Hthr born of M'nh.
4) 'Idy born of Mbt-itf. As the only man named on the stela, 'Idy is likely to be either the husband or the father of Nf'rt.

Berlin stela, vol.I, p.181, no.1188, and Louvre stela G.174, pl.XXX.
Owner: Sn-Wart.

The stela in the Louvre names only Sn-Wart himself, but on the Berlin stela he appears with his wife, parents, five brothers, five sisters, and sixteen retainers and servants of both sexes.

The interesting feature of the Berlin stela is the unusual role assigned to one of his sisters. The owner and his wife are shown on the left hand side of this rectangular monument, and all the other members of the family face them across the offering table, but, whereas everyone else is drawn on a much smaller scale than Sn-Wart and his wife, one sister, ant.f mw.t.f Rn.f- 'nh, is represented by a figure drawn at almost
the same large scale as the owner and his wife. She alone of his siblings is said to be "his beloved", and she is the only one to be represented with a child, $3\text{jt.s Sm}t$.

Under the chair of Sn-Wart, is the small crouching figure of a man, who might be the son of Sn-Wart, were it not for the fact that no kin-term is applied to him, and all the other figures on the stela are given their appropriate kin-term.

Sn-Wart may have singled out his favourite sister and her child for special honours on his stela, but, in view of the fact that she is given precedence, even over their parents, and the fact that Sn-Wart appears to have had no child by his wife, suggests that he possibly married, or at least had a child by, his sister.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Owner: Wr-nb-kmwy.
pl. LVIII.

1) Wr-nb-kmwy born of Sfgt.
2) His son ($hrd.f$).
3) The nbt pr Hri born of Hr-W3dt - i.e. the wife of the owner.
4) An unidentified man.
5) Sfgt born of $3\text{jt-Hi}$ *(4,8).*
6) A man born of Hri.
7 and 8) Two men, both born of Nbt, one of whom is named 33-H3.
9 and 10) Two unidentified men.
11 and 12) W3-nb-kmwy born of Htpt and a woman born of Htpt.
13) Ty born of S3t-H3 and Nbt born of Htpt.
14) S3t-H3 born of Nbt.
15/17) Inscriptions partially illegible.

Cairo stelae 20089 and 20703 belong to the same man but add nothing to our knowledge about his family because 20089 names only W3-nb-kmwy and his mother, and 20703 is broken so badly that only the name of the owner survives.

---

1) Mntw-htp and the nbt pr Htpti born of Wnt *(49).
2) A man born of S3t-ddt and Rw3 (born of) S3t-ddt *(50).
3) mwt.f .... The name is illegible, but she was born of Rw3. Also named are a man born of Rw3, and two other men, both said to be sn.f born born of Wnt, so they are brothers-in-law of the owner. This is one of the rare occasions when sn is used of a brother-in-law. There are two more men said to be sn.f, but born of Ti3y, and they cannot be identified.
4) Five men, all born of Ti3y. Ti3y must have been a near relative of the owner. Perhaps she was the mother of Mntw-htp, though the degree of kinship
is never given. They are followed by: the nbt pr 'nkt-ddt born of Rwī - i.e. paternal aunt of the owner.

snī born of 'nkt-ddt - i.e. the cousin of the owner.

ụtptī born of 'nkt-ddt.

An unidentified man and woman.

The nbt pr Rwī born of Ṣpmt-ddt and a man born of Ṣpmt. This could be the same Rwī, who appears in the second register, or a sister of the same name.


This stela is dedicated to Kms by his son, Bmbw, who was born of the ḫkt nsw, King's Favourite, Trs. Trs is not mentioned elsewhere on the stela, nor is she said to be the wife Kms.


Owners: Ṣ3-Imn and Ṣ3-Imn.

Stela 7731 shows Ṣ3-Imn receiving offerings from Ṣ3-f Ṣ3-Imn, while opposite him stands the nbt pr Mrī, who is presumably his wife.

Stela 7732 shows Ṣ3-Imn, born of Ṣ3-Imn and Mrw, which must be a mistaken writing of Mrī, receiving offerings from ḫnt.f Nfrw and ant.f

Hanover stela 2928.

(Z.L.S., 1936, vol.LXXII, p.84)

Owner: Ṣ3-f.

pl.LIX.
1 and 2) ḫ-m3.j born of ḫpt and ḫtp born of 33t-Nḥt. The names of the mother and the wife of the owner are spelt consistently throughout.
3 and 4) Two men born of ḫtp, shown making offerings to their parents.
5) 33t-Nḥt born of ḫpt.
6) An unidentified woman.
7) An unidentified boy.
8 and 9) Two women born of 33t-Nḥt.
10) ḫpt born of Bsw.
11) An unidentified woman.

Hanover stela 2930.
(2.2.3., 1936, vol.LXXIII, p.86).
Owner: ḫpr-k3-R'.
pl.IX.

1) ḫpr-k3-R' born of 33t-Wart.
2) 33t-Wart born of 33t-Ḥthr.
3) ḫw.s-‘3.s born of 33t-Ḥthr - i.e. the maternal aunt of the owner.
4) A woman born of 33t-Ḥthr.
5 and 6) ḫm.y born of Shk-nḥt and ḫm.t.f Nḥt-nbs born of ḫw.s-‘3.s.

Ḥpr-k3-R' appears to have died without wife or children, on the evidence as it is presented here, and the rest of the stela is devoted to his cousin, Nḥt-nbs, and her family.
7/10) Four men, all said to be s3.t and born of Nbt-nbs – i.e. the sons of Tmny. One of them is named Ḥmr-k3-R, the younger.

11) Ḥpt born of Sbk-nht.

12) A woman born of Sjt-Hthr.

13) An unidentified woman.

14 and 15) Two men born of Ḥpt – i.e. the nephews of Tmny.

16) A man born of Sbk-nht.


Owner: S3-Mntw. pl.LX.

This offering table has been included because it is inscribed with the names of several members of a large family.

Round the outside rim are the names of:

S3-Mntw born of T..... Name illegible.

iš.t, Mntw-m-b3t born of Mrt.

s3.t, Sn-Wrt.

In the centre block of inscriptions are the names of:
s3t.f Nb(w)-ddt.

snt.f Mrt and s3.s.

snt.f Nb(w)-ddt.

s3t.f.

s3t.f.

s3.t S3-Mntw.

sn.f.

su.f.
Up to this point, it has been easy to identify all the people named, but the identification of Imm-m-h3t is more complex. He cannot be the father or paternal grandfather of the owner, since these are both known. He might be the maternal grandfather, but this is unlikely as no maternal grandmother is named, and it is most unusual for a line to be traced back to a male alone. The same objection must be raised against the identification of Imm-m-h3t as the paternal great-grandfather of the owner, so Imm-m-h3t may have been his step-father, and has been tentatively entered as such in the family tree.

On the raised hs-vase on the offering table is the name of ham.f Hntwts. This must be the wife of the owner, and the mother of his five children.

Vienna stela, p.13, no.16. Owner: Kwik. pl.LXI.

The first register contains the htp dd mw formula, made out for Hpr-k3-R' born of Mnt, and then refers to him again, but this time by his "pet name", Kwik *51. The mother of the owner was also known by two names, Mnt and M3't-htp, both of which are used on the stela.

Second register:

Kwik born of M3't-htp - i.e. the owner again.

Bnt.f Sbtsy born of B3stt *52.

s3.t s3.f Sn-Wart Mnt born of B3stt - i.e. the granddaughter of the owner.

s3.f Hri born of Sbtsy. As his name is shown with that of Sn-Wart Mnt, he may be her father.
hat. f. Name illegible, born of '3mt. If this is the wife of Hri and the mother of Sn-Wrt Mnt, then her name has already been given as B3t.t. As the mother-in-law and daughter-in-law of the owner are both called B3t.t, they may be related by blood as well as by marriage.

Third register:

it. f Sn-Wrt born of 33yt.

mwt. f Mnt born of Itt.

sn. f born of Mnt.

Three men, all said to be s3. f and all born of Snbtlsy.

Fourth register:

sn it. f Hyr-k3-Rt born of 33yt.

mwt. n t mwt. f Itt.

snt it. f Wryt born of 33yt.

Four unidentified men.

Fifth register:

Snbtify born of M3't-ty.

It n hat. f Wrrw born of Skk-m-h3t. As Snbtify has one named wife, this is presumably the father-in-law of Kwi. Since all the other lines are traced back to women, Skk-m-h3t is likely to have been a woman too, but there is no positive confirmation.

A man, name illegible.

M3't-hyp born of T33w * (53).

The mnt pry T33w.

Itt. born of T33w, and s3. t. s 'nhtsy. One of the men, otherwise unidentified, is said to be born of 'nh...., so he may be the son of this woman.

pl. XXII: 3, (Queen's College, Oxford, stela 1110). Owner: Rn-snb. pl. LXII.

1) Rn-snb.

2) hmt.f Nn born of the nbt pr Wnm! *(54).

3 and 4) Rdi-s'nh *(55) and T3-ntt. It will be observed that the Queen's College stela names these two as the parents of Rn-snb.

5) A line of inscription naming the nbt pr Snb-m-..... *(56). The Queen's College stela awards this woman the title of wife.

1) Rn-snb born of the nbt pr T3-ntt.

2) It.f Rdi- 'inh.

3) The owner making an offering to his father.

4) A mid notified man and his wife.

5 and 6) hmt.f n t pr Snb-m-..... and hmt.f Nn born f Intf. Intf must be th. f th r of Nn, as h r mother has already been named as Wnm!
7) mw.t.f T3-ntt.

8 and 9) The figures of 3.f and 3.t.f T3-ntt, together with an inscription naming another son. There is no indication which of the two wives was the mother of these children. It appears to have been more important, since both of her parents are named, but this may be because she was the wife at the time of the commissioning of the stela.

10) Several lines of inscription, most of the people named are unidentified but they include two men, both said to be s.n mw.t.f.


```
  1.  3.  2.
 4.  5.  6.  7.
 8.  9. 10. 11.
```

1) Tmny born of Bbi.

2) b.t.f nhbyt nt níwt *(57) Bbi born of Shnt *(58). Bbi is such a popular name that little significance can be attached to the fact that the mother and the wife of Tmny are both called Bbi.

3, 4, 5, 8 and 9) Five men, all said to be s3.f born of Bbi.

6) s3.t.f Bbi born of Bbi.

7, 10 and 11) Three unidentified women, all entitled nbt pr.
1) ḫemy born of Bbl.
2) s3.f ḫmwb born of Bbl.
3) ḫmwb. The relationship of this man to the owner is not given, but he must be important, because he occupies such a prominent position. It is likely that he is the father of the owner, especially in view of the fact that one of the owner's sons bears the same name.
4) Bbl. This could be either the mother or the wife of the owner. In front of her is a dedication to an unidentified man.
5) An unidentified woman.
6 and 7) Pth-pw-wȝp and ḫnt.f Snt. Snt has already been named as the mother-in-law of the owner.
8) The ṣmt ḫmt.
9/11) Two unidentitied men, an unidentified woman, and an inscription naming another unidentified woman.

pl. LXII.

This stela is jointly owned by ḫmr born of ḫt and ḫt born of Sȝt-Hḥmr, and it was dedicated by ḫamy, the son of ḫmr. B th ḫmr and
Dät are entitled snm nsw, King's Sister, so Mrt may have been the child of a consanguineous union within the royal family.

The dedicatory prayer appears on p. 499.

Verschiedenen Sammlungen, pl.I, no.1, supplemented by Louvre stela C.5, pl.

1) ḫ'nty born of S3t-Imy, together with mwt.f S3t-Imy born of S3t-Sbk.

2) s3. S3-Stt born of S3t-hty-wr. Though she is the mother of his son, S3t-hty-wr is named nowhere else on this stela.

3) it.f 'Intf born of Rnf-'nh. All the other people on this stela are identified by their mothers' names, so Rnf-'nh is probably a woman.

4 and 5) Two men, both said to be sn.f and both born of S3t-Sbk - i.e. the maternal uncles of ḫ'nty.

6) mw.t nt mwt.f S3t-Sbk born of S3t-Htr.

7, 8 and 11) Three men, all said to be sn.f, and all born of S3t-Mnty *(59). S3t-Mnty could have been the second wife or concubine of either of the unnamed grandfathers of ḫ'nty, or of his father. On the other hand, she might have been the wife of one of his brothers, in which case, her sons would be the nephews of the owner. On the family tree on pl.LIII,
she has been entered as the second wife of Inty, the father of the owner.

9) The s3t h3ty- * (60) S3t-tp-ihw born of S3t-hnti-hty. The figure of this woman is directly behind that of one of the sons of S3t-Hnty, so she may be his wife.

10) snt.f born of S3t-Hnty.

12) s3 snt.f born of S3t-Hnty. The children of S3t-Hnty have hitherto been described as sn(t).f, so this man must stand in a different degree of kinship to the owner. As this man is "the son of his brother", either there were two women called S3t-Hnty, probably related, or S3t-Hnty was married twice, once to the father, and then to the brother of the owner. On the family tree two women called S3t-Hnty have been shown.

13) A woman born of S3t-Hnty. From her position she is likely to be a sister of the previous man.

14) A man born of S3t-tp-ihw.

15) An inscription records the fact that S3-Stt, the son of the owner, went to Abydos in the company of Ty-hr-nfrt (see above, p. 83, Cairo stela 20310).

Louvre stela 0.5.

1) S3-Stt born of S3t-hty-wr - i.e. the son of the owner of the previous stela.
2) A man born of S3t-h2ty-wr - i.e. the brother of S3-Stt. He was not named on the stela of Ḫmny.

3) wmt.f S3t-h2ty-wr born of S3t-h2ty-wr.

4) Ḫ3ṭ-k3-R' born of Ḫmmy. Since S3-Stt is known to be the son of Ḫmny, this cannot be his real father. Ḫ3ṭ-k3-R' is shown with the mother of S3-Stt, so it is most likely that she married again after the death of Ḫmny, thus her second husband, Ḫ3ṭ-k3-R' was the step-father of S3-Stt. The brother represented by figure 2 may therefore be the son of S3t-h2ty-wr and Ḫ3ṭ-k3-R', rather than of Ḫmny, since he did not appear on the stela of Ḫmny.

5) An unidentified woman, bearing the title of s3t h3ty-t'.

6) The s3t h3ty-t' S3t-tp-ḥnw born of Ḫy. The name, though not this particular woman, is known from the previous stela.

7) An unidentified woman.

8) S3-Stt, the owner, again.

9/12) Four unidentified men.

13) Ḫmny born of S3t-Ḥmny - i.e. the true father of the owner.

14/29) Unidentified men and women. One of them, figure 19, is said to be a female singer, ḫányt *(61).

Verschiedenen Sammlungen, pl.III, no.3  
Owner: Ḫ3ṭ-nfr.

pl.LXIV.
1) Iry-nfr born of (lr n) Iy-mr, (who was) born of (ms n) Tw-n.s-snb.
   When the name of the owner is followed by the words lr n plus a man’s
   name, then ms n plus a woman’s name, the logical assumption is that this
   couple were his parents. This stela, however, is one of the rare
   exceptions, and the inscription accompanying figure 2 shows that these
   two were actually the owner’s father and the mother of his father.

2) It.f Iy-mr the son of (s3) Tw-n.s-snb. Tw-n.s-snb is thus identified
   as the paternal grandmother of the owner.

3) A female harpist and two men bringing offerings.

4) Mwt.f Snb-w3wt. - i.e. the mother of the owner.

5) The ‘nh.t nt nwt Sjt-Mntw born of ‘nh-ib. This woman is not actually
   said to be the wife of the owner, but since she is shown in a prominent
   position, facing the figures representing the children of the owner,
   there is no doubt that she is to be identified as his wife.

6) Three men and two boys. Four of them are said to be sJ.f, so the
   fifth was probably his son also.

7) Sn.f n It.f Hw born of Tw-n.s-snb. This is a crucial inscription
   since it proves conclusively that "his brother of his father", like
   sn n It.f, means "paternal uncle".

8) Sn.f. This must be the brother of the owner.

9) Two women, both said to be sJt.f, and one man said to be sJ.f. These
   are presumably more children of the owner, because all the other kin-term
   refer back to him, though they might be the children of the brother of
   the owner, whose figure they face.

10) The ‘nh.t nt nwt ‘nh-ib and sJ.s - i.e. the mother and brother of
    the wife of the owner. It should be noted that both mother and daughter
were entitled 'nḥt nt nỉwt. The husband of 'nh-ỉb was not named and his
rank is unknown, but ḫy-nfr, the husband of Sỉt-Mntw was a w'b-priest of
Montu (w'b n Mntw).

Though the dedicatory prayers on the stelae belonging to women have
been translated, as they have a bearing on the status of women and their
expectations for the Hereafter (see Excursus C, p.488), it has not been
necessary to translate more than kin-terms allied texts from the
majority of stelae examined. In this case, however, I propose to offer a
translation of the whole dedication, b th because it is of some
chronological interest, and because it contains references to some of the
relatives of the owner, which will be of value in the elucidation of the
complex family tree.

For the convenience of the reader, the lettered notes in this text
have been placed at the end of the translation on p.194/195, instead of
with the other footnotes.

A) The invocation text:

Lines (1) ḫỉt-sp 33 ḫr ḫmn (Ḫṛr-k3-R') 'nh ḏt (2) ḫtp dī ḫsw W-src
Year 33 under the Majesty of Kheperkare, living eternally. (2) A boon which the king gives (to) Osiris, Lord of Busiris, First of the Westerners, the Great God, the Lord of Abydos; and a boon which the king gives (to) (3) Anubis, who is upon his mountain, he who is in the place of embalming, Lord of the Sacred Land, that they may give invocation offerings of bread and beer, and a thousand of oxen and fowl, to the revered one, the scribe of the cadaster and overseer of the fields in the Head of the South and the Thinite nome, southwards as far as (4) the Crocodile nome *(a) and northwards as far as the Khent-Min nome, Iasaw. There acted *(b) as scribe of the fields in the waters *(c) of Abydos of the Thinite nome, my father and my grandfather *(d) from the time of the Horus Wahankh, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt (5) the son of Re Intef *(e). Now I came to this tomb at the staircase of the god in the district of Great of Roarings, so that I should see (6) Wepwawet in all his feasts, in all his processions, because I was one (continued on next page)
beloved of his lord and capable in his office. A boon which the king gives (to) Osiris, Lord of Busiris, the Great God, the Lord of Abydos, invocation offerings of bread and beer, and a thousand of oxen and fowl to the revered one, the scribe of the cadaster and overseer of the fields in the Head of the South and the Thinite Nome, Imnī. [7] A boon which the king gives (to) Anubis, who is upon his mountain, that he may give invocation offerings of bread and beer, and a thousand of oxen and fowl, to the revered one, the scribe of the fields, Imnī. [8] It is their beloved son *(r) who makes their names to live, the revered one, the scribe of the fields in Abydos of the Thinite Nome, Intef-ıkr, born of Mwwt, justified and revered *g).

(a) Ṣnw, the Crocodile Nome, see Montet, Géographie de l'Égypte Ancienne, vol.II, p.91.
(b) The subject normally follows its verb, preceding the object or any dependent clauses, but here the words It [.] it n it.i are clearly the subject, and there is no other verb applicable to them.
(c) Presumably either those fields subject to inundation, or those situated in the marshy land near the desert edge.
(d) It [.] it n it.i, my father, and the father of my father. If it is accepted that the text has been correctly amended here (see Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar, p.413, paragraph 507, no.3), then the speaker is referring to his father and grandfather. The stela was dedicated by Ḫntef-ıkr, but his father, Imsw, was clearly intended to be the owner. His is the first and most elaborate ḫtp di naw formula, and he is probably meant to be identified as the speaker in line 4, and "my father and my grandfather" must refer to the two men called Imnī, who are mentioned in line 7.
It is possible that the text could be amended as \( \text{it} [n] \text{it} n \text{it} i \)
the father of the father of my father, thus giving three generations before \( \text{Imsw} \), but, attractive though this might be from the chronological standpoint, it is unlikely that the scribe would have omitted the first genitive here and the suggested amendment of \( \text{it} [i] \text{it} n \text{it} i \), my father and my grand-
father, is to be preferred.

(e) Ahankh Intef II (2117/1069 B.C.) of the Eleventh Dynasty, see Cambridge Ancient History, vol.1, part 2, p.996. This monarch died more than one hundred and thirty years before the erection of the stela in the thirty-third year of the reign of Senusret I (1971/1928 B.C.). Though \( \text{Intf-ldr} \) must have commissioned this stela during his lifetime, it need only have been dated to the year of his death, when it would have been erected in his tomb or cenotaph.

(f) \( \text{Intf-ldr} \) erected this stela as an act of piety on behalf of three named generations of his forefathers, so \( a \) here is being used in the sense of a descendant.

(g) Since the words \( a\bar{s} ^{-} - htw \text{ nb Imnh} \) are written in the masculine form, they are presumably intended to refer back to \( \text{Intf-ldr} \), rather than to \( \text{Hwtt} \), though it is possible that they do refer to her and that the feminine endings have been omitted, as so often happens.

There are forty-five members of the family and servants named on this stela, but in only two cases, those of \( \text{Intf-ldr} \) and one of the men called \( \text{Imnh} \), are the names of their mothers supplied. It is therefore impossible to arrive at a completely satisfactory interpretation of the information
supplied concerning the relationships within this family.

It is essential to establish how many generations separated Intef-Ikr, the dedicator of the stela, from the ancestor who acquired the office under Wahankh Intef. Besides Intef-Ikr the dedicatory inscription names only three other men - Itsw (line 3), who is later shown to be the father of Intef-Ikr, and two men called Im (line 7), who, on the evidence of line 4, appear to be the father and grandfather of Itsw (see above p.194, note d).

The minimum time that can have elapsed between the appointment of the first Im and the dating of this stela in the thirty-third year of Senusret I, is about one hundred and thirty years. If it is assumed that, as a young man of about twenty, the first Im was appointed to office towards the end of the reign of Wahankh Intef, and if it is further assumed that each generation of his descendants were born when their respective fathers were, on average, about thirty years of age, then, by the thirty-third year of Senusret I, that is about 1938 B.C., Intef-Ikr, the fourth in direct line of descent, would be in his early/mid-sixties. This chronology is therefore satisfactory, provided the first Im did indeed receive his appointment as a young man at the end of the reign of Wahankh Intef, but if Im was older, or was appointed earlier, then there would really need to be five generations from Im to Intef-Ikr inclusive, rather than the four named in the dedicatory inscription.

The figures on the main body of the stela are:

1) Itsw, who is shown seated with pt.f Mrtrt and pt.f Mwr. Mwr has already been named in the dedicatory inscription as the mother of Intef-Ikr, so Itsw is to be identified as his father.
2) Facing lastName and his wives across the offering table, under which is the tiny figure of a man-servant, are *Imny and het.sf *Tanl. *Imny was evidently an important member of the family and, on analogy with other stela, he is most likely to be the father, son, or brother of the man opposite him.

*Imny was probably not the son of *Imsw because the words *s3.t do not precede his name, and this is the only kin-term which was regularly included on this stela. It would certainly be convenient if *Imny could be identified as the father of *Imsw, because there would then be five generations between the first member of the family and the dedicator of the stela, but only four generations are named in the dedicatory inscription, and it is unlikely that the text of line 4 is to be amended to read "the father of the father of my father" (see above p.194, note a). *Imny, therefore, cannot be the father of *Imsw, so he may have been his brother, and has been tentatively entered as such on pl.LXIV, though it is always possible that he was some more remote connection, such as the father-in-law of one of the men of the family.

3) *Intf-ikr - i.e. the dedicator of the stela, who is shown seated with het.sf Kcw.

4) Facing him across the offering table, under which is the tiny figure of a man-servant, are:

*s3.t *Imsw - i.e. the son of *Intf-ikr, named after his father.

A man, presumably another son of *Intf-ikr, though the space for his kin-term and name has been left blank.

*s3.t Kpw.

*s3.t Kswt.
5) ḫmnḫ born of ḫpw and ḫnḫ Ṣmnḫ. His position on this stela suggests that this was either the father or grandfather of ḫmḥw.

6) Facing ḫmnḫ and Ṣmnḫ across the offering table are:

s3.f ḫmḥw - i.e. probably that ḫmḥw who was the father of ḫntf-ḥpr, for it was quite common practice to show a man twice on a stela, once with his parents and once with his wife. If this interpretation is correct, then this ḫmnḫ was the father of ḫmḥw and the grandfather of ḫntf-ḥpr. To complete the generations as named in the dedicatory inscription, it is therefore necessary to prove that this ḫmnḫ was the son of another ḫmnḫ, and this seems to be established in a later inscription.

s3.f,

mwt.f ḫpw - i.e. the mother of ḫmnḫ.

Ḏḥw and ḫnḫ Ṣḥḥ. From his position, ḏḥw may have been the brother ḫmnḫ and has been tentatively entered as such on the family tree.

ḥt.f ḫmnḫ and ḫnḫ Ṣḥḥ. ḫḥw has already been named as the mother of ḫmnḫ, and by showing her here, her husband is identified as the father of ḫmnḫ, who is figure 5. The two men called ḫmnḫ, ḫmḥw and ḫntf-ḥpr are thus all accounted for, and have been shown to be four, uninterrupted generations.

7) Eight men, all said to be s3.f, and four women, all said to be s3t.f. There is no indication as to which of the principal characters named so far was supposed to be the father of these children.

8) A man called ḫmḥw and his four daughters. They must belong to the family, but insufficient data is supplied to determine their exact relationship. Facing them are four men-servants, a ḫḥṣḥḥt and an ḫḥḥḥt.
Leiden, pl.V, no.6, supplemented by Cairo stela 20531 and Guimet B.3, pl.LVII. Owner: Hpr-k3-R’. pl.LXV.

It is convenient to consider the Guimet stela first, since this shows only two figures, that of the owner, Hpr-k3-R’, and the nbt pr Hpt. On this evidence, Hpt might be either the mother of the wife of Hpr-k3-R’, but the Leiden stela names his mother as Ini, so Hpt may be safely accepted as his wife.

The Leiden stela is larger and more complex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Hpr-k3-R’ born of Ini. The sides of the stela are also inscribed with the name of the owner and Ini, his mother.

2 and 3) It.f T3w the younger born of S3t-Inr and mwt.f Sdmyt born of Sbk-m-saj.s. Sdmyt is shown seated with T3w and is clearly intended to be identified as his wife. She cannot also be the true mother of Hpr-k3-R’ however, because it has already been established that he was born of Ini. Sdmyt is nowhere said to be the "good name" (mn nfr) of Ini, so there is no reason for doubting that Sdmyt was the step-mother of the owner.

4 and 5) Two men, named Intf and Sr respectively, both said to be snfr and both born of Sdmyt. The separate identity of Intf and Sdmyt is thus
confirmed by this inscription.

6, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 13) Six women, all said to be stt. f born of Stt-Hthr. The stela in the Cairo Museum names Stt-Hthr as the sister of Hur-k3-R'. so these women are his nieces. Stt-Hthr herself does not appear on the Leiden stela, so without the Cairo stela, the identity of these women would have been uncertain.

7) stt. f born of Stt-Hthr.

10) Htpt born of Htpt. On the evidence of the Guimet stela, this is the wife of Hur-k3-R', though here she is given no title or kin-term.

14 and 15) Two men, one of whom is a singer (hsw).

---

20531.

1) Hur-k3-R'.
2) It.f Tsw.
3) mwt.f Inl Sdnyt. The dedications appear in vertical columns above the heads of the figures. The words mwt.f Inl appear together in a column above the head of the woman and the name Sdnyt appears by itself in the last column. The Leiden stela left no doubt that Inl and Sdnyt were two different women, both with children of their own, so the inscription must read "his mother Inl and Sdnyt". It was not uncommon for two inscriptions to apply to one figure on stelas, and this must be the explanation here. If Inl died while her son was still very young and he was raised by his step-mother, he would have wanted to perpetuate the memory of both
women, and this would be a convenient method of achieving his aim.

4) sn.t.f mrt.f Sjt-Hthr. This beloved sister was named on the Leiden stela as the mother of seven children. She appears here with the two known sons of Sdmtyt, so was probably her daughter, rather than the child of Ind.

5 and 6) Two men, both said to be sn.t. Their names are Intf and Sr and they were named on the Leiden stela as the sons of Sdmtyt.

Leiden pls. VIII and XIX, nos. 9 and 20. Owners: Shtp-ib and Kwy. pl. IXV.

Both stelae have inscriptions without figures. The first one, belonging to Shtp-ib, names:

Hk3-ib born of Nfrt-hswt.
s3.f Snbbw born of Sjt-Nfr-tm.
Snbbw born of Sjt-Nfr-tm.
s3.f Shtp-ib.
Shtp-ib born of Kwy.
s3.f Hk3-ib born of Kwy. Kwy is one of the more unusual names, so the fact that Shtp-ib and his son were both born of women named Kwy suggest that, though this need not indicate a mother/son marriage, they were probably born of women who were related to each other by blood as well as by marriage.

The second stela names:

Kwy born of Tb.

Hk3-ib born of Kwy. This is the man already named as the son of Shtp-ib, but Kwy makes no reference to her husband on her stela, which may
indicate that it was commissioned after the death or divorce of Shtp-1b.

Hk3-1b born of Tp - i.e. the brother of Kwy. The appearance of the name Hk3-1b on both sides of the family, suggests that they were related in some way, besides the one recorded on these stelae.

Tb born of Tp.

Hk3-1b born of Sjt-Pth. Since his name follows that of the mother of Kwy, this may be her otherwise unknown father.

Leiden pl. IX, no. 10, supplemented by British Museum stela, vol.II, pl.15.

Owner: Sjt-3st. pl.LXVI.

Leiden stela.

1) Sjt-3st born of Tw.s-n-pr.s.
2) mw.t nt mw.t.f Mkt born of Sjt-Wart.
3 and 4) Sjt-mr.s born of Htp and Tw.s-n-pr.s born of Mkt - i.e. the parents of Sjt-3st.
5) An unidentified woman.
6) A woman born of Tw.s-n-pr.s.
7) Three men and two women, all born of Tw.s-n-pr.s.
8) An unidentified man.
9) Two unidentified men, and a woman called Htp—i.e. the paternal grandmother of the owner. The name of her mother is illegible.

10) Priests and servants.

British Museum stela.

1) The owner, S3-3st.
2 and 3) It.f S3- mr.s and mwt.f ëw.s-n-pr.s.
4) ant.f.
5, 6 and 8) Three men, all said to be sn.f.
7, 9 and 10) Three women, all said to be ant.f. Only three sisters were named on the Leiden stela, but this shows he had four.

Leiden, pl. XI, no.12
Owner: Hr.
pl. LXVI.

1 and 2) Hr and hmt.f S3t-Wsr.
3) s3.f.
4 and 5) Hr and hmt.f S3t-Mnty—i.e. the owner again, this time with his second wife.
6 and 7) *it.f Nht and hmt.f S3t-Snfrâ - i.e. the parents of the owner.

8) *ant.s S3t-Snfrâ.

9) Four men, all said to be *s3.f. These are probably the sons of Hr and S3t-Wnty.

10) *ant.f.

11) An inscription naming *s3.s, s3.s and s3t.s.

12) Three women, all said to be *ant.f.

13) Two male and three female servants.

---

Leiden, pl.IXIII, no.30.
Owner: Sn-Wart.
pl.LXVII.

---

A) A *htp dî nsw formula in the names of Sn-Wart, *it.f 'Imny-înh and *wmt.f S3t-thy.

1 and 2) Sn-Wart born of S3t-thy and hmt.f S3t-Imn.

3 and 4) Two boys, both said to be s3.f.

5) 'Imny-înh born of S3t-Hthr - i.e. the father of the owner.

6 and 7) hmt.f S3t-thy born of *It-nfrw and hmt.f ...t born of Htpî. The father of the owner was thus married twice.

8 and 9) S3-nfrâ born of S3t-Rî and *wmt.f S3t-Rî. S3-nfrâ evidently held an important place in this family, and the brother of the owner was named after him. The father and paternal grandfather are accounted
for, so the most likely role is that of maternal grandfather, and he has been tentatively entered as such in the family tree.

10) S3-Nfrt born of S3t-thy.
11) An unidentified woman.
12) A female singer.
13) War born of Prt.
14) It-nfrw born of S3t-thy.
15/17) Three men, all said to be born of It-nfrw. As these men follow the figure of the sister of the owner, they must be her children, rather than those of his maternal grandmother of the same name.
18) An unidentified woman. Her name is S3t-thy, so she is probably related to the mother of the owner, but the name of her mother has been destroyed, and she cannot be integrated into the family tree.
19) It-lt.f Sn-Wart - i.e. the paternal grandfather of the owner.
20) mwt.f S3t-thr - i.e. a great grandmother of the owner.
21 and 22) Two men, both said to be sj.f - i.e. the paternal uncles of the owner.
23) sn.f. The other kin-terms refer back to the elder Sn-Wart, so this is his brother.
24) hat.f S3t-ip born of Prt. The wife of the elder Sn-Wart has been has been named as S3t-Ethr, so this is evidently the wife of figure 23.
25) A man born of S3t-ip.
26) sn.t.f born of an unidentified woman. The identification of this woman is so uncertain that she has been omitted from the family tree.
27) A woman born of It-nfrw. Had this woman been the child of the
sister of the owner, she would probably have been shown in the second register with the other children. This is therefore likely to be an aunt of the owner.

29) An unidentified man.

Leiden, pl.XIV, no.16.

Although the owner is said to have a son and a daughter, this stela was erected by *sn.f n mw.t.f* - i.e. his maternal uncle. This may have been an act of piety, on behalf of a favourite nephew who died young, but it might equally well have been an obligation. If the children of the owner were too young to direct affairs at the time of their father's death, his uncle might have acted for them, or the son, and perhaps the daughter too, might have predeceased their father, so his uncle took over the funeral arrangements as the nearest surviving male relative.

Leiden, pl.XXIII, no.24.

Owner: *Tmn-m-h3t-snb*.

pl.IXVI.

1) *Tmn-m-h3t-snb* born of *Tw-ib1-r.s*.

2) *sn.f* born of *Tw-ib1-r.s*.

3) The nbt pr *Hmn* born of *Kby*. Her position and title identify this woman as the wife of the owner.
4) Tw-1-l-r.s born of Hnwt.
5) Imm-a-pit-nnb. This might be the owner again, but it is more likely to be his father.
6) A man born of Tw-1bl-r.s.
7) s3t.f Tw-1bl-r.s born of Swk. This is presumably the daughter of the owner, though she may be the daughter of the preceding man, the brother of the owner. Her mother's name does not occur anywhere else on the stela, and she is not said to be the wife of either brother.
8) A line of inscriptions at the bottom of the stela refers to a man born of Tw-1bl(l-r.s). In the family tree this man had been entered as another brother of the owner, but he might have been the child of the younger Tw-1bl-r.s.

| 1 | 4. 3. 2. 5. 6. | 7. 8. |

Leiden, pl.XXIII, no.38.

Owner: Nht.

1 and 2) The owner, Nht.
3) hmt.f Hp.
4) s3t.f.
5) hmt.f Snt.
6) Three men, all said to be s3.f.
7 and 8) s3.f and s3t.f.

The way the figures are grouped on this stela would seem to imply that, by Hp, Nht only had one daughter, but by Snt he had four sons and
a daughter.

The figures of Nḥt and Ḥp are drawn on a larger scale than all the others, which may indicate that Ḥp was the wife at the time the stela was commissioned and that she claimed some special mark of favour over her predecessor, or it might indicate that Nḥt was practising polygamy, and that Ḥp was the senior wife.

Leiden, pl.XXX, no.40

Owner: Ḥwd.

pl.LXVIII.

1) Ḥwd born of Dw.
2) s3.f Ḥmy born of Ḥyw. Although drawn on the same scale as his parents, Ḥmy is shown as a naked boy.
3) Ḥpy born of Ḥwy.
4) s3.f Shk-ḥtp born of Dw.
5) s3.f Ḥmy born of Ḥwy. This Ḥmy, the nephew of the owner, is shown as a small, naked boy, clasping his father's knee.
6) S3t-War born of Dw. This woman is shown with her arm round the shoulder of her brother Shk-ḥtp, an attitude usually reserved for the wife. Ḥnw, the mother of the son of Shk-ḥtp, is not shown on the stela at all.
1. Hickw born of Titl.

2. There is only one female figure shown here, but there are two inscriptions naming the nbt pr Rsw-snb born of T'w and the nbt pr Titl born of T'w - i.e. the maternal aunt and the mother of the owner.

3. The nbt pr Snb born of Kt. Her title and position on the stele indicate that this was the wife of the owner. A second inscription with this figure names a woman born of Rsw-snb.

4. A man born of Titl.

5. A man born of T'w. Under this figure is an inscription naming a man born of Kt, and in front of him is the name of an unidentified man.

6. An unidentified woman.

7. A woman born of Snb - i.e. the daughter of the owner.

Leiden, pl.XXXV, no.46

Owner: Hickw.

pl.LXVIII.

Leiden, pl.XXXVII, no.48

Owner: Sn- srt.

pl.IXIX.
1) Sn-Wart born of Hri.
2) Hri born of Prt.
3) Prt born of S3t-thr.
4) A man born of Hri.
5) M¿hw born of Prt.
6) Sn-Wart born of Twt. The figure of this man follows that of M¿hw, so he may be her husband. On the other hand, he has the same name as the owner, and it would be rather strange if the owner chose to include an uncle by marriage, but to exclude his own father. On balance therefore, this Sn-Wart is more likely to have been the father of the owner.
7) Twt born of mwt.s.
8) A man born of M¿hw.
9) A man born of Hri.
10) A man born of M¿hw.
11) An unidentiﬁed man, probably the husband of one of the women of this family.
12) A woman born of Hri.
13) A man born of Hri.
14) S3t-Ethr born of Tti.
15) A man born of Hri.
16) The mwwit M¿hw born of mwt.s. M¿hw is not a particularly common name, so this nurse is likely to have been named after the maternal aunt of the owner.
17 and 18) Two unidentified men.
19) Ptti born of Tti.
20 and 21) Two men, born of Ptti. As Ptti was the sister of the great-grandmother of the owner, the connection with these men is somewhat remote.

22) An unidentified man.

23) A man born of Sj-t-htfr.


Owner: Sj-Rnn-wtt. pl. LXIX.

1) Sj-Rnn-wtt born of Sj(t)-Inyt.

2) The nbt pr Snb. Her title and position show that this is the wife of the owner.

3) sj.f Psâ born of Sn-snbs. Sn-snbs is probably an expanded writing of Snb.

4 and 5) sj.f born of Snb and sj.t.f.

6 and 7) Two men, both said to be sn.f, but born of different women, neither of whom is the known mother or maternal grandmother of the owner. They have been tentatively entered in the family tree as the half-brothers of the owner.

8 and 9) Two men, both said to be sn.f and both born of Sj-t-Inyt.

10) Sj-t-Inyt born of Nvy.

11) A man born of Psâ. This is the grandson of the owner, but, for some unknown reason, no wife is named for Psâ.
1) ḫt-pḫ-nḥt born of ḫty.
2) ḫt.f šbk-lmḫ born of ḫt.
3) s₃t.f ḫty born of ṟḏjyt.
4) s₃t.f ḫty born of ḫty.
5) s₃t.f ḫt born of ḫty.
6) s₃t.f born of ḫt. As both the sister and the paternal grandmother of the owner are called ḫt, this man could be either his nephew of his uncle. This man is likely to be the nephew, because his figure is directly beneath that of the sister of the owner.
7) s₃t.f born of ṟḏjyt. One of the sisters of ḫt-pḫ-nḥt is called ṟḏjyt, so this is likely to be another nephew of the owner, rather than his maternal uncle.
8) s₃t.f born of ḫty.
9) s₃t.f ṟḏjyt born of ḫty.
10) s₃t.f 'ṯṯt born of ḫty.
11) s₃ṯ.s ṟḏḥt born of ṭmḥy. It is usual for the figure of a mother to precede that of her child when the term s₃(t)s is employed, and,
as the figure of '3tt is the last one in the second register, and that of W'bt is the first in the third register, it would be assumed that W'bt was the daughter of '3tt, were it not for the fact that W'bt is said to be born of Imny. It is just possible that Imny was the father and '3tt the mother of W'bt, but this would necessitate assuming the existence of a man who is otherwise not mentioned on the stela, and would mean that W'bt was the only person on the stela to be identified by her father's name. This must therefore be one of those rare examples of the figure of a child preceding that of the mother to whom the kin-term relates.

12) snt.f Imny born of Shtp- Ib - i.e. the mother of W'bt. The relationship of Imny to the owner is difficult to determine. Neither of the grandmothers, and none of the sisters of the owner is called Shtp- Ib, so Imny cannot be an aunt or niece of the owner, and she cannot be his cousin, because her grandmother is later named as Sjt-Hthr, so she and the owner did not share a common grandmother. It would therefore appear that Imny was the half sister of the owner, Shtp- Ib being the second wife of Sbk-Im3.

13 and 14) mwt.f Shtp- Ib born of Sjt-Hthr and It.f Shtp- Ib born of Sjt-Hthr. The kin-terms in these two inscriptions can only refer to the owner, because no other male figure has replaced him as the subject. It has already been suggested that Shtp- Ib, the woman, was the second wife of Sbk-Im3, so mwt.f must be understood to mean "his step-mother", and it is most reasonable to identify It.f Shtp- Ib as his step-father.

To fit the facts as they are presented here, it must be assumed that Hty, the mother of Kr-hr-nht died and that the widower, Sbk-Im3
took Shtp-lb as his second wife, by whom he had a daughter, Tamy. Shbk-īm3 then died, and the widowed Shtp-ib married again, her choice falling on Shtp-ib born of Sjt-Hthr. If these events took place in fairly rapid succession while Ḥr-hr-nḥt was still a child he would be brought up by the two step-parents, and they would naturally figure rather prominently on his monument, even though he gave precedence to his real parents.

It should be noted that the man and woman called Shtp-ib were both said to be born of Sjt-Hthr, so, as they appear to have been born of the same woman, and have the same name, which was quite usual practice among siblings (see Excursus C), they were probably brother and sister, besides being husband and wife.

15) A man born of Shtp-ib. Tamy born of Shtp-ib was said to be the "sister" of the owner, but this man is not claimed as his "brother". This may indicate a slightly different relationship with the owner, which would be accounted for if he were the child of Shtp-ib by her marriage to her brother, Shtp-ib.

16/18 Three unidentified men.

19) A man born of Sjt-Hthr.

20) The names of two unidentified men, though there is only one figure.

21) Two lines of inscriptions naming friends and servants. Among them is a man born of Ḥt. Since he is separated from the immediate family of Ḥr-hr-nḥt, he is unlikely to be his nephew, but may be his uncle.
This stela is made in the form of a rectangular naos. The only figures shown are on the front face, but there are inscriptions on the other faces as well. All the people named were evidently related, though in some cases, lack of evidence makes it difficult to determine the various degrees of kinship.

Front:
1) A štp d3 nsw formula made out to the k3 of ḫr1 born of Twnn *(62) and of ḫr1.
2) In the recess is a seated figure of ḫr1 with his name written beside his right leg. By the side of the left leg of ḫr1 is an inscription naming the nbt pr Tw.nn.b-n-1, who is therefore to be identified as his wife.
3) This area is divided horizontally into three registers, each with the figure of a kneeling woman in it. All three women are said to be the nbt pr Twnn born of S3t-Snfrw. Either the mother of ḫr1 was, for some obscure reason, being shown in triplicate, or these figures represent the mother of ḫr1 and her two sisters, who happened to have the same name, which was a common occurrence in ancient Egyptian families.
4) ḫr1 born of S3t-Snfrw. The position of this figure clearly
identifies him as the father of the owner, and it would appear that he was also the brother, or half brother, of his wife Twnn, as they were both born of S3t-Snfrw.

5) S3t-Snfrw born of 'n-mwt - i.e. the mother of both the parents of the owner. Their names are repeated again here, confirming that they really were her children.

One side is divided into three registers:

First register: Hr1 - i.e. the owner again.

Ty-n.i born of Katt. This man is shown in a position of some prominence, so he must have been closely related to Hr1, though the kinship is not defined. One important person, otherwise omitted from the family tree, is the father of the owner's parents, so this is the role tentatively assigned to Ty-n.i of pl.TXXI.

s3.f Nq3.
s3.f Katt.
s3.f Hm.
s3.f Hr-'nh. If Ty-n.i has been correctly identified then these are the aunt and uncles of Hr1, the owner.

Second register: Shtp-3b born of Mnt.

s3.f Nsw.
s3.f Hm.
s3.f Hr-'nh.
s3t.f Mnt.

mwt.an Twnn. If the mother of these children, and therefore the wife of Shtp-3b, was called Twnn, she might have been the mother of the owner, but, as Twnn had two sisters who were also called
Twnn, it is more likely that this was one of them. It will be observed that two of the sons of Twnn have the same names as two of the sons of Ny-ni. If Ny-ni has been correctly identified, then Twnn named two of her sons after her brothers, which would be in keeping with the usual custom.

Third register: Twnn - i.e. the third of the three sisters of this name.

The absence of a named husband for this Twnn can probably be accounted for by either an early death or a divorce.

On the other side of the naos there are only two registers.

First register: The nbt pr K3-ns born of Bn't. This may represent the K3-ns who was the grandmother of the wife of the owner.

Tws-ni? born of Tti. The name connects her with the wife of Krī, but this is probably not the wife herself, for a better candidate appears on the back of the naos.

Snfrw. On the evidence of the name alone, this might be the father of S3t-Snfrw.

A man born of Krī.

Krī born of Ttw. Ttw is later said to be born of Twnn, so she is probably the sister of the owner, for the children of the other two women called Twnn were grouped together on the opposite side of the naos.

Second register: A man born of Krī.

An unidentified woman.

'it born of Krī.
Two unidentified men.

Ntw *(63) born of Kpî. Like Krl, Kpî is shown later to be a niece of the owner.

The back of the nace has four registers.

First register: Snbtîsy.

Tw.s-n.î born of Snbtîsy. The obvious importance of this figure suggests that this is the wife of the owner. As might be expected if she were the wife of Hrl, her family connections are recorded in some detail.

Kî-na born of Snbtîsy - i.e. the sister-in-law of Hrl.

Nfr-hîp born of Tw.s-n.î and Sî-Fnw born of Tw.s-n.î. If this Tw.s-n.î does represent the wife of the owner, then these two were his sons, or, perhaps, step-sons, since they are not specifically said to be Sôt.f.

Second register: Hr(î) born of Twnn - i.e. the owner again.

Sôt.f. Unfortunately neither the girl, nor her mother appear to have been named.

Two men, both said to be born of Snbtîsy.

Then, in isolation, come the words "born of the nbt pr Kî-ns". That the words "born of" refer to a woman is clear from the use of the feminine t in mst n, so the inscription can only refer to Snbtîsy or the daughter of the owner. If the words are applied to the daughter of the owner, then the grave difficulty arises that the wife of Hrl has been identified as Tw.s-n.î, and there has been no indication that anyone called Kî-ns was married to him. Hrl might have practised sororal polygamy, marrying the two sisters Tw.s-n.î and Kî-ns, but there is no
evidence for the existence of this custom outside the royal family.

It is not unusual, however, for a person's name to be followed by the names of both his mother and maternal grandmother. The formula in such cases reads something like "X born of the nbт pr Y born of the nbт pr Z".

It is therefore very likely that the words "born of K3-ns" are to be associated with Snbtisy. It is known that Snbtisy had a daughter called K3-ns, and it was common practice to name one's daughter after one's mother.

Third register: S3-Fwnt. One of the sons of Tw.s-n.l was called S3-Fwnt, so it is possible that this is her father, after whom she named her son.

Tw.s-n.l born of Snbtisy. This could be the wife of the owner again, but it is more likely to be a sister of the same name.

R'-htp.

A man born of Tw.s-n.l - i.e. a son of the woman named in this register.

An unidentified man and woman.

Fourth register: R'-htp born of Tw.s-n.l. His name is followed by the words mỉr n.f ḫmn(s).f mr.f ỉmy-r ǧa n hṛtyw-ntr ḫr(ỉ) m3'-ḥrw ms n Twnn s'ḥ nib ḫn.f, it is his beloved friend, the Overseer of the gang of necropolis workers, ḫrỉ, the justified, born of Twnn, who makes his name live.

This inscription confirms that there were two women called Tw.s-n.l born of Snbtisy, for ḫrỉ would not refer to his wife's child by the designation ḫmn(s).f. However, he might well refer to the nephew of his wife in these terms.

A man called R'-htp has already been named in the previous register, where he appeared closely associated with Tw.s-n.l. It is therefore
reasonable to assume that he was her husband and the father of the children with her.

Itw born of Twnn - i.e. presumably a sister of the owner.
The names of her daughter Krt, and that daughter's children, have already been given some prominence on another face of the stela.

Tppi born of Twnn - i.e. another sister of the owner, and probably to be identified with the who has already been named above.

A man born of Twnn - i.e. a brother of the owner.

Finally there is a list of the names of some of the servants of the family, including three "Asiatics" (33mt).


Owner: Hnsw. pl. LXXIII.

Hnsw born of Nb-sw-Mntw is shown seated with hmt.f Snb.s-'nh.s. This is one of the few stelae where the owner identifies himself by the name of his father alone at the top of the stela.

sn.f.

sn.f n mwt.f - i.e. his maternal uncle.

Nb-sw-Mntw and hmt.f nbt pr Nht.n. - i.e. the parents of the owner.

sn.f n mwt.f.

sn.f n mwt.f.

sn.f nt mwt.f Jbt.n.2.

sn.f.

sn.f.

sn.f.

sn.f.

ant mwt nt It.f Bbl.
Two women, both said to be the ant mwt nt mn'(t), which means that, as the
aunts of his nurse, they were only remotely connected with the owner.

An unidentified man.

s3 mn't.f - i.e. the foster-brother of the owner.

It is not clear to whom this refers.

Three unidentified men.

Another stela belonging to Hnsw, but naming only himself and his
parents, was acquired by the Musée Calvet of Avignon *(64).


Owner: Ehw'-nh. pl.LXXIII.

In the top left hand corner, where it is more usual to find the owner,
is the figure of Snbl born of Thl and kneeling before him is the owner
Ehw'-nh, accompanied by mwt.f Ppw born of Tbbyt and the nbt pr 'nkt-ddt
born of Snbtisy. To judge from the arrangement and titles, Snbl and Ppw
were the parents of Ehw'-nh and 'nkt-ddt was his wife.

The second register is headed by Snb and mwt.f Sbk-ddt born of Kwnht,
followed again by the owner, Ehw'-nh born of Ppw. Snb is identified by
later inscriptions as the first cousin of 'nkt-ddt. Then comes
ant.f T3-nt-së born of Ppw - i.e. the sister of the owner.
Hat.n.sn born of Sn'-nh. This woman is later identified as the maternal grandmother of the husband T3-nt-sś.

The third register names Șabw born of Rs-snb and hat.f T3-nt-să born of Fyw - i.e. the sister of the owner and her husband.

sjt.f Rs-snb born of T3-nt-să.

s3.f born of T3-nt-să.

s3t.f It.s-snb born of T3-nt-să.

A man born of Snbtisy.

Snbtisy born of Kwmht. Snbtisy has already been named as the mother of 'nkt-ddt. Thus, though Rhw'-nh and 'nkt-ddt were childless, considerable attention is paid to the family of 'nkt-ddt as well as to the in-laws of T3-nt-să.

A woman born of Sbk-ddt.

A woman born of Snbtisy.

A woman born of Sbk-ddt.

Sry born of Ty-mrw and hat.f Hat.n.sn born of Sn'-nh, who has already been named above.

Two women, both said to be sjt.f born of Hat.n.sn. One of them is named Ty-mrw.

sjt.f Rs-snb born of Hat.n.sn. This is presumably the woman named above as the mother of Șabw and she provides the only known link between the families of Rhw'-nh and Sry.

His son (hrd.f) born of the nbt pr Mrw. This is the only known son of Sry, and the inscription provides the only evidence for his second marriage.

Since Hat.n.sn is given so prominent a role, it is tempting to see her as
the more favoured wife who had produced only daughters, making it necessary for Srv to take a second wife or concubine, in order to have a son. However, she might equally well have been the second wife, who was alive at the time of the commissioning of this stela, and her predecessor would thus be relegated to an obscure role.

Rec. de Trav, 1903. vol.XIV, p.134, Toulouse 64,5b.

Owner: Ṭy-snḥ. pl.LXXIII.

The ḫtp di nsw formula is made out on behalf of the k3 of Ṭy-snḥ born of Ṣnt-ỉḥ and nsw. Ṣnt-ỉḥ.

The figure representing Ṭy-snḥ is shown receiving offerings from s3t.t Ṣnẹ Ṣnẹ-snḥ born of Ṣt.t and nsw. Ṣt.t born of ḫpw.

Under this, four horizontal lines of inscriptions name:
The 'ỉḥ n nỉw[Hnt-w-ḥt]t]t born of ḫpw - i.e. the brother-in-law of the owner. s3t.t 'ỉḥ n nỉw[Ht]t born of Ṣnt-ỉḥ. The title and position of this inscription indicates that this is the son of Hnt-w-ḥp. As the mother of the Ṭy-snḥ and the wife of Hnt-w-ḥp are both called Ṣnt-ỉḥ they may be the same woman, or they may have been related in some way besides the one shown here. However, Ṣnt-ỉḥ is not an uncommon name, so its reappearance might be coincidence.

Two women born of Ṣnt-ỉḥ. These women could be the sisters of Ṭy-snḥ or the daughters of Hnt-w-ḥp. Since their names come directly after that of the son of Hnt-w-ḥp they too were probably his children.


Owner: Skr-ḥt. pl.LXXIV.

These three stelae, which all belong to the same man, will be
examined in reverse order.

A.) The htp d3 nsw formula is made out for the k3 of Skr-htp born of Ntw1.
B) A single line of inscription naming It.f Wr-nb.
C) Above and behind the figure of Skr-htp is a line of inscription naming the nbt pr 'wy born of S3t-W3dt and s3t.s S3(t)-nb. This is evidently the wife of the owner, though the girl is not necessarily his daughter, since she is only said to be the child of 'wy.

1) Skr-htp.
2) Nhl1. The position of this figure shows that Nhl1 was an important member of the family and, since he has the same title as the father of the owner, he is almost certainly the brother of Skr-htp.
3) s3.f Ky and s3.f En-snb - i.e. presumably the sons of Skr-htp.
4) hmt.f Ntw1. The figure of the owner dominates this stela and this kin-term must refer to him, so he would appear to have had two wives, 'wy and Ntw1. What makes this a remarkably interesting stela is that one is said to be the nbt pr, while the other is said to be hmt.f, although it was the custom to show two wives with the same title. Also of great interest is the fact that the mother and wife of the owner are both called Ntw1, which is such a rare name that the occurrence in this family is the only one quoted by Ranke *(65). It is therefore just possible that Skr-htp married his
mother, though the evidence for mother/son unions is so slight, that this is perhaps unlikely. There can be little doubt, however, in view of the unusual name, that the mother and wife of the owner were closely related to each other in some way not revealed on the stela.

Beside Ntwi are inscriptions naming sjt.s Mryt and sj.s Kwt.

1) An unidentified woman.

2) Skr-htp.

3) The nbt pr 'wy, her position and title again confirming that she was the wife of Skr-htp.

4) Mryt, presumably to be identified with the daughter of Ntwi, named on the first stela.

A) Dedications to: sjt.f. The owner of the stela is Skr-htp again, so this must be his daughter.

sjt.s.

nbt pr Kwt.

sjt.s Snbtisy.
s3. s S3-nb. The appearance of the name S3-nb suggests that these were members of the family of 'wy, because her daughter was called S3t-nb.

s3t. s W3dt. The mother of 'wy has already been named as S3t-W3dt and it is reasonable to assume that W3dt and S3t-W3dt were the same person, thus providing the link between the owner and the descendants of Katt.

Two unidentified women and the two sons of one of them.

An unidentified man.

B) s3.f Rn-snb. This man has already been identified as a son of Skr-htp.

Skr-htp born of NtwI.

Wr-nb - i.e. probably the father of the owner, and an unidentified man.


Owner: 'wy *(66) pl.LXXV.

This stone stela is carved in the likeness of a small chest with a curved lid. The htp d1 nsw formula on the lid is made out for Hr, who does not appear anywhere else on the stela, and his connection with the family of 'wy is unknown.

First side:

A htp d1 nsw formula for 'wy born of S'nh-ib-snb.f-n.I. This is one of the few stela where the name of the father is given precedence over the name of the mother in the offering formula.

Second side:

A htp d1 nsw formula for S'nh-ib-snb-snb.f-n.I, clearly an expanded writing of the name of the father of the owner, and his parents
Wntw-htp- nh and Nb(w)-ddt-. thr-Wsr, the latter being the daughter of a h3ty'- prince named Ty-w3d.

Third side:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
4. & 1. & 3. & 2. \\
\hline
\hline
\hline
\end{array}
\]

1) twy.
2) ham.t.f šnµy Ehk *(67), his wife the chantress of Sobek, ḫn-ib.
3) s3t.f Bw-rtw-ris *(68).
4) A man called W3h-pw presenting offerings. His relationship to the owner is not given.
5) A man born of ḫn.s-s *(69).
6/8) Two unidentified men and an unidentified woman.
9) snt.f It.s-sn *(70).
10) A woman born of W3h-pw. This is presumably the daughter of figure 4, though no further information is supplied concerning their identity.
11) An unidentified man.
12) The ham.t.f *(71) nurse, Šntbt born of ..... Name illegible.
13) An unidentified man and woman.
Fourth side:

1) S'nb-ib-snbnf-n.l born of Nb(w)-ddt-.thr-Wsr.
2) hmt.f Bw-rht born of Rn.s-snbn. This identifies figure 5 on the third side as the maternal uncle of the owner.
3) An unidentified woman.
4) s3.f Twy born of Bw-rht - i.e. the owner.
5) snt.f hmt ntr Inm ......... Bw-rht born of Rn(s)-snbn - i.e. the maternal aunt of the owner. Although the key figure in the first register was the father of the owner, in the other four registers the degrees of kinship are defined with reference to Twy.
6) sn.f born of Bw-rht, who was born of Rn.s-snbn. His position suggests that this is a cousin of the owner, born of the woman represented by figure 5.
7) s3t.f Bw-rhtw-ris born of Hn-ib.
8) The šm'yt n(t) Sbk Hn-ib born of Bw-rhtw-pr.s. Compounds of the name Bw-rht are therefore to be found on both sides of the family, suggesting they were related in some way prior to the marriage of Twy and Hn-ib.
9) sn.f born of Bw-rht.
10) sn.f Nfr-htp born of Bw-rht.
11) nbt.f Nfrw born of Nfr-htp. Several key figures on this stela are identified by the names of their fathers, and Nfrw is one of these, unless it is to be argued that, by coincidence, one of her parents, unrelated to the family who owned the stela, happened to have the same name as her husband. On the evidence as it stands, however, it would appear that Nfrw was married to her own father, and the name of her mother has been omitted.
12) sn.f born of Bw-rht.
14 and 15) Two unidentified men and an unidentified woman.
16) sn.f born of Bw-rht.
17) Mntw-htp born of Rn.s-snb.
18) sn.f Ty-w3d born of Bw-rht. This man is named for his paternal great-grandfather. Behind him, but in the same square, is the nbt pr W3htyw born of Imw, who is presumably to be identified as the wife of Ty-w3d.
19) An unidentified man.
20) A woman born of W3htyw.

Stockholm stela, p.10, no.16. Owner: Sn-Wsr. pl.LXXIV.

On the left hand side of the stela in the first register, is the owner, Sn-wsr, together with nbt.f S3t-Htry born of Ddt-mrt and 3.f Imn-.3t.

Facing him on the right hand side of the stela is Sn-Wsr born of t, whose name and position on the stela suggest that he was the father of the owner. Behind him are nbt.f Imny and 3t.f.
In the second register, on the right side, directly under the figure of the elder Sn-Wrt, are an unidentified man, and s3t.f Sn-Wrt born of Hnt, an unidentified man, and s3t.f Sn-Wrt born of Tmny, who is presumably to be identified as the owner, though he might be a brother of the same name.

On the left hand side of the stela, in the second register, under the figure of the owner, are s3t.f Sn-Wrt born of S3t-thrt, two women, both said to be snt.f and both born of Tmny, confirming that the owner was the son of Sn-srt and Tmny.

In the third register are:

s3t.f born of S3t-Hthr.

Mwt-ddt born of Dpt-mrt - i.e. the sister of S3t-Hthr.

s3t.s Dpt-mrt.

An unidentified man.

---

J.E.A., 1938, vol.XXIV, pls.XII/XIII.

Owner: S3-R'.

pl. LXXVI.
A) A list of nine male members of the family of S3-R':

The sculptor (gmwt) S3-R' - i.e. the owner.

The sculptor hwty, whose identity is discussed below.

It.f Ŧnti-hty-m-h3t - i.e. the father of S3-R'.

sn.f Sbk-ḥtp - i.e. the brother of S3-R', also said to be a sculptor.

S3-R', who is later identified as the grandson of the owner.

Hty, later shown to be the half-brother of the owner.

Another Ŧnti-hty-m-h3t, later identified as a brother of the owner.

Two men called Ŧnti-hty-ḥtpw, later identified as a brother and a son of the owner.

There then follows a ḥtp ḏ1 nsw prayer on behalf of the owner,

S3-R' born of Ḥtpw.

1) S3-R' and hmt.f mrt.f. Although there is room for the name of the wife, it has been omitted. The couple are seated at an offering table, beyond which is sn.f Ŧnti-hty-ḥtpw - i.e. the brother of S3-R'.

2) sn.f Sbk-ḥtp and hmt.f S3t-Sn-mrt *(72) are shown receiving offerings from sn.f Sn-mrt.

B) A ḥtp ḏ1 nsw made for Ḫwty by s3.f S3-R', which clearly implies that these two were father and son.

3) It.f Ḫwty and mw.t.f ṭpw, with s3t.f S3t-Sn-mrt. This is the second time that a father/son relationship has been claimed for Ḫwty and S3-R', but Ŧnti-hty-m-h3t is said to be the father of S3-R' on four occasions, and he is more likely to be the real father of S3-R', which means that Ḫwty, shown with the mother of S3-R', is likely to be his step-father.

Facing Ḫwty across the offering table are s3.f Sn-mrt, s3.f Ḧty, s3t.f S3t-Sn-mrt and sn.f Intf.
The kin-terms applied to ḫwty and ḫtpw refer to their relationship with S3-R', but the other kin-terms must refer to ḫwty. The Sn-mri who is said to be the son of ḫwty is probably to be identified with the Sn-mri who was referred to as the "brother" of S3-R' and Ṣbk-ḥtp, and, indeed, he was their half-brother, since presumably the children of ḫwty were born of ḫtpw. This would mean that S3t-Sn-mri was the half-sister of her husband Ṣbk-ḥtp. ḫty would also be another half-brother of S3-R'.

C) A ḫtp d3 nsw prayer made for ḫnti-hṭy-m-h3t by his son S3-R'. He was also named as the father of the owner in inscription A.

5) Ṣ3-R' is shown with ḫnti-hṭy-m-h3t with ḫnti-hṭy-m-h3t and Ṣ3-R'. It is significant that Ṣ3-R' has specifically said that ḫtpw is the wife of ḫnti-hṭy-m-h3t, whereas, when she is shown with ḫwty, she is identified as the mother of S3-R'. It was clearly the marriage connection with ḫnti-hṭy-m-h3t that was important, so he must be the father of S3-R'.

6) Ṣ3-R', ḫnti-hṭy-m-h3t, two girls, both said to be Ṣ3-R'. All these people are given kin-terms which apply to ḫnti-hṭy-m-h3t, just as those in the register above were applied to ḫwty.

D) A ḫtp di nsw formula on behalf of the owner, S3-R', made for him by his grandson (in Ṣ3-S3-R', by the son of his son), another S3-R'.

7) S3-R' and Ṣ3t-hnti-hṭy, who are represented as husband and wife. A woman called Ṣ3t-hnti-hṭy has already been named as the child of ḫnti-hṭy-m-h3t and ḫtpw, so there is a strong possibility that S3-R' married his sister. It has already been suggested that his brother, Ṣbk-ḥtp, married their half-sister, Ṣ3t-Sn-mri, so consanguineous unions were apparently popular within this family.
Facing S3-R' across a table of offerings is s3t.f Hnti-hty-htpw. This must be the father of the younger S3-R', who is said to make the htp dišuaw in inscription D.

8) A htp dišuaw prayer for Hty made by his grandson, (in s3.t.f, by the son of his daughter), S3-R'.

8) Hty and hmt.f S3-t-R, .... *(73). Hty has already been named as the son of Pšwty, and so was the half-brother of the owner. Facing them across the table is s3.t.f S3t-Fpy, who must/the mother of the grandson, who made the htp dišuaw prayer of inscription E.

The juxtaposition of these two groups, combined with the fact that no wife is named for the son of S3-R', and that no husband is named for the daughter of Hty, strongly suggests that the younger Hnti-hty-htpw and S3t-Fpy were husband and wife, as well as being first cousins, and that they were the parents of the younger S3-R'.

9) S3-R' born of Htpw is shown facing the figures of:

an.t.f Intf. If this is the man already named as the brother of Pšwty, then he was only a remote connection by marriage, though as the brother of the owner's step-father, he may have played an important role in the life of S3-R'.

smt.f Nt-3bdw-S3-t-Wp-w3jt. This woman is probably to be identified as the mother of Intf, and therefore of Pšwty as well.

Two unidentified men.

10) S3-R' born of Htpw is shown facing the figures of several men and women, but the inscriptions accompanying them are too badly damaged to allow positive identifications.

The back of the stela is also carved. The central portion has a
figure of S3-Rt born of Hpyt *(74), that is the owner, and down the left
hand side as one looks at the stela, there is an inscription recording:

\[ \text{sn.t3 n Wp-w3wt nb t3 dar in \text{Hnty-m-h3t nb Im3h}, the adoration of} \]

Wepwawet, lord of the sacred land, by his father Hnty-m-h3t, possessor
of honour. The inscription conclusively proves that Hnty-m-h3t was the
real father of S3-Rt.

El Arabah, pl.VI. Two stelae, both
numbered E.295.

Owner: Tmn-m-h3t-nbwy.

pl.LXXVII.

1) Tmn-m-h3t-nbwy.
2) mw tf Nfrt born of ty.
3) The nb.t pr Snb born of Imny - i.e. the wife of the owner.
4) sn.f S3'nh born of Nfrt.
5 and 6) ant.f and sn.f.
7 and 8) Two male servants.
9) The owner again.
10) sn.f S3-Rntwt born of Mayt. They have different mothers, so the owner
and S3-Rntwt must be half-brothers.
11) sn.f.
12) sn.f Rn.f-snbt born of ty - i.e. the maternal uncle of the owner.
13 and 15) Two male servants.
14 and 16) Two men, both said to be sn.f.
1) S'nh born of Nfrt - i.e. the brother of the owner.
2) Nbwy born of Nfrt - i.e. the owner, his name being written in a very abbreviated form.

The figure of a small boy is shown standing facing Nbwy but his name has either been omitted or has been totally destroyed.
3) It.f Sn-Wart born of Nbt-Twnt.
4) mwt.f Nfrt.
5) sn.f S3-Rnntwt born of Mst. Pm-m-p3t-nbwy has chosen to include his half-brother on this stela, even though he has omitted the names of four of his full brothers and his sister. On both stelae S3-Rnntwt is shown on a smaller scale than the others, perhaps an indication that he was much younger than the rest.

El Arabah, pl.XII, no.8.312
Owner: Snbw.
pl.LXXVII.

1 and 2) Snbw and hat.f S3t-Shk.

3) The nbt pr Rn-snб and the nbt pr Snbw-rs. Clearly these are important members of the family, but in the absence of kin-terms and
the names of their mothers, they cannot be identified.

4) Two women, both said to be snt.f nt mwt.f - i.e. the maternal aunts of the owner.

5) A man called Rn.f-snb and his wife. Their relationship to Snbw is unknown.

6) s3t.f S3t-Inhr and mwt.f Htpal - i.e. the daughter and mother of the owner.

7) The hmt Rn.s-rs and s3.s Snbw. The inclusion of this woman and her son on a family stela from which all other servants have been excluded, combined with the fact that the boy is named after the owner, suggests the possibility that Rn.s-rs was the concubine of the owner and that she bore him a son. The wife of Snbw does not appear to have produced a son, which may have induced him to pay particular attention to the offspring of a servant (see below, p.299).

8) S'nh and snt.f Inhr-ddw. This might be the sister of the owner and her husband, or she may be the sister of S'nh, in which case, their relation to the owner is unknown.

Tombs of the Courtiers, pl.XXVII.

(University College, London, 14334)

Owner: Snbw.

pl.LXXVII.

A) A htp d3 nsw formula made out to the k3 of Snbw by s3t.f Imny, and she then lists the names of her children, her sister, and her sister's
children: s3t.s Mrrt, s3t.s, s3.s, s3.s, s3.s, s3.s, s3t.s Fert, s3t.s, s3.s Tmny, snt.s Dtt, s3.s and s3t.s.

1 and 2) šnw and hat.f Fert.

3) s3t.f Tmny - i.e., the woman who dedicated the stela.

4) It.f Nut. The figure of Nut is followed by an inscription naming a woman called Tnl, who must surely be his wife and the mother of šnw.

Tmny does not name her husband, or her sister's husband, presumably feeling that it was unnecessary to include them on her father's stela. It is unusual, but not unique, for a woman to dedicate a stela. Tmny probably had no surviving brothers, so undertook the maintenance of her parents' funeral cult. As the mother of nine children, she was a mature woman when she commissioned the stela.

Kemi, 1928, vol.I, pl.VII.
Owner: Rn(sf)-snb.
pl.LXXVIII.

1) Rn(sf)-snb born of Tnl.

2) Tnl born of Tt.

A) Rn.f-snb born of Rn.s-'nh. Rn.f-snb could be the father of the owner, but it could also be the owner himself, his name written in an expanded version. Rn.s-'nh looks like a woman's name, but it can be used of men too *(75), and, in this case, Rn.s-'nh probably is a man, because the
determinative after the name is . Rn.s-'nh is probably to be identified as the father of Rn(f)-anb, the owner.

\( \text{Ikw} \) born of \( \text{Int} \) - i.e. the sister of the owner.

\( \text{Pyw} \) born of \( \text{Int} \). The rest of the inscriptions concern the family of \( \text{Pyw} \), so it is reasonable to assume that she was the wife of Rn(f)-anb, otherwise the two families cannot be linked.

Two men born of \( \text{Pyw} \).

B) \( \text{Int} \) born of \( \text{Hp} \).

An unidentified man and woman.

\( \text{Thi} \) born of \( \text{Int} \).

An unidentified man.

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>←</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4 - 7.</td>
<td>12. 11. 10. 9. 8.</td>
<td>13 - 15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Musée Curtius de Liège.

1 and 2) \( \text{Shyp-ib-R'} \) born of \( \text{Snty} \) and hat.f \( \text{Sst}-\text{Hnmw} \) born of \( \text{Sst}-\text{Hntw} \).

3) 'nhw born of \( \text{Sst}-\text{Hnmw} \) - i.e. the son of the owner. He is shown facing the other figures across a table of offerings, and he is the subject to whom the following kin-terms relate.

4) \( \text{sst.f} \).

5) hat.f \( \text{Hwf-anb} \) - i.e. the wife of 'nhw and probably the mother of figure 1.

6) hat.f \( \text{Bbl} \) - i.e. the other wife of 'nhw, and probably the mother of figure 7.
7) s3t.f.
8 and 12) An unidentified man and woman.
9/11) Three men, all said to be born of S3t-Hnww.
13/15) Two male and one female servant.


The owner of this stela names his father, mother, and paternal grandmother, and a son and daughter. Both children are said to be born of Nfr-sht, but Nfr-sht is not shown on the stela, nor is she said to be the wife of Mntw-Wsr, nor given the title nbt pr. She may have been a concubine, but she might equally well have been a long-dead wife, to whom other funerary monuments had been erected, or a divorced wife.


1) Rw-r-dr.sn born of ...y.
2) sn.f Fw.

A) There is no information in the following lines of inscription which might link Rw-r-dr.sn and his brother with the rest of the family. The most reasonable explanation would be that Ipd, the first man on the list, was his son. If this is correct, the Rw-r-dr.n had several great-grandchildren when this stela was erected. This is perfectly possible, though the stela may not have been erected by him, but by one of his
I I born of Mwwt-'nh and hmt. f P3 s.

s3.f Ipl and s3.t. S3t-Wrt.

Hntf-hty-htp born of Mwwt-'nh and hmt. f S3t-k3.

s3.f Sbk-ddw, hmt. f Rn.f-'nh, and s3.t. The arrangement suggests that Rn.f-'nh was the wife of Sbk-ddw, rather than the second wife of his father.

s3.f and s3.f - i.e. the sons of Sbk-ddw.

Sn-Wsrt, born of Twbt.

hmt. f S3t-Wsrt. S3t-Wsrt has already been named as the daughter of Ipl and P3s. It is felt to assume that this is the same woman, and she provides the link between the families of Ipl and Sn-Wsrt.

s3.f.

s3.f and s3.f Sbk-ddw. S3t-Wsrt thus named one of her sons after her cousin.

s3.t.f and s3.t.f.

s3.t.f Mwwt-'nh. This girl was thus named for her maternal great-grandmother. Also on this line is the name of s3.t.f Twbt.

See ter of Egypt, vol.I, p.335, fig.222.

A) The dedicatory prayers are made in the names of a woman called Intf-'nh the daughter of Hört and Nfr-th and another woman, M tw-nfr-th born of Nb(w)-ddt.
1) Sjt-Inpr.

2) Two young girls, shown on a smaller scale than the women, said to be born of Nb(w)-ddt and therefore sisters of Mstw-ntr-th.

3) A woman probably meant to represent Nb(w)-ddt since that name is directly in front of the figure, though actually part of the inscription naming the girls.

The connection, if any, between 'Intf-'nh, Sjt-Inpr and the family of Nb(w)-ddt is not recorded.

A translation of the dedicatory prayer appears on p. 500.


Owner: Shk-ddw.

This stela is divided into three registers, each one containing a family group. Sharing the same stela in this way probably indicates that they were related, but there is no mention of how, though there may have been some information on this point in the inscriptions which have been destroyed. The interest in this stela, however, lies in the probable affiliations of the first group.

1) Shk-dd(w) born of Hpyw.

2) hmt.f (his wife) Sn-Vsr born of Nfrt-smjt.

3) hmt.f (his slave) 'Idd.

4) h.f (his slave) Shk-ddw *(76) born of hmt.f 'Idd.

5) Two women, both said to be s3jt.f.
6) $a3.f$

It is very unusual to find servants in prominent positions in the first register on any stela, but the role accorded to $Sbk-dd(w)$ (figure 4) is unique. The figure representing $Sbk-dd(w)$ is drawn on the same scale as the figures of the owner and his wife, and he is larger than the figure of the owner's son. He stands in front of the children of $Sbk-dd(w)$ and is represented holding a goose in one hand and pouring a libation from a $hs$-vase with the other. There are a few examples of prominently placed female servants bringing gifts of food to their masters, but it was the son, or nearest surviving male relative, who was performing the ritual.

In view of the way he is shown, and the fact that he takes precedence over the children of the owner, $Sbk-dd(w)$ may also have been the son of the owner, $Sbk-dd(w)$, after whom he was named. The named son of $Sbk-dd(w)$ is shown on a small scale, suggesting that he was only a child at the time of his father's death. If he were too young to play the role required of a son in the funeral cult, the son of $Tdd$ might have acted as a substitute.

Another interesting feature of this stela is the inscription which identifies figure 7. She is said to be $h.t.f nt Pwnt$, his Puntite slave.


Owners: $Nb-itf$ and $Isf$. pl. LXXVIII.

These three inscriptions are to be found on a statue, an offering table, and a stela respectively, and all belong to the family of $Nb-itf$. Inscription 6:

1) $Nb-itf$ born of $Int-it.s$. 

$\delta$
2) **hmt.f Tb** born of **Nb( )-ddt**, and **s3.f Isi** born of **Tb**.

3) Two separate **htp di nsw** prayers, one for **Int-It.s** born of **Tb**, and the other for **Nb(w)-ddt** born of **Tb**. These could be the daughters of **Nb-Itf** and **Tb**, but, in that case, a kinship term ought to have been included, as it was for their son. Not only are kin-terms omitted, but their names are separated from those of **Tb** and her son by the afore-mentioned **htp di nsw** formulae. It is therefore likely that these two women are the mothers of **Nb-Itf** and **Tb**, and, as they are sisters, the husband and wife were first cousins.

*Inscription 7:*

**Nb-Itf** born of **Int-It.s**.

*Inscription 16:*

**Isi. W. Alliot** *(77)* suggests that this is the son of **Nb-Itf** and **Tb**, who was named on the first of these inscriptions. This is certainly possible, but it is difficult to understand why, if this were so, he omitted all reference to his parents, but included the names of his paternal grandparents, whose names appear further down this inscription. The **Isi** of this stela is therefore more likely to be a brother of **Nb-Itf**.

**hmt.f T.** The rest of his wife's name is illegible, but the space available is so limited, that it was probably **Tb**, in which case, the brothers **Nb-Itf** and **Isi** may have married women who were related to each other, or, perhaps were even the same woman.

3) **Sbk-htp** *(78)* and **hmt.f Int-It.s.** **Int-It.s** has already been named as the mother of **Nb-Itf**, and **Isi** too, if they were brothers, so her husband **Sbk-htp** is to be identified as the father.

4) Three unidentified women, all entitled **nbt yr**.
Inscription 13:
1) \( \text{Hr-} ' 3 \) born of \( \text{Rn-snb} \).
2) \( \text{Hr-htp} \) born of \( ' 3 \). The dedication to \( \text{Hr-htp} \) is made by his son \( \text{Hr-} ' 3 \).
3) The \( \text{nbtp pr Nb-m-s3} \) born of \( \text{Rdtt} \). By position and title, this woman is to be identified as the wife of the owner, and this is confirmed by the next inscription.
4) A woman said to be the daughter of \( \text{Hr-} ' 3 \) and \( \text{Nb-m-s3} \), and another said to be the daughter of \( \text{Hr-} ' 3 \).
5) \( \text{Rn-snb} \) born of \( \text{It} \).
6) The owner again.
7) An unidentified man.
8) Two men, both said to be born of \( \text{Rn-snb} \) — i.e. the brothers of \( \text{Hr-} ' 3 \).
9) \( \text{Hr-htp} \) born of \( \text{Rn-snb} \).
10) An unidentified man.

Inscription 17:
1) \( \text{Hr-} ' 3 \) the son of \( \text{Hr-htp} \) and \( \text{Rn-snb} \).
2) \( \text{b3kt (nt bk3) *79 Nb-m-s3} \). Though only half the title of \( \text{Nb-m-s3} \) is actually written here, it appears in full in the next text.
3) \( \text{s3.f Nfr-htp} \).
4) Two women, both said to be \( \text{s3t.f} \), one of whom was named in the previous inscription. The other is called \( \text{Rn-snb} \) after her paternal grandmother.

Inscription 20:
1) Besides the owner, \( \text{Hr-} ' 3 \), there are the names of his son, \( \text{Nfr-htp} \).
2) Four men. Two of them have already been named as being born of Rn-snb. The other two cannot be identified through lack of information.

3) hat.f b3kt nt hk3 Nb-m-s3.

4) Five unidentified men.

Inscription 30:

1) Hr-'3 the son of Hr-htp.
2) Hfr-htp the son of Hr-'3 and Nb-m-s3.
3) Three men and one woman, none of whom can be identified.
4) Two women born of Rn-snb. These could be either the sisters or the granddaughters of Hr-'3. They have been entered in the family tree as his sisters, for no effort has been made by the arrangement of the stela to attach them in any way to the younger Rn-snb.
5) A separate htp di nsw on behalf of Sbk-htp born of E4st, which is dedicated by sn.f Hr-'3. Since they had different mothers, Sbk-htp can be no more than the half-brother of Hr-'3. The name of Sbk-htp is accompanied by the names of several other people, none of whom can be identified.


This stela is dedicated to Hr-'3 by his sister (sn.f). No other member of the family is mentioned, so there is no way of knowing if this is the same Hr-'3 who figured in the previous group of texts.


Owners: Name destroyed and Rn.f-rs.

The stela is damaged so the name of the owner has been lost, but he was born of Nb(w)-ddt, and the dedicator was his brother (sn.f).
The joint owner was Rn.f-rs, the son of Mnty-htp and Sub.s-"nh.s, and the dedicator was ant.f hkr nsw Skk-nfrw born of Nfrw, his sister (or rather, half-sister, since they have different mothers), the King's Favourite Skk-nfrw born of Nfrw.

Bologna 1904.

Owner: Ṭmn-nḥt.

pl.LXXX.

1) Ṭmn-nḥt born of Mayt.
2) Ṭbt pr Sṯt-Ipy born of Bbwt. By position and title it may be assumed that this is the wife of the owner, and this is confirmed by the fact that she is the mother of his children.
3) The inscription that accompanies this woman is badly worn but it appears to read ant.f *(30). As she is born of Bbwt she is the sister-in-law, rather than the sister of the owner, though there is always the possibility that Mayt and Bbwt had both married the same man, in which case her two daughters, one of whom married Ṭmn-nḥt, were also his half-sisters.
4) s3.t.f.
5 and 6) s3t.f Nfrw and s3t.f Mayt, both born of Sṯt-Ipy.
7) mw.t.f Myst born of Dḥt.
8) Ṣt.f Ṣḥḥi born of Sḥḥ.
1) 'nhw born of Ini.

2) sn.f Snb born of S3t-t. Since these two men have different mothers they are half-brothers.

A) List of inscriptions naming:

sn.f born of mwt.f. Since the name of the mother is not recorded, some doubt must remain as to the degree of relationship to the owner.

sn.f.

sn.f Ini born of Hwnt. It is later established that Hwnt was the sister of 'nhw, thus sn.f here means "his nephew".

sn.f born of mwt.f.

sn.f.

snt.f Ini born of mwt.s.

B) mwt.f Ini born of mwt.s.

snt.f Hwnt (see above) born of Ini.

snt.f born of Ini.

snt.f born of Ini.

sn.f.

sn.f.
Although limitations impose by time and space necessitated the exclusion of graffiti from this work, I am including one such group of inscriptions, left by minor officials at various places on the West bank of the Nile in the Aswan region, because they clearly illustrate the value of this type of monument for deducing and expanding the family affiliations of such officials.

de Morgan, p.23, inscription 156.

This particular inscription is chosen as the starting point because it contains reference to many key figures. A simple htp di nsw is made on behalf of:

1) Wsr-`nh-Snfrw (in other inscriptions the name is written in an expanded version as Sn-wsrt-`nh-Snfrw) born of Tt1-W3dt.
2) s3t.f S3t-Tmm born of Hwnt.sn.
3) Ny born of S3t-Infr. His prominent position in the inscription, combined with the fact that the next name is that of the owner's mother, makes it very likely that this was the father of Wsr-`nh-Snfrw.
4) The nbt pr Tt1-W3dt born of the nbt pr EbI.
5) Three men, named respectively T--snb, Tmy- nb, and S b.f, all said to be born of Tt1-W3dt.
6) Snb-pwnty-n.1, also born of Tt1-W3dt, and so he was another brother of the owner. In a later inscription his name is expanded to Sn-Wsrt-snb-pwnty-n.1.
7) bnt.f Tly born of Hwnt-pw - i.e. the wif of b-pw- ty-n.1.
8/12) Five wome, all said to be s3.f and all born of T2y. Their
1) Rdi.ś born at S3t-Wart.

2) hmt.ś S3t-Rdi.ś born of S3t-Rdi.ś. The repetition of the element rdi.ś would suggest that this woman was related to her husband by blood.

3) Nb(w)-ddt born of S3t-Rdi.ś. This woman could be either the daughter or the sister-in-law of the owner, the former identification being more likely.

4) Hnmw-ddw born of S3t-Rdi.ś - i.e. the son, or possibly the brother-in-law of the owner.

5) hmt.ś S3t-Rdi.ś born of Nb(w)-ddt - i.e. the wife of Hnmw-ddw and, since Nb(w)-ddt was the sister of Hnmw-ddw, his wife was also his niece.

6) Illegible. The inscription possibly begins sn.f.

7) s3.f Rdi.ś-'nḥw born of S3t-Rdi.ś. - i.e. the son of Hnmw-ddw, and he is also said to have dedicated the stela.

8) sn.f.
name include Ttì-W3tı, Hmt-Wt-w, and Nhy(t).

13) 3.f Snrfrw born of Ttì.

de Morgan, p.44, no.20.

The link between this group and the last is provided by the owner's mother, named in line 4, but the use of their family names must have suggested that some link existed.

1) Snbbì born of Nhyt.

2) Hmt.f Rht-ib born of Hmt. Granted that Hmt is a common name, it is possible that this woman was a member of the family.

3) Ht.f Hkw born of S3t-Inm. The name S3t-Inm has already been encountered in the previous inscription, where she was said to be the daughter of Hwa-Inh-Snrfrw and Hmt.w, and this would make her the same generation as Hkw. However, the family was a numerous one and it is possible that the eldest daughter of the eldest brother could have a son of the right age to marry her cousin, if that cousin was the daughter of the youngest brother. This is purely speculative, however, and two women called S3t-Inm have been included in the combined family tree on pl.IXXXII.

4) Hmt.f Nhyt born of Ttì. This establishes the link with the previous group and Snbbì is shown to have been the grandson of Snb-pw-nhy-n.ı and Ttì.

The rest of the inscription is not clearly legible, but it names at least three brothers (sn.f), and a sister (snt.f) called Hmt.

de Morgan, p.13, no.55.

1) Sn- rh- inh-snbw born of Ttì-W3ıt.

2) Nhy born of S3t-Inhr. It has already been suggested that this man was the husband of Ttì-W3ıt and his prominent role on this second
stela tends to confirm this.

3) Sn-Wart-sn-b-pw-nty-n.2 born of TtÌ-W3ât, born of Bu1.
4) mwt.3 TtÌ-W3ât.
5) His children, already known from the first inscription.
6) An unidentified woman.
7) Facing these is a single line of inscription naming a woman called 4pw born of Hwtt-sn, who was thus another daughter of Wsr'-nh-Snfrw.

De Morgan, p.13, no.51.

1 and 2) Sn-Wart'-nh-Snfrw and Sn-Wart-sn-b-pw-nty-n.1, both born of TtÌ-W3ât. These are the expanded writings of the names of the two brothers who have played leading roles on these inscriptions.

3) The three men, born of TtÌ-W3ât, who were named in the first inscription.
4) Two unidentified men.
5) A man born of Hwtt-sn - i.e. the only known son of Wsr'-nh-Snfrw.
6) An unidentified man named Imn-m-pâ3t.
7) A man born of S3t-Imn. Since many of these inscriptions are concerned with the male members of the immediate family of Wsr'-nh-Snfrw, this may well be his grandson, born of the daughter named in the first inscription.
8) An unidentified man.
9) T'mny born of Hwtt-pw. This could be either the grandson or the brother-in-law of Sno-pw-nty-n.3, though perhaps the former is the more likely identification.

De Morgan, p.74, no.56.

This belongs to the same group of people, but provides no new information about them.
This probably belongs to a branch of the same family, though the identification is admittedly little more difficult.

1) ḫmny born of S3t-Inhr, who may thus be a brother of ḫnty born of S3t-Inhr named in the previous inscriptions.

2) hmt.f S3tp-ib-R1, whose name is followed by that of an unidentified woman.

3) ḫnty born of Snbtisy. The exact relationship of this man to the rest is never clarified.

4) ṣ3t.f S3t-Inn born of ḫnty, so this would be one of the few occasions where someone is identified by the father's name.

5) hmt.f S3t-Hthr - i.e. the wife of ḫnty.

6) Three, or possibly four sons of ḫnty.

7) The rest of the inscription is damaged and is virtually illegible, but two nurses are named.

A woman called ḫmwt-pw was named as the mother of ḫty, and a woman called Snbtisy was named in the previous inscription. Identification by the occurrence of name alone is very uncertain, so the information gathered from the last two inscriptions has been only tentatively entered on the family tree on pl. LXXXII.
It is the stated policy of this study to avoid the complexities of the various royal family trees, especially those of the Thirteenth Dynasty, and to concentrate on the evidence provided by non-royal stelae. However, the stela of the \textit{mwt nsw} (King's Mother) Twht-\textit{ib} has been included as it is of special interest in that it belongs to a member of a family which was not royal, although she and some of her descendants attained royal rank.

1) \textit{mwt nsw} Twht-\textit{ib} born of Sn-Wart. The words "born of" were written \textit{mst n}, so Sn-Wart was the mother of Twht-\textit{ib}. Twht-\textit{ib} is known to have been the mother of King Sekhemre-Sewadjtawy Sobekhotepe of the Thirteenth Dynasty.

2) It ntr (The God's Father) Sbk-ddw born of Bbl-'nh. From his prominent position on the stela, it may be deduced that Sbk-ddw was either the husband or the father of Twht-\textit{ib}. A rock-cut stela on the Armant/Nag-Hammadi track *(82) and some scarabs *(83) name the father of King Sobekhote as the it ntr Mntw-\textit{htp}, who does not appear to have been royal, though two of his sons by Twht-\textit{ib} called themselves s3 nsw (King's Son). If Mntw-\textit{htp} was the husband of Twht-\textit{ib}, then it is logical to assume that Sbk-ddw was her father, though in this case, it is possible that
he was, in fact, both. This hypothesis will be considered later.

3) s3t n(t) Twnt-ib born of the mtw nsw Twnt-ib. M.F. Laming MacAdam suggested that this figure represented several daughters of the queen, who were not named individually *(84).

4) mtw.f Bh1-'nh born of Hyyw - i.e. the mother of Shk-ddw.

5) s3t.s Twnt-ib born of Bh1-'nh - i.e. the aunt of the queen.

6) s3t. born of Twnt-ib. This must be the son of the mtw nsw and not of her aunt of the same name because the name of the mother is followed by the royal female determinative *(85), but he is not given the title of s3 nsw which the children of mtw-htp, none of whom appear on this stela, arrogated to themselves. This would be accounted for if Twnt-ib had been married twice, for this man could then be identified as a son of the other husband.

Neither this man, nor his brother (figure 7 below) claims the title of an nsw (King's Brother), though as half-brothers of Sobekhotep they must have had some claim to such honours. Certainly both their sisters named below (figures 8 and 9) claim to be snt nsw (King's Sister). Either it must be accepted that an nsw was omitted through lack of space, or an alternative explanation for the variation of titles must be sought. The most likely explanation would be if these two men died before the elevation of their half-brother to the kingship. They would still command an honourable place on their mother's stela, but they would have had no pretensions to a royal title. If this is not accepted, the only other course is to evolve some intricate hypothesis, involving three marriages for Twnt-ib to account for the varying titles of her children.

7) Ngtl born of Twnt-ib. The royal female determinative is used here as well.
8) ant nsw Shk-ddt born of mwt nsw Twht-ld. Whatever the fate of the
two sons of Twht-ld named above, this girl evidently lived into the reign
of Sobekhotep. If she were a child of Mntw-htp it would seem reasonable
to suppose that she would take the titles of s3(t) nsw or Twyt p't as they
did, so she may be the child of the other husband of Twht-ld.

9) ant nsw Mntw-snt.1 born of the mwt nsw Twht-ld. The name Mntw-snt.1,
translated literally, means "My mother is my sister" *(86). In the words
of M.F.Laming MacAdam, who discusses the implications of this: "A name
may proverbially mean nothing, or it may only be intended to be understood
metaphorically. But if it be taken literally it involves the conclusion
that one of Yauheyebu's husbands was her father" *(87).

10) mwt.s Nb(w)-ddt born of Hpyw. Hpyw has already been named as the
maternal grandmother of Shk-ddw, so Nb(w)-ddt was his aunt. But to whom
does the kin-term mwt.s, her mother, belong? The suggestion offered by
the excavators *(88) was that she was the mother of Inr, whose children
were figures 16/17 on this stela. However, it would be most unusual to
call someone "her mother", without clearly showing a figure of the woman
whose mother she was. Unless Shk-ddw married his aunt, besides Sn-Wart,
so that mwt.s here would mean "her step-mother", that is the step-mother
of Twht-ld, it is more likely that it is to be understood to mean "her
grandmother". Sn-Wart and Shk-ddw would thus have been first cousins
through their common grandmother, Hpyw.

11) A man born of Hpyw.

12) An unidentified man.

13) ant s nt mwt.s Hx born of Bb3-nh. It is difficult to decide to
whom the feminine pronoun refers here. The only local candidate is 'Iwht-ib, yet for one of her maternal relatives to be born of Bbi'-nh, 'Iwht-ib's mother would have to have been born of Bbi'-nh, and that would make Sn-Wart and Sbk-ddw brother and sister, or half-brother and sister. This is not impossible, but there is no other evidence to suggest this. The exact nature of this kin-term must therefore remain obscure.

14/17) Four men, all born of In1. The first of these men is said to be the s3 n Sbk-wn, the son of Sbk-wn. Sbk-wn and In1 must, therefore, have been man and wife *(89), but their position in the family is unknown, unless it is accepted that In1 was the daughter of Nb(w)-ddt.

18) A man born of Ty.

19) Sbk-wn s3 Sn.1'-nh ms n Sn.1'-nh - i.e. Sbk-wn, named in connection with figure 14, was the son of Sn.1'-nh born of Sn.1'-nh.

20) An unidentified man, born of Sn-pw.

21) A man born of Sn-Wart and therefore the brother of 'Iwht-ib.

22) sjt.f 'Ifr'-nh born of Sbk-nht. One of the sons of In1 is called Sbk-nht and in the family tree presented by Ayrton, Currelly and Weigall *(90), 'Ifr'-nh is shown as his daughter. However, the words "born of" are written ⲡⲱ ⲭⲱ ⲩⲱ, which is invariably followed by the name of the mother, not the father, so this Sbk-nht must be an otherwise unknown woman. 'Ifr'-nh might be the daughter of the brother of 'Iwht-ib, who is figure 21, or she may be the child of one of the people shown as 25 and 26, who cannot be identified because this part of the stela is broken away.

23) sant.n mw.t.s born of ḫpyw. A woman born of Bbi'-nh has already been designated sant.n mw.t.s, so, if the possessive pronoun refers back
to "wht-\h in both cases, then clearly this kin term must have more than one meaning in English.

24) \textit{ant.f n(t) mwt.f born of Snt-pw.}

25/26) Figures destroyed.

Since so many of the relationships on this stela are obscure, only a tentative reconstruction of the family tree can be attempted. However, I have also incorporated in it other known information about the family.

Carlsberg A683, AE.I.N.966, pl.XCVII. Owner: \textit{It}.

This stela, which belongs to a woman called \textit{It}, is divided horizontally into three registers. The first register is decorated with a design of Eyes oforus and couchant jackals, and down the middle is the name of \textit{Mr\\.}

There is no indication whether this man was the father, husband, or son of \textit{It}.

The second register has a simple prayer on behalf of the deceased (see Excursus C, p.502), while the third register shows \textit{It} on the left hand side of the stela, while facing her are her two small girls and a boy, who are presumably to be identified as her daughters and her son.

Carlsberg A684, AE.I.N.965, pl.XCVII. Owner: \textit{Hm\l}.

This is a simple stela, but it has one unique feature. The owner is named as \textit{Hm\l}, and he is shown with his parents, his wife, and their son and daughter, but there are two other girls on the stela and they are both said to be \textit{s3t hmt.f}, the daughter of his wife. This must surely be intended to indicate that they were not the real daughters of \textit{Hm\l}, b t
the children of his wife by a previous marriage. This is the only stela
to use this particular combination of kin-terms. There is another woman
said to be ant.f ṣjt n mwt (.f) ḫmny, a combination of kin-terms which may
be intended to indicate that this was the half-sister of ḫmny, the daughter
of (his) mother, though the possessive pronoun, ḫ, has been omitted. If
so, this is also a unique combination of kin-terms.

Carlsberg A687, AE.I.N.1664, pl.XCVII. Owner: ḫt-n-ḥb *(91).

This stela belongs to the woman who is shown seated on the left hand
side of it. Facing her across an offering table is the kneeling figure
of ṣjt ṭr(.s), her eldest daughter, and on this girl's knee is ṣṣ.s, her
son, but it is not clear whether this is the son of the owner, or of her
daughter.

The prayer at the top of the stela (see Excursus C, p.502) invokes
Ceris and Hathor.