THE FUNERARY CONES OF MENKHEPERRESENEB AND DENREG AT THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL MUSEUM IN ZAGREB

Tomislav Kiš
Savska cesta 50
HR – 10360 Sesvete
kistomislav96@gmail.com

UDK / UDC: 069.5:904(32)
Stručni članak / Proffesional paper
10.52064/vamz.59.1.2

This study presents the first detailed analysis of the funerary cones of Menkheperreseneb and Denreg in the Egyptian Collection of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb. Despite their modest appearance, these objects provide valuable insight into funerary architectural practices and strategies of self-representation in New Kingdom Thebes. By examining their provenance, inscriptions and historical context, the study discusses the identity and status of their owners and highlights the significance of the cones preserved in Zagreb, which have so far received limited scholarly attention. In doing so, it contributes to the broader study of ancient Egyptian artefacts in the museum's collection.

Key words:
Ancient Egypt, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, Denreg, funerary cones, Menkheperreseneb, New Kingdom, Theban Necropolis

Introduction

Among the objects preserved in the Egyptian Collection of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb are two ancient Egyptian funerary cones. Although they may at first appear modest, these artefacts are of considerable significance, as their epigraphic character provides valuable historical and prosopographical information. To date, they have received only limited attention, being mentioned briefly in catalogue entries or short notes within studies of the Egyptian collection, while in the broader academic literature and compendia dealing with this class of objects they have been almost entirely overlooked. The aim of this paper is therefore to bring these two funerary cones into closer scholarly focus, continuing the more comprehensive recent practice of publishing detailed studies devoted to ancient Egyptian artefacts at the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb.[1] Within this framework, the cones will be examined in their broader geographical, chronological and historical contexts. Particular attention will be devoted to identifying their owners and, where possible, the tombs to which they originally belonged, as well as establishing a more precise dating.

Funerary Cones

Funerary cones are clay objects that served as decorative architectural elements of the tombs of officials at several sites in Upper Egypt and Nubia.[2] Their origins can be traced back to the late First Intermediate Period and the early Middle Kingdom, with the last examples dated as late as the 26th Dynasty, but most of the known objects of this type date to the New Kingdom and derive from the Theban necropolis. A defining feature of all New Kingdom and later variants is the presence of a usually circular stamped surface at the flat end, bearing the name of the tomb owner and his titles[3] or, more rarely, those of his family members. Owing to their epigraphic character, funerary cones preserve valuable biographical and prosopographical data and constitute an important source for dating tombs and reconstructing the social structure of Thebes during the New Kingdom. Moreover, they may attest to tombs that have not survived and assist in attributing preserved ones, although this potential is limited, since they are rarely found *in situ*, and their provenance is seldom recorded.

1 Uranić 1990; 1992; 1994; 1995; 1997; 2003; 2018; Meyrat 2003; 2014; Tomorad 2011; Toth, McClain 2012; Kiš 2022; Šćukanec Rezniček 2024.

2 Funerary cones have so far been discovered at Naga ed-Deir, Abydos, Dendera, Naqada, Thebes, Armant, Rizeiqat, Tod, Gebelein, Ed-Der, Kuban, Aniba, Abu Simbel and Tombos (Manniche 1988, 6–7; Dibley, Lipkin 2009, 6–7; Zenihiro 2009, 15–16).

3 Funerary cones of the First Intermediate Period and the Middle Kingdom do not feature stamps, which are characteristic of later periods. Stamps, although predominantly circular, also occasionally appear in square form.

These objects, of which more than 700 types are currently known, have received considerable attention in scholarly literature,[4] and there is therefore no need to address here in detail their specific features, morphological characteristics, or manufacturing processes. It should, however, be emphasized that there is a general consensus regarding their placement on the façades of private tomb chapels, where they formed an integral part of the overall decorative scheme. This is confirmed by archaeological reports,[5] as well as by the dotted patterns depicted on the walls of several tomb façades in paintings and papyri,[6] which likely represent this type of object. Numerous theories have been proposed to explain their function,[7] and it is reasonable to assume that they possessed a range of different connotations, much like many other features of ancient Egyptian funerary architecture and art. Apart from their undeniable decorative quality, it is also evident that cones functioned as instruments of self-representation, although the extent to which this role was effectively realized remains open to question, since their dimensions and placement in the upper parts of the tomb façade could hardly have allowed their inscriptions to be clearly visible to visitors. Nevertheless, they served as an additional means of preserving the name and titles of the deceased, thereby ensuring the eternal continuation of his existence in the afterlife.

Funerary Cones in the Egyptian Collection of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb

The only two funerary cones preserved in Croatian museum collections are housed in the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb.[8] They entered the museum in 1868, when the then National Museum acquired the collection of Austrian Field Marshal Franz Koller in Prague, which forms the nucleus of today's Egyptian Collection.[9] First published by Šime Ljubić in 1870, these objects were briefly described as "tomb seals" of prophets whose names he misread as "Ramencheper" and "Tenurukasetem".[10] They were not examined again in detail until 1970, when Janine Monnet Saleh included them in the comprehensive catalogue of the collection.[11] Although her treatment was brief, the descriptions, drawings and translations she provided remain the most detailed account of these artefacts prior to the present study. Monnet Saleh was also the first to attempt a more precise dating, assigning the seal of Menkheperreseneb to the reign of Thutmose III and that of Denreg to the broader period of the New Kingdom. They were subsequently included in the most recent catalogue of the collection, authored by Igor Uranić, where they appear within a single entry that provides a brief yet informative overview, accompanied by a photograph of the funerary cone of Denreg and a general attribution of both objects to the New Kingdom.[12]



FIGURE 1. Funerary Cone of Menkheperreseneb, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, inv. no. E-205, frontal view (photo by I. Krajcar).

Although the funerary cones in the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb belong to types well documented in the relevant compendia, these specimens were not explicitly listed in earlier publications on the subject. This omission was corrected only recently by Christoffer Theis, whose work sought to catalogue previously overlooked examples. However, he erroneously stated that the two cones are housed in the Archaeological Museum of Istria, located in Pula rather than Zagreb.[13] Subsequently, Kento Zenihiro, who had also omitted them from his earlier monograph, listed the objects on his website.[14] The history of research thus clearly demonstrates that the funerary cones at the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb have not yet received the detailed attention and contextualization they merit. The following discussion therefore aims to address this gap.

4 Funerary cones were already the subject of study by prominent figures in the early phases of Egyptological research (e.g. Schiaparelli 1884, 25–27; Mariette 1864, 145; Petrie 1888, 23–25; Daressy 1893; Borchardt, Könisgberger, Ricke 1934). The first systematic treatment is represented by the catalogue of de Garis Davies and Macadam (1957), followed by the compendia of Dibley and Lipkin (2009) and Zenihiro (2009), and the website developed by the latter (2026). More recent studies include Stewart 1986; Reeves, Ryan 1987; Manniche 1988, 3–12; Kondo 1992; Vivó, Costa 1995; 1998; Vivó 1997; 2002; 2019; 2022; Sukova 2004; Al-Thibi 2005; Kruck 2012; Theis 2017; Zenihiro 2017; 2023; Dorn *et al.* 2020; Aglan 2022; Barrios Mufrege 2023.

5 Rhind 1862, 136–137; Winlock 1928, 6–7, fig. 4–5; Reeves, Ryan 1987, 47–48.

6 Such depictions are attested in tombs TT 41, TT 49, TT 55, TT 78, TT 159, TT 178, TT 181, and A.21, as well as on papyri EA 10471/7, EA 10471/14 (British Museum) and N3068 (Louvre).

7 A detailed overview of previous interpretations is provided in: Zenihiro 2019.

8 Today they are kept in the Egyptian Collection of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb under inv. no. 205 and 206.

9 For more on Koller's collection, see Ljubić 1870; Monnet Saleh 1970; Rendić-Miočević 1986; Uranić 1996; 2005; 2007; Mirnik, Uranić 1999; Tomorad 2003, 19–27; 31–48; 2017, 52–65; 2020, 82–83; Šćukanec Rezniček 2015.

10 Ljubić 1870, 46, cat. no. 20–21.

11 Monnet Saleh 1970, 46, cat. no. 27–28.

12 Uranić 2007, 102, cat. no. 120.

13 Theis 2017, 3, 6.

14 Zenihiro 2019, cat. no. 45, 100.



FIGURE 2. Funerary Cone of Menkheperreseneb, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, inv. no. E-205, side view (photo by I. Krajcar).



FIGURE 3. Funerary Cone of Menkheperreseneb, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, inv. no. E-205, rear view (photo by I. Krajcar).

Funerary Cone of Menkheperreseneb

Funerary cone E-205 at the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (Figures 1–3) measures 23.5 cm in length.[15] Its body is dark greyish brown in colour (Munsell 10 Y 4/2), with an oval perforation near the tip of the tail, and is generally well preserved, although it exhibits mechanical damage in several areas. The circular stamped surface at the rounded end, still retaining traces of a thin red-ochre coating, bears hieroglyphs written from left to right in four vertical columns separated by dividing lines. This area is more heavily affected by damage, with the lower part of the leftmost column completely missing as a result of chipping, while the remaining text shows significant surface wear, particularly in the rightmost column, whose right edge is entirely abraded. As Monnet Saleh's drawing records damage only in the right-hand corner of the inscribed surface,[16] it is possible that part of the deterioration has occurred within the last fifty years, although this cannot be determined with certainty in the absence of comparable photographic documentation. Nevertheless, the drawing in question, the partial legibility of the inscription, and analogous objects from the well-known de Garis Davies and Macadam Type 100,[17] to which the cone belongs, allow for the following complete reading:

[18]

Transliteration: Wsir rpʿ ḥꜣtyʿ ḏtmty-bity ḥm-nṯr tpy n Imn Mn-ḫpr-Rʿ-snb mꜣʿ-ḥrw

Translation: Osiris, hereditary noble, mayor, seal-bearer of the king of Lower Egypt, first prophet of Amun, Menkheperreseneb, justified.

As the inscription reveals, the owner of this funerary cone is Menkheperreseneb,[19] whose name follows a formula incorporating a royal prenomen and the element *snb*,[20] attested from the Middle Kingdom and continuing into the New Kingdom. Such names were typically borne by high officials and served to emphasize their proximity to the sovereign, thereby expressing close ties to the royal court and loyalty to the reigning king, on whom their elevated position depended. In the case of Menkheperreseneb, the privileged status is further highlighted in the titulary inscribed on the cone. The titles "hereditary prince, mayor, and seal-bearer of the king of Lower Egypt" were reserved for the most senior officials of the state, while the additional title of "first prophet of Amun" identifies him as High Priest of that god. It is worth noting that Monnet Saleh and Theis, in their hieroglyphic copies of the inscription,[21] present a reversed arrangement of the signs *ḥm* and *tpy* compared to that attested on analogous published examples. The current state of preservation of the inscription does not allow a secure assessment of whether this reading reflects one of the rare instances of cones bearing nearly identical texts with slight variations, possibly resulting from the use of two different stamps,[22] or whether it represents a minor inaccuracy by the authors in

15 I would like to thank Porin Šćukanec Rezniček, curator of the Egyptian Collection, for providing information on the exact dimensions of the funerary cones at the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb. The dimensions of funerary cone E-205 had previously been reported inconsistently as 23.2 cm (Monnet Saleh 1970, 46, cat. no. 27) and 26 cm (Uranić 2007, 102, cat. no. 120).

16 Monnet Saleh 1970, 46, fig. 27.

17 Daressy 1893, no. 38 = De Garis Davies, Macadam 1957, no. 100 = Dibley, Lipkin 2009, no. 100. Cf. Eichler 2000, 279–280.

18 The hieroglyphic text was created using Jsesh (Rosmorduc 2014).

19 Ranke 1935, 150, no. 15.

20 'Menkheperre' was the prenomen (throne name) of Thutmose III.

21 Monnet Saleh 1970, 46, cat. no. 27; Theis 2017, 6.

22 Such a case has been noted by Guksch (1995, 24).



FIGURE 4. Sheikh ʿAbd el-Qurna, Theban necropolis (photo by T. Kiš).

question. Since Monnet Saleh already recorded damage to this part of the cone at the time of her publication, and no alternative versions of the object are known to the present author, the latter explanation appears more probable. The restitution given here therefore follows the reading attested in the published examples of the same type.

It was long assumed that the High Priest of Amun, Menkheperreseneb, was the owner of two tombs in the Theban necropolis: TT 86 and TT 112, both located in Sheikh ʿAbd el-Qurna (Figure 4). However, Peter Dorman has convincingly demonstrated, on the basis of genealogical data from these sepulchres, that two individuals bearing the same name successively held this office.[23] The first Menkheperreseneb, owner of TT 86,[24] was the son of Nakhtmin, a high official who held the title 'Overseer of the Granary', and of Nebetta, 'Sister of the King's Nurse'.[25] This indicates a strong connection with the royal family, within whose circle Menkheperreseneb himself was likely raised. Such proximity to the court is reflected in his very name and proved decisive for his rapid advancement to the position of High Priest of Amun. As was the case with many others who held this office, he bore a wide range of additional religious and secular titles that accompanied the position and underscored his elevated status,[26] while the scenes depicting Aegean emissaries bringing tribute in his tomb bear witness to Egypt's extensive foreign relations during the early New Kingdom and additionally emphasize Menkheperreseneb's prominent role within elite administrative and diplomatic milieus.

On the other hand, the Menkheperreseneb for whom TT 112 was prepared appears to have been the nephew of the aforementioned namesake and thus his successor in the office of High Priest of Amun. Dorman reached this conclusion by identifying Nebetta, the grandmother of the later Menkheperreseneb, as the mother of his probable predecessor.[27] Betsy M. Bryan, however, cautions against such a straightforward identification, pointing out that the name 'Nebetta' was relatively common at this time and could therefore refer to two different women.[28] She also emphasizes that the style of TT 112 suggests an earlier date of execution, which could indicate that the succession of the two Menkheperresenebs was in fact the reverse of that

23 Dorman 1994.

24 De Garis Davies, de Garis Davies 1933, 1–17; Porter, Moss 1994, 175–178.

25 De Garis Davies, de Garis Davies 1933, pl. 14; Bryan 2006, 108.

26 In addition to those recorded on the funerary cones, he also bore titles such as 'Superintendent of the Priests of Upper and Lower Egypt, Administrator of the Two Thrones of the God, Superintendent of the Advanced Offices, Superintendent of the Double Treasuries of Gold and Silver, Superintendent of the Temple of Thes-khau-Amun, set over the mysteries of the Two Goddesses'. Cf. Breasted 1906, 300-302; Dorman 1994, 152; Bryan 2006, 108; Wilkinson 2007, 160–162.

27 Dorman 1994, 150–154.

28 Bryan 2006, 108.

proposed by Dorman.[29] Regardless of how the relationship between the two is to be interpreted, it is evident that the second Menkheperreseneb was also closely connected to the royal court. His father, Hepu, served as Charioteer of His Majesty, and his mother, Taiunet, bore the prestigious title of 'Royal Nurse'.[30]

On the basis of the evidence discussed above, it is clear that one must exercise caution when attempting to determine which of the two High Priests of Amun named 'Menkheperreseneb' is referred to by the name appearing on sculptures, papyri and several types of funerary cone.[31] Conversely, the situation is different in the case of the de Garis Davies & Macadam Type 100, to which the example preserved in Zagreb belongs, since 185 such examples have been recorded from the area of TT 86.[32] To this must be added the fact that several funerary cones of the same type have documented findspots in the immediate vicinity of this tomb, situated on the opposite side of Sheikh ʿAbd el-Qurna (Figure 4) from the more distant TT 112. Most were recovered on the slope directly below TT 86,[33] precisely where such objects are often found, having slid down the hillside following the collapse or erosion of the tomb superstructures to which they originally belonged. This makes the cone of Menkheperreseneb one of the few artefacts from the Koller Collection for which a secure and precise provenance can be established.[34]

The owner of TT 86 is known to have held office towards the end of the reign of Thutmose III, and for this reason his cone in the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb may be attributed either to the reign of that pharaoh or, less likely, to the early years of his successor, Amenhotep II. Such a chronological placement accords with the available data on the corpus of funerary cones, since the majority of known examples are dated to the time of Thutmose III, with a significant number also belonging to the subsequent reign of Amenhotep II.[35] The highest concentration of funerary cones has been discovered at Sheikh ʿAbd el-Qurna,[36] where the cone of Menkheperreseneb at the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb would likewise have stood as part of the decorative program of one of the tombs.



FIGURE 5. Funerary Cone of Denreg, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb. inv. no. E-206, frontal view (photo by I. Krajcar).

Funerary Cone of Denreg

The second funerary cone in Zagreb is also a part of the Egyptian Collection of the Archaeological Museum, under inventory number E-206 (Figures 5–7). Measuring 24 cm in length,[37] it is in a very good state of preservation. It is handmade from fired Nile clay and has a reddish brown surface (Munsell 7.5YR 5/4). The rounded end bears a circular stamped area, which is deeply and entirely impressed, causing the surrounding clay to project slightly forward. This feature indicates that the craftsman paid greater attention to its production than is the case with some comparable published examples, where the impression is often off-centre.[38] The stamped surface is covered with a red pigment and contains a remarkably well-preserved inscription, on the basis of which the cone is classified as de Garis Davies & Macadam Type 45.[39] The text, written from left to right and arranged into four columns separated by vertical lines, reads as follows:

[40]

Transliteration: *imꜣḫy ḫr Wsir ḥry-wꜥb Dnrg mꜣʿ-ḫrw*

Translation: Revered one before Osiris, chief *wab* priest, Denreg justified

The owner's name is given by Monnet Saleh as 'Delga',[41] and similarly by Theis, who transliterates it as *Dlg*.[42] However, the

29 Bryan 2006, 108.

30 Dorman 1994, 153; Bryan 2006, 108.

31 For different spellings and attestations of the name on various monuments, see Persons and Names of the Middle Kingdom and Early New Kingdom, *s.v. mn-ḫpr-rʿ-snb*. Apart from the de Garis Davies & Macadam Type 100, the name 'Menkheperreseneb' also appears on funerary cones of Types 90, 388, and 493. It seems that the first and the last of these belong to the same individual, who was buried in TT 79 (cf. Zenihiro 2009, 76, 195), whereas Type 388 may have belonged either to the Menkheperreseneb of TT 79 or to the Menkheperreseneb of TT 86 *(cf.* Zenihiro 2009, 163).

32 Mond 1905, 65.

33 They have been recorded in TT 29 (Tefnin, Bavay 2008, 368), TT 46 (Redford 2010, 368), TT 87 (Guksch 1995, 120), and TT 99 (Strudwick, Strudwick 2016, 53).

34 The association of de Garis Davies and Macadam Type 100 with TT 86 has already been noted in: De Garis Davies, Macadam 1957, no. 100; Eichler 2000, 279–280; Dibley, Lipkin 2009, no. 100; Zenihiro 2009, no. 100; 2019, cat. no. 100.

35 Manniche 1988, 5–6; Zenihiro 2009, 19–22.

36 Zenihiro 2009, 15–19.

37 The dimensions of funerary cone E-206 were previously listed as 22.1 cm (Monnet Saleh 1970, 46, cat. no. 28) and 27 cm (Uranić 2007, 102, cat. no. 120).

38 See, for example, the cones Liverpool WM 1973.1.337; Vienna ÄS 1707; 6122 and MMA 15.2.55.

39 Daressy 1893, no. 60 = de Garis Davies, Macadam 1957, no. 45 = Dibley, Lipkin 2009, no. 45. *Cf.* Stewart 1986, 38, no. 41.

40 The hieroglyphic text was created using Jsesh (Rosmorduc 2014).

41 Monnet Saleh 1970, 46, cat. no. 28.

42 Theis 2017, 3.



FIGURE 6. Funerary Cone of Denreg, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb. inv. no. E-206, side view (photo by I. Krajcar).



FIGURE 7. Funerary Cone of Denreg, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb. inv. no. E-206, rear view (photo by I. Krajcar).

reading 'Denreg' is adopted here,[43] which is also the form most frequently attested in the relevant literature. This name, although relatively uncommon and spelled in several different ways, belongs to a group of personal names denoting physical characteristics of the bearer. In this case, it means 'deaf',[44] as further suggested by the determinative of the ear, which appears in most orthographic variants of the name, including the one preserved on the funerary cone in the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb. The presence of this determinative clearly indicates that the name is associated with concepts of hearing, auditory perception, or related notions.

The only title recorded on Denreg's cone is that of chief *wab* priest. On most funerary cones, where space for text is limited, only the most significant titles of the deceased were selected for inclusion. It therefore seems that *ḥry-wꜥb* was indeed the most important position held by Denreg, at least at the stage of his *cursus honorum* when the cones were produced. This title referred to higher-ranking officials who supervised the activities of the regular *wab* priests, responsible for the practical aspects of ritual performance, such as presenting offerings and assisting in other aspects of cult practice, including, for instance, carrying the sacred boat during oracles.[45] However, it remains uncertain to which specific cult of a divinity or a member of the royal family he was attached in the course of his career, since the inscriptions on his funerary cones do not provide this information, as is often the case with comparable examples within the same corpus. Furthermore, no additional titles are mentioned in Denreg's case, even though the designations '*wab* priest' or 'chief *wab* priest' were frequently combined with other civic and religious offices.

Considering the available evidence, it is therefore clear that very little can, in fact, be said with certainty about Denreg. This limited information also makes it difficult to associate the owner of the funerary cone kept in Zagreb, along with other examples of the same type, with the remaining objects or contexts in which this name appears.[46] Among these is the TT C6, located in the vicinity of TT 343 at Sheikh ʿAbd el-Qurna and dated to the reigns of Thutmose IV and Amenhotep III, where one of the sons of the tomb owner Ipy was a certain Denreg, attested as "overseer of prophets, first prophet, overseer of the house of Montu, lord of Armant".[47] Another example is a sandstone slab from Philadelphia,[48] probably part of a door jamb, on which a man of the same name is recorded as holding a position in the mortuary chapel of Amenhotep III. It is possible that in both cases the same individual was attested, since the recorded priestly titles are not incompatible.[49] Still, they could just as well refer to different men bearing the same name. In this context, Denreg's funerary cones, including the example in Zagreb, are of particular importance, as they provide some of the few surviving attestations to an individual about whom little else is known.

Denreg's tomb remains undiscovered or unidentified, and consequently the provenance of his funerary cone in the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb can only broadly be assigned to the western bank of Thebes. Ahmed Fakhry notes that five examples of the same type were unearthed in the courtyard of TT 276, the tomb of Amenhotep, at Qurnet Murai,[50] while Davies records in his notebook another example found in this part of the Theban necropolis.[51] This evidence may provide a general idea of the tomb's approximate location, but it is insufficient

43 Ranke 1935, 332, no. 27.

44 Wb V, 470. 2–3; Carridi 2025, 239. Dng is also attested as a term referring to persons with dwarfism, but in that case it is written with a different determinative (*cf.* Bergerot 2025, 179).

45 Doxey 2001, 69; Teeter 2011, 20–21.

46 For different spellings and attestations of the name on various monuments, see Persons and Names of the Middle Kingdom and Early New Kingdom, *s.v. dnrg*.

47 Manniche 1988, 126; Porter, Moss 1994, 458–459.

48 Block Philadelphia 39-12-5 (Penn Museum)

49 Manniche 1988, 126.

50 Fakhry 1937, 35.

for determining its precise position, since funerary cones, as previously mentioned, were commonly scattered following the destruction of tomb superstructures.

While the precise dating of the structure and its associated cones remains unclear, it is still possible to make several observations. The dating of monuments bearing Denreg's name, the priestly titles inscribed on them, and the characteristics of Denreg's funerary cones indicate that the latter should not be assigned to a period earlier than the reigns of Thutmose IV or Amenhotep III.[52] The frequent use of Qurnet Murai as a burial site for high officials at the end of the 18th Dynasty supports this conclusion, though it remained in use throughout the 19th Dynasty. Consequently, the beginning of the 19th Dynasty must also be considered within the possible chronological range, even if the cones are more likely to date to the latter half of the 18th Dynasty, given their greater prevalence during that period.

51 *Cf.* Zenihiro 2019, cat. no. 45.

52 Characteristic features of de Garis Davies & Macadam Type 45 cones, such as the use of dividers, the overall shape of the seal impression, and the inscribed religious content, serve as chronological criteria established by Kento Zenihiro (Zenihiro 2023) for dating funerary cones and the associated Theban tombs and support the proposed dating.

Conclusion

The funerary cones of Menkheperreseneb and Denreg, like other objects of the same class, offer an important source for studying the social, religious and administrative landscape of New Kingdom Thebes. Beyond their decorative and funerary function, these objects attest to the prominent positions of their owners within the Theban priesthood and shed light on the mechanisms of self-representation and commemoration in the funerary sphere. Observations regarding their provenance further contribute to understanding the history and formation of the Egyptian Collection of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, where they are preserved as the only examples of this category of artefacts in Croatian museum collections. On the other hand, their examination demonstrates how even seemingly modest objects, when carefully analysed, can shed light on broader historical, social and religious dynamics in ancient Egypt. By drawing attention to them, the present paper underscores their individual significance and reinforces the importance of systematically studying museum holdings within both national and international Egyptological research.

SAŽETAK

POGREBNI STOŠCI MENKHEPERRESENEBA I DENREGA IZ ARHEOLOŠKOG MUZEJA U ZAGREBU

Ovaj rad donosi prvu sustavnu obradu pogrebnih stožaca Menkheperreseneba i Denrega iz Egipatske zbirke Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu. Riječ je o dekorativnim elementima nadzemnih dijelova grobnica s izraženim ornamentalnim i epigrafskim karakterom, koji, unatoč naizgled skromnom izgledu, pružaju vrijedne biografske i prozopografske podatke o njihovim vlasnicima te stoga predstavljaju važan izvor za razumijevanje pogrebnih arhitektonskih praksi, društvene hijerarhije, religijskih obrazaca i administrativnog ustroja tebanskoga društva tijekom Novog kraljevstva. Analizom provenijencije, natpisa i šireg povijesnog konteksta ovih predmeta razmatra se identitet i društveni status Menkheperreseneba i Denrega, pri čemu se ukazuje na njihov istaknuti položaj unutar svećeničke hijerarhije u Tebi. Detaljna analiza zagrebačkih primjeraka staroegipatskih pogrebnih čunjeva usto po prvi puta konkretnije naglašava njihovu ulogu u strategijama samoprezentacije i komemoracije unutar pogrebnog konteksta, dok iznesena zapažanja o njihovoj provenijenciji pridonose proučavanju procesa formiranja Egipatske zbirke Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu.

ABBREVIATIONS

Wb – A. Erman, H. Grapow (eds), *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*, Akademie-Verlag, 1926–1963.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aglan 2022 – H. Aglan, Unknown Funerary cones From Central Dra' Abu el-Naga (CDAN), *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 45, 2022, 73–82.

Al-Thibi 2005 – M. Al-Thibi, *Aspects of Egyptian funerary cones*, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Liverpool, 2005.

Barrios Mufrege 2023 – J. M. Barrios Mufrege, A Funerary Cone of Ray on the Upper Terrace of TT 209, *Trabajos de Egiptología* 14, 2023, 1–16.

Bergerot 2025 – L., Bergerot, Bes or the Offense of Physiognomy in Egyptology, in Morris, A. F., Vogel, H. (eds.), *Disability in Ancient Egypt and Egyptology; All Our Yesterdays*, Routledge, 2025, 172–188.

Borchardt, Königsberger, Ricke 1934 – L. Borchardt, O. Königsberger, H. Ricke, Friesziegel in Grabbauten, *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 70, 1934, 25–35.

Breasted 1906 – J. H. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt; Historical Documents from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest. Volume II. The Eighteenth Dynasty*, University of Illinois Press, 1906.

Bryan 2006 – B. M. Bryan, Administration in the Reign of Thutmose III, in Cline, E. H., O'Connor, D. B. (eds.), *Thutmose III: A New Biography*, The University of Michigan Press, 2006, 69–122.

Cariddi 2025 – I. Cariddi, On Deafness in Ancient Egyptian Literary and Paraliterary Texts, in Morris, A. F., Vogel, H. (eds.), *Disability in Ancient Egypt and Egyptology; All Our Yesterdays*, Routledge, 2025, 239–256.

Daressy 1893 – G. Daressy, Recueil de cones funéraires, *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire* 8, 1893, 269–352.

De Garis Davies, de Garis Davies 1933 – N. de Garis Davies, N. de Garis Davies, *The Tombs of Menkheperrasonb, Amenmosĕ and Another (Nos. 86, 112, 42, 226)*, Egypt Exploration Society, 1933.

De Garis Davies, Macadam 1957 – N. de Garis Davies, M. F. L. Macadam, *A Corpus of Inscribed Egyptian Funerary Cones*, Griffith Institute, 1957.

Dibley, Lipkin 2009 – G. Dibley, B. Lipkin, *A Compendium of Egyptian Funerary Cones*, Bron Lipkin & Gary Dibley, 2009.

Dorman 1994 – P. Dorman, Two Tombs and One Owner, in Assmann, J., Dziobek, E., Guksch, H., Kampp, F. (eds.), *Thebanische Beamtennekropolen*. Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altägyptens 12, Heidelberger Orientverlag, 1994, 141–154.

Dorn *et al.* 2020 – A. Dorn, L. Werkström, A. Noren, E. Trossvik, I. Kingo, E. L. Karlsson, B. Edhlund, D. A. Andersson, L. Velling, Funerary Cones kept at the Museum Gustavianum, the Uppsala University collection, *Göttinger Miszellen* 262, 2020, 117–132.

Doxey 2001 – D. M. Doxey, Priesthood, in Redford, D. B. (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt, vol. 3*, Oxford University Press, 2001, 68–73.

Eichler 2000 – S. S. Eichler, *Die Verwaltung des „Hauses des Amun« in der 18. Dynastie"*, Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur, Beihefte 7, Buske, 2000.

Fakhry 1937 – A. Fakhry, Miscellanea, *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 37, 1937, 25–54.

Guksch 1995 - H. Guksch, *Die Gräber des Nacht-Min und des Men-cheper-Raseneb, Theben Nr. 87 und 79*, Philipp von Zabern, 1995.

Kiš 2022 – T. Kiš, Staroegipatska lopatičasta lutka iz Arheološkoga muzeja u Zagrebu / Ancient Egyptian paddle doll from the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu* 39 (2), 2022, 5–19.

Kondo 1992 – J. Kondo, Inscribed funerary cones from Dra' abu al-Naga', *Orient* 23, 1992, 111–123.

Kruck 2012 – E. Kruck, *Dra' Abu el-Naga I Eindrücke: Grabkegel als Elemente thebanischer Grabarchitektur*, Archäologische Veröffentlichungen 124, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012.

Ljubić 1870 – Š. Ljubić, Kollerova egjipatska sbirka, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 1, 1870, 29–54.

Manniche 1988 – L. Manniche, *Lost Tombs: A Study of Certain Eighteenth Dynasty Monuments in the Theban Necropolis*, KPI, 1988.

Mariette 1864 – A. Mariette, *Notice des principaux monuments exposés dans les galeries provisoires du Musée d'Antiquités Égyptiennes de S. A. le vice-roi à Boulaq*, Impr. de Mourès, Rey et Cie, 1864.

Meyrat 2003 – P. Meyrat, Papirus Zagreb 603, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 36, 2003, 181–190.

Meyrat 2014 – P. Meyrat, The First Column of the Apis Embalming Ritual. Papyrus Zagreb 597-2, in Quack, J. F. (ed.*), Ägyptische Rituale der griechisch-römischen Zeit*, Mohr Siebeck, 2014, 263–337.

Mirnik, Uranić 1999 – I. Mirnik, I. Uranić, Geneza Kollerove egipatske zbirke Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, in Balabanić J., Krizmanić K., Vuković M. (eds.), *Naš museum, Zbornik radova sa Znanstvenog skupa održanog prigodom proslave 150 godina od utemeljenja hrvatskoga Narodnog muzeja u Zagrebu (1846– 1996), Zagreb, 12–14. studenoga 1996*, Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, Hrvatski povijesni muzej, Hrvatski prirodoslovni muzej, 1999, 197–210.

Mond 1905 – R. Mond, Report of Work in the Necropolis of Thebes during the Winter of 1903–1904, *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 6, 1905, 65–96.

Monnet Saleh 1970 – J. Monnet Saleh, *Les antiquités égyptiennes de Zagreb. Catalogue raisonné des antiquités égyptiennes conservées au Musée Archéologique de Zagreb en Yougoslavie*, Mouton, 1970.

Persons and Names of the Middle Kingdom and Early New Kingdom 2025, s.v. *dnrg – Persons and Names of the Middle Kingdom and Early New Kingdom*, 2025, https://pnm.uni-mainz.de/5/name/7034 (25 February 2026).

Persons and Names of the Middle Kingdom and Early New Kingdom 2025, s.v. *mn-ḫpr-rʿ-snb – Persons and Names of the Middle Kingdom and Early New Kingdom*, 2025, https://pnm.uni-mainz.de/5/name/6250 (25 February 2026).

Petrie 1888 – W. M. F. Petrie, *A season in Egypt 1887*, Trübner & co, 1888.

Porter, Moss 1994 – B. Porter, R. L. B. Moss, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Statues, Reliefs and Painting Volume I: The Theban Necropolis, part 1 - Private Tombs. 2nd ed. 1*, Griffith Institute/ Ashmolean Museum Oxford, 1994.

Ranke 1935 – H. Ranke, *Die Ägegyptischen Personennamen: Band I: Verzeichnis der Namen vol. I*, J. J. Augustin, 1935.

Redford 2010 – S. Redford, Report on two seasons of fieldwork in Theban tomb #46, *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 84, 2010, 363–383.

Rendić-Miočević 1986 – A. Rendić-Miočević, *Egipatska zbirka Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, Katalog 24, Arheološki muzej Istre, 1986.

Reeves, Ryan 1987 – N. C. Reeves, D. P. Ryan, Inscribed Egyptian Funerary Cones In Situ: An Early Observation by Henry Salt, *Varia Egyptiaca* 3(1), 1987, 47–49.

Rhind 1862 – A. H. Rhind, *Thebes, its Tombs and their Tenants Ancient and Present, Including a Record of Excavations in the Necropolis*, Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862.

Rosmorduc 2014 – S. Rosmorduc, *JSesh Documentation*, 2014, https://jseshdoc.qenherkhopeshef.org/ (25 February 2026).

Schiaparelli 1884 – E. Schiaparelli, *Il significato simbolico delle Piramidi Egiziane*, E. Loescher, 1884.

Stewart 1986 – H. M. Stewart, *Mummy-cases and Inscribed Funerary Cones in the Petrie Collection*, Aris & Phillips Limited, 1986.

Strudwick, Strudwick 2016 – N. Strudwick, H. Strudwick, The tomb, its architecture and history, in Strudwick, N. (eds.), *The Tomb of Pharaoh's Chancellor Senneferi at Thebes (TT99)*, Oxbow Books, 2016, 45–83.

Sukova 2004 – L. Sukova, Funerary Cones in the Czech Republic, *Annals of the Náprstek Museum* 25, 2004, 92–98.

Šćukanec Rezniček 2015 – P. Šćukanec Rezniček, The Egyptian Collection in the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb: History and Research, in Tomorad, M. (ed.), *A History of Research into Ancient Egyptian Culture conducted in Southeast Europe*, Archaeopress Egyptology 8, Archaeopress, 2015, 85–91.

Šćukanec Rezniček 2024 – P. Šćukanec Rezniček, Gold Amulets from the Egyptian Collection in the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 57(2), 2024, 143–156.

Teeter 2011 – E. Teeter, *Religion and Ritual in Ancient Egypt*, Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Tefnin, Bavay 2008 – R. Tefnin, L. Bavay, Study of the Funerary Cone, in Tefnin, R. (ed.), *Report on the eighth season of excavation and conservation in the Theban tombs of Amenemope TT 29 and Sennefer TT 96A in Sheikh abd el-Qurna (January 2 – February 19, 2006)*, Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte, 2006, 343–369.

Theis 2017 – C. Theis, Egyptian Funerary Cones from Various Auctions and Collections, *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology* 14(1), 2017, 1–25.

Tomorad 2003 – M. Tomorad, *Egipat u Hrvatskoj. Egipatske starine u hrvatskoj znanosti i kulturi*, Barbat, 2003.

Tomorad 2011 – M. Tomorad, Shabtis from the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (Croatia): A Typological Study, *Advances in Egyptology* 2, 2011, 109–134.

Tomorad 2017 – M. Tomorad, *Staroegipatska civilizacija. II: Uvod u egiptološke studije*, Hrvatski studiji, 2017.

Tomorad 2020 – M. Tomorad, *Egipat u Hrvatskoj: hrvatska fascinacija staroegipatskom kulturom*, Hrvatski studiji, 2020.

Toth, McClain 2012 – G. Toth, M. McClain, The stela of Qema-Mar and his household, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 42, 2012, 553–563.

Uranić 1990 – I. Uranić, Pogrebna stela Min-Nakhta u Arheološkom muzeju u Zagrebu, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, 23, 1990, 183–190.

Uranić 1992 – I. Uranić, Prilozi o skarabejima srca u Arheološkome muzeju u Zagrebu, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, 24–25, 1992, 249–262.

Uranić 1994 – I. Uranić, Sarkofag i kartonaža Kaipamau, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 26–28, 1994, 145–156.

Uranić 1995 – I. Uranić, Egipatska skulptura u Arheološkom muzeju u Zagrebu, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 28–29, 1995, 229–252.

Uranić 1996 – I. Uranić, Egipatska zbirka, in Balen-Letunić D., Dukat Z. (eds.), *Muzeopis... 1846-1996*, Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, 1996, 89–95.

Uranić 1997 – I. Uranić, Akvizicija zbirke skarabeja i skaraboida Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 30-31, 1997, 273–280.

Uranić 2003 – I. Uranić, Sedam brončanih kipova Harpokrata, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 36, 2003, 191–203.

Uranić 2005 – I. Uranić, *Egipatska zbirka. Vodič*, Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, 2005.

Uranić 2007 – I. Uranić, *Aegyptiaca Zagrabiensia*, Katalozi i monografije Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu 4, Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, 2007.

Uranić 2018 – I. Uranić, The Book of the Amduat on Papyrus Zagreb E–605, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 51, 2018, 55–66.

Vivó 1997 – J. Vivó, Two Amenemhet Funerary Cones, *Le Bulletin de la Société d'Égyptologie* 21, 1997, 81–83.

Vivó 2002 – J. Vivó, Notes sobre els cons funeraris egipcis, *Nilus* 11, 2002, 5–30.

Vivó 2019 – J. Vivó, Alguns cons funeraris no vistos per Davies i Macadam: Cons funeraris (amb molta probabilitat) inexistents (2ª part), *Nilus* 28, 2019, 31–46.

Vivó 2022 – J. Vivó, *Cons Funeraris Egipcis. Testimonis oblidats de la necròpolis tebana (Quaderns de la Societat Catalana d´Egiptologia 3)*, Societat Catalana d'Egiptologia, 2022.

Vivó, Costa 1995 – J. Vivó, S. Costa, A «new» funerary cone in the Bolton Museum, *Le Bulletin de la Société d'Égyptologie* 19, 1995, 97–100.

Vivó, Costa 1998 – J. Vivó, S. Costa, Funerary cones Unattested in the Corpus of Davies and Macadam (Annex I), *Le Bulletin de la Société d'Égyptologie* 22, 1998, 59–72.

Wilkinson 2007 – T. Wilkinson, *Lives of the Ancient Egyptians*, Thames & Hudson, 2007.

Winlock 1928 – H. E. Winlock, The Egyptian Expedition 1925-1927: The Museum's Excavations at Thebes, *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* Vol. 23, No. 2, Part 2, 1928, 3–58.

Zenihiro 2009 – K. Zenihiro, *The Complete Funerary Cones*, self-published, 2009.

Zenihiro 2017 – K. Zenihiro, The Career of Nakhtmin (TT 87) as Revealed by his Funerary Cones, in Rosati, G., Guidotti, M. C. (eds.), *Proceedings of the XI International Congress of Egyptologists, Florence, Italy 23-30 August 2015*, Archaeopress Egyptology 19, Archaeopress, 2017, 686–692.

Zenihiro 2019 – *The World of Funerary Cones and Stamped Bricks*, 2019, https://sites.google.com/view/funerarycones/home?authuser=0 (21 February 2026).

Zenihiro 2023 – K. Zenihiro, Funerary Cones as Tools for Dating Theban Tombs, in El-Aguizy, O., Kasparian, B. (eds.), *Proceedings of the XII International Congress of Egyptologists, 3rd–8th November 2019, Cairo, Egypt*, Institut Français D'Archéologie orientale, 2023, 687–695.