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Abstract

Publication of a fragment of a faience menat naming Ahmose Sattjutji. It is suggested that Ahmose Sattjutji is a hitherto unknown member of the royal family of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Dynasties.

الملاخص

منشور علمي عن قِطْعة من حجرالفاينس "منات" حمل اسم أحمس ساتوتي. كان أحمس ساتوتي عضو غير معروف في العائلة المالكة في الأسرة السابعة عشر والأسرة المصرية الثامنة عشر.

A faience fragment now in a private collection (figs. 1–2) was acquired on the art market in the first decade of this century.1 The fragment measures 3.8 cm high by 3.5 cm wide by 0.6 cm in thickness. It is made from a turquoise-blue faience with white, fine-grained core visible at the two broken ends, and is inscribed on both faces in a purplish black pigment applied before firing. The clear blue color of the faience and the rather ungainly paleography are consistent with a dating to the late Second Intermediate Period or early Eighteenth Dynasty.2

I am grateful to the owner of the object for access, and to Aidan Dodson, Marcel Marée, and the editor and anonymous reviewer at JARCE for useful comments on a draft.

1 The fragment was acquired from a “runner” to the art trade who sourced material from private collections and minor sales on the south coast of the UK. The fragment was one of a group of small faience pieces acquired by them from the same source. These included a number of pastiche pieces bearing signs of old restoration (for one of these, see T. Hardwick, “Things of Threads and Patches,” CIPEG Journal 5 (2021), 103–4), corroborating the suggestion that the pieces had spent some time on the British market. The fact that the fragment has no excavated findspot does not invalidate the information it can still provide, and it is presented here in the hope that publication may yet allow its ancient and more recent contexts to be recovered.

2 For images and discussion of early New Kingdom faience, see most conveniently C. Roehrig (ed.), Hatshepsut: From Queen to Pharaoh (New York, 2005), 175–80. For an example of “ungainly paleography” on early New Kingdom faience, see most conveniently G. Pinch, Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt 58 (2022), 113–17
http://dx.doi.org/10.5913/jarce.58.2022.a006
The shape of the fragment is similarly diagnostic. The two sides taper together slightly as they descend, and the thickness of the fragment is bisected by a groove running down each side. The fragment evidently derives from the counterpoise of a *menat*, the necklace of small beads with a flat, spoon-shaped counterpoise, associated especially with women and the cult of the goddess Hathor. The inscription is essentially identical on both faces, and consists of a name written right to left in two columns in a cartouche. Both faces lack the top part of the cartouche, but the name is otherwise complete. The name in the side illustrated in figure 1 is more complete, while the side illustrated in figure 2 has the remains of a sign below the cartouche: the square enclosure containing a raptor (Gardiner Sign List G5) which writes the name of the goddess Hathor. The inscription, reconstructed from both sides, can be read as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(…)} & \text{ ms } dd[w] n=s / \text{ […] sTt tweT } \mid \text{ hwt } hr \text{ […] mry}\end{align*}
\]

\(sTt\) is usually the first element of a name (albeit sometimes pushed into second place after a divine name in honorific transposition, not the case here), so it seems likely that the name in the second column is complete. To begin at a level with the \(sTt\) goose, the first element of the first column must therefore be a flat sign that took up relatively little space above the \(ms\) sign. The \(fH\) sign (Gardiner N12) is more likely than most, and the inscription is thus restored

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ahmose called Sattjutji}, \text{ [beloved of] Hathor [?of …]} \quad \text{(fig. 3)}
\end{align*}
\]

Yet another Ahmose can thus be added to the plethora of Ahmoses, male and female, that populate four generations of the royal family at the end of the Seventeenth Dynasty and the start of the Eighteenth Dynasty. Where precisely Ahmose called Sattjutji fits in the period that the object type and paleography suggest cannot be definitively established, but a little more information can be wrung from study of her name and the object itself.

Ahmose

The first royal Ahmose in the Seventeenth Dynasty is Senakhtenre Ahmose (“Ahmose the Elder”), husband of Tetisheri and father of Seqenenre Tao. Among Seqenenre’s children with his wife Ahhotep are his successor-but-two Ahmose I, and probably a number of daughters distinguished by their second names: Ahmose Nefertari; Ahmose Nebetta; Ahmose Henutempet; and Ahmose Tumerisi. With another other wife, Satdjehuty, Seqenenre fathered another princess Ahmose (no second name listed). Another likely daughter of Seqenenre is Ahmose...
Hennuttamehu, who was probably a wife of Ahmose I. Ahmose I’s own children included a son Ahmose Ankh, and daughters Ahmose Meritamun and Ahmose Sitamun.7

Even less securely placed in this list come Ahmose Inhapi, perhaps another wife of Seqenenre and probably mother of Ahmose Hennuttamehu; Ahmose Sitkamose, presumably a daughter of Kamose and perhaps a wife of Ahmose I; and Ahmose Sapair, probably a brother or son of Ahmose I.

\[ddw \text{ n}=s\]

The most unusual part of Ahmose Sattjutji’s name is its use of the phrase \[ddw \text{ n}=s\] “called” in the cartouche. A popular way to introduce a person’s second name from the Middle Kingdom onwards,\(^8\) \[ddw \text{ n}=f / ddw \text{ n}=s\] is exceptionally rare in royal contexts, even though several royal names from the Second Intermediate Period (e.g., Ameny Kemau, Seneb Kay, Amenemhat Sobekhotep) are clearly bipartite and one might expect \[ddw \text{ n}=f\] to be used.

Kim Ryholt has identified these and other bipartite kings’ names, however, as indicating not a second name but rather filiation to an earlier king.\(^9\) Ryholt’s thesis has alluring internal coherence but lacks evidence from other sources (i.e., independent attestations of their fathers’ names) to support it, and has not received complete acceptance: it seems more likely that these are, instead, bipartite names.\(^10\) Ryholt does not suggest that the other bipartite royal names from near this period—the profusion of male and female Ahmoses listed above—should conform to his proposed pattern of revealing filiation rather than being a second name. In many of these instances the bipartite Ahmoses are known to have parents with different names, further suggesting that Ryholt’s theory should be reconsidered.

One other royal name written with \[ddw \text{ n}=s\] is known to me: the “king’s daughter and king’s sister Satdjehuty called Satibu, born of the king’s wife Tetisheri” (and Senakhtenre Ahmose the Elder), known from a fragment of her coffin lid, now in Munich.\(^11\) On this, her name is not written in a cartouche, nor is Tetisheri’s. Satdjehuty Satibu is also just called Satdjehuty (written, however, in a cartouche) on the mummy wrappings of her daughter Ahmose.\(^12\)

It is impossible to draw firm conclusions from such a small sample, but it can be suggested that the use of \[ddw \text{ n}=f/s\] was discouraged among members of the immediate royal family during the Second Intermediate Period and early New Kingdom, even though the royal families of this period were, like non-royals, fond of bipartite names. Did the two relatively unusual—and perhaps more “intimate”—contexts of Satdjehuty’s coffin and Sattjutji’s menat justify the use of the phrase; or were coffin and menat made in workshops that produced material for a variety of clients, and where scribes may have confused royal and non-royal protocols? Were these just mistakes? Or are the conventions for the use of this phrase entirely lost?

---

8 P. Vernus, Le surnom au moyen empire (Rome, 1986), 82–85.
10 S. Quirke, “Royal Power in the 13th Dynasty,” in S. Quirke (ed.), Middle Kingdom Studies (New Malden, 1991), 129–30. Doubt has been further cast on Ryholt’s theory as epitomized by his King Seb-Kay (i.e., Kay-son-of-Seb). Ryholt places Seb-Kay as the 19th ruler of the 13th Dynasty (with Seb, otherwise completely unattested, as the 18th ruler), and as father of Amenemhat VII / Amenemhat-Kay, whose place in the middle of Dynasty 13 is relatively fixed by the Turin King List (Ryholt, Political Situation, 219, 340–41). However, the recent discovery of the tomb of King Senebkay at Abydos (J. Wegner, “A Royal Necropolis at South Abydos: New Light on Egypt’s Second Intermediate Period,” ANEO 78.2 (2015) 68–78, especially page 71) now shows that Senebkay (the only attestation of his name known to Ryholt is ambiguously written, and was read by Ryholt as \[\text{sb} \text{ not sb}\]; it is unequivocally \[\text{sb}\] in his tomb) reused fixtures from the tomb of Sobekhotep IV in his tomb. This automatically dates Senebkay considerably after the reign of Amenemhat-Kay, whom Ryholt’s theory would place as his own son.
11 Munich ÄS 7163: A. Grimm and S. Schoske, Im Zeichen des Mondes: Ägypten zu Beginn des Neuen Reiches (Munich, 1999), 2–33; 92, illustrated in color on the back cover and frontispiece.
12 PM I, 755–56.
Satjuti

Satjuti is not listed in Ranke, Personennamen, although TwTi is known from the Middle Kingdom and is also cited as a New Kingdom variant of TT. It seems tempting to view the name Satjuti as a hypocoristicon (contracted / pet name) of Satdjhuty, “Daughter of Thoth.” There is apparently little phonetic justification for this, however, since ġ does not change to j in Demotic or Coptic, but it has been suggested that the kingly name tē-tē may conceal dhwty-nkt. There can have been few unbreakable rules for making pet-names. It is tempting to try to link both of Ahmose Satjuti’s names to the lunar devotion of the royal family, showcased in the names of Satdjhuty and the Ahhoteps, Ahmose, and Thutmose of this period. Ahmose Satjuti could perhaps be the preexisting Ahmose, daughter of Satdjhuty Satibu (and thus sister / half-sister of Ahmose I and the numerous Ahmoses of that generation), who is listed without a second name on Satdjhuty’s mummy wrappings. If this is the case, Satjuti could perhaps be considered a diminutive variant of her mother’s name Satdjhuty. Another hypothesis could see Ahmose Satjuti as a new sister of Satdjhuty Satibu (and so a sister of Seqenenre Tao and aunt of Ahmose I). Both would be daughters of Teisheri and Senakhtenre Ahmose the Elder; Satjuti could then perhaps be viewed as a hypocoristicon of Sat-Teti(sheri).

The menat fragment cannot provide any firm conclusions, but it seems likely that Ahmose Satjuti was either an aunt or sister of Ahmose I who lived through the end of the Seventeenth Dynasty and beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty. Satjuti’s name is written in a cartouche, which Grajetzki suggests was the prerogative of kings’ wives rather than kings’ daughters in the Second Intermediate Period. By the start of the Eighteenth Dynasty, however, the cartouche is occasionally used for kings’ daughters too, and this may have started earlier than the first attested examples. Satjuti’s titles—king’s wife, sister, or daughter, or any combination thereof—are unknown.

The Menat, Its Context, and Conclusions

The menat was obtained on the art market, and its original findspot is unknown. Pinch cites menats inscribed for rulers of the early Eighteenth Dynasty, starting with Amenhotep I, as coming from Deir el-Bahri and Serabit el-Khadim. The fragment is broken through the name of Hathor, so any following epithets are not preserved. She could have been Hathor hry tp w3bt, from Thebes, nbt mfkt, from Sinai, or nbt twnt, from Dendera (found on New Kingdom examples from Deir el-Bahri). The fragment here does not have the distinctive weathering, greenish surface, and brown surface encrustation typical of material from Serabit, but is consistent with material from Deir el-Bahri. One further point may hint that it came from Deir el-Bahri: the writing of Satjuti’s name in two columns within the cartouche. This format is otherwise unheard of in the early New Kingdom, but is vaguely reminiscent of the way in which some Middle Kingdom royal inscriptions—which would have been nearby at Deir el-Bahri—often have s3 ṭḥ written inside the cartouche, rather than atop it. Did this local orthographic peculiarity influence the unusual treatment of the cartouche on the menat?

---

13 PN I, 390.15; 395.21, 26.
14 I am grateful to Roland Enmarch for a discussion of this topic.
18 Pinch, Voice Offerings to Hathor, 270.
19 In this context, it is possible that the Satjuti fragment may have been sold at Christie’s London, Egyptian and Classical Antiquities, the property of the most honourable the Marchess of Dufferin and Ava, Monday May 31 1937, lot 26: “A blue faience menat 9 in. high; and eleven blue faience pieces of menat amulets, with black line designs, cartouches of Aahmes Nefertari, Amen Hetep and Thothmes I–1 ¼ in, to 4 ½ in. long – New Kingdom.” The First Marquess of Dufferin and Ava carried out excavations at Deir el-Bahri in 1859: M. Bierbrier, Who Was Who in Egyptology, 5th edition (London, 2019), 54.
20 Egyptian Museum JE 38655, stela of Senwosret III adoring Nebhepetre Mentuhotep with Senwosret’s full title written inside a single
An unprovenanced menat fragment, suggested to come from Deir el-Bahri, not cited by Pinch, carries the name of Ahmose Nefertari in a cartouche. The orientation of the iaH sign in this example, its horns turned down, indicates that it was made before the second half of the reign of Ahmose, when the crescent moon starts regularly to be written pointing upwards. It therefore extends the documented use of menats back before the reign of Amenhotep I. The lack of the iaH sign on Sattijutji's fragment removes the one concrete dating criterion available for the piece.

If Ahmose Sattijutji was, as suggested, an aunt or sister of Ahmose I, then a shrine of Hathor already existed at Deir el-Bahri where she could have dedicated offerings. The menat discussed here may have been among them. Gratifying though it may be to add another individual to the royal prosopography of the early New Kingdom, Ahmose Sattijutji's resurrection is likely to remain limited to her menat.

---

21 Munich ÄS 2929: Schoske, In Zeichen des Mondes, 94. Her title is missing.
22 C. Vandersleyen, Les guerres d'Amosis, fondateur de la XVIIIe Dynastie, MRE 1 (Brussels, 1971), 205–28; see also Ryholt, Political Situation, 187.