Posudek: Bakalářská práce

☒ vedoucí práce   ☐ oponent

Autor: **Julie Prokopová**	Číslo studenta:
Název práce: ***Hrobka Petosirida v Tuna el-Gebel. Studie egyptských a řeckých aspektů dekorativního programu hrobky*** (*The Tomb of Petosiris at Tuna el-Gebel. A study of Egyptian and Greek aspects of the tomb's decorative program*)	
Rozsah: 84 stran celkem, z toho: 66 stran textu, 12 stran bibliografie, 0 stran příloh	
Posudek vypracoval: Doc. PhDr. Filip Coppens, Ph.D. (vedoucí práce)	

Stručné souhrnné hodnocení práce
(Téma, členění, logická návaznost myšlenek a/nebo argumentace, kritický přístup k předmětu práce)

The topic of the paper, an analysis of the Egyptian, Greek and – to a lesser degree – Persian iconographic elements of the decorative program of Petosiris' tomb in Tuna el-Gebel, and related issues (e.g the plausible motivations of an Egyptian high priest of Thoth to include an amalgamation of iconographic elements from different cultures within the superstructure of his tomb) are clearly defined in the introduction. The subject is appropriately positioned within in its historical and topographical context, as well as in the context of previous research.

Throughout the work, the author presents a unified and lucid text in support of the central theme. The argumentation is clear and logical and supported by appropriate evidence. Noteworthy is the fact that the author in her analysis of individual scenes included not only evidence from a funerary context but also crucial information provided by Greek painted vases.

Overall the study indicates that the author is capable of working in a scientific and critical manner with historical documents as well as modern research and publications. The study conforms, both in form and content, to all requirements of a BA paper. As such I would recommend that the study should be accepted for defence in front of the appropriate committee and rated as "**výborně**".

I. Formální kritéria

	výborně	velmi dobře	dobře	dostatečně	nedostatečně
Vědecký aparát					
Jednotnost citací, bibliografie a poznámkového aparátu	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Citování použitých cizích myšlenek (dobrá vědecká praxe)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Formální stavba práce					
Obsahové členění	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Formální členění (Obsah, nadpisy apod.)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Popisky k tabulkám a obrázkům	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Jazyk					
Stručnost a srozumitelnost	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ortografie, gramatika, diakritika	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Odborná terminologie	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Vzhled a přehlednost					
Layout, písmo	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Výběr a kvalita obrázků a dalších příloh (včetně tabulek a grafů)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Komentář k formální stránce práce

The paper is organized in a comprehensible manner, with individual chapters and sub-chapters marked in a coherent and logical way. The format and layout of the text leave nothing to be desired. The method of referencing, in both footnotes and bibliography, is likewise clear-cut and citations are rendered according to the expected format. Illustrations have been chosen appropriately to accompany the text.

The paper is written in a lucid and straightforward style, making it easy for the reader to follow the argumentation and train of thought of the author, without having the need to reread passages several times. The author demonstrates throughout the paper good knowledge of the specific terminology associated with the topic of study.

The main body of the text as well as the bibliography contain some misspellings, but they are limited in number and do not detract from the overall quality of the paper or interfere with the communication of ideas. For example, in footnotes (pages 9-10) and bibliography (page 82) the author continuously refers to the author Tyldesley as Tyldelsley.

II. Obsahové hodnocení

	Výborně	velmi dobře	dobře	dostatečně	nedostatečně
Struktura a členění práce					
Přehled předchozího bádání (popř. teoretické pozadí)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Logická struktura textu a jeho prvázanost	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Preciznost argumentace	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Práce s literaturou					
Rešerše a výběr odborné literatury	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Zohlednění relevantní literatury v argumentaci	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Kritické zhodnocení odborné literatury	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Metodologie					
Formulace otázek a hypotéz	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Výběr pramenů	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Transparentnost kritérií výběru pramenů	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Přiznání možností a hranic práce s materiálem	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Výsledky					
Jasná stavba hypotéz	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Zdůvodnění hypotéz	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Začlenění do stavu bádání	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Komentář k obsahovému hodnocení

The topic of the paper and the questions posed by the author on the theme are clearly defined in the introduction. The author has managed to organize the work in a very logical manner, always keeping track of the main research questions. As a result, the paper represents a unified text with lucid argumentation supported by apt and comprehensive evidence and source material.

In the introduction to the paper (pages 7-8), the author clearly indicates the aims and research questions of her study into the iconographic program of the tomb: an investigation of specific reliefs that are a clear amalgamation of (decorative) elements from different cultural backgrounds (combining Greek and Egyptian, and occasionally also Persian, iconographic details), as well as a query into the motivation that led to the introduction of non-Egyptian themes into the decorative program of the tomb of an ancient Egyptian high priest of Thoth. In light of this, the author's focus is first and foremost on scenes from the tomb's pronaos rather than the naos, as the latter is almost exclusively Egyptian in style, with very little external influences.

Before delving into the description and analysis of individual scenes, the author provides a series of brief chapters (pages 9–18) that place the tomb of Petosiris in its larger historical, topographical and cultural context. This includes a detailed description of the site of Tuna el-Gebel, an overview of previous research on site (not limited to the tomb itself, but focusing on the entire necropolis), an introduction to the tomb owner and a general description of the super- and substructure of his tomb. An overall historical background, from the very end of Saite Egypt and the first Persian period (Twenty-sixth and Twenty-seventh Dynasty) to the arrival of Alexander III and early Macedonian rule over Egypt, is likewise provided, next to a brief overview of Greek (cultural) presence in Egypt since the seventh century BC.

The main part of the BA paper (pages 18–68) concerns the description and analysis of selected scenes from the pronaos (and a single scene from the naos) of the superstructure of the tomb. For each scene, the author provides, in a very systematic manner, a detailed description with a specific eye for typical Egyptian and Greek (and occasionally Persian) iconographic elements. The characteristic Egyptian aspects of each scene are placed in context, while parallels to earlier, similar scenes are always provided. The author, for the most part, worked with equivalents from New Kingdom tombs, especially from the Theban region, but tombs from the necropolis at e.g. el-Kab, Memphis or (nearby) Amarna are also included.

The main Greek aspects in the iconography of the analysed scenes consist of the frequent occurrence of typical Greek clothing (e.g. *chiton*, *himation*, *exomis*, and *peplos*) or its complete absence (full nudity), as well as hairstyles and the presence of beards and/or wrinkles. The author provides counterparts from decorated Greek vessels with similar characteristics; a source of comparative material all too often overlooked in similar studies. A possible avenue that the author might still have considered would be an investigation of the specific types of vessels that occur on these reliefs, especially in processions, and

whether it would be possible to establish their Greek or Egyptian origin. The latter was for instance obvious when a *rhyton* was depicted on more than one occasion, indicating a clear Persian iconographic element within the decorative program.

On various occasions, the author was able to improve or amend the original description of individual scenes by Gustave Lefebvre. This includes both the identification of clothing worn by Petosiris or others, but also, based on the characteristic shape of their horns, various antelopes (specifically oryx and gazelle) and goat (ibex) species in processional scenes.

In the conclusion of the BA paper (pages 69–72), the author provides an overview of the main results of the research – clearly indicating the typical Egyptian, Greek and Persian iconographic elements within the scenes analysed as well as possible sources of origin, but also discussing possible reasons that motivated Petosiris, a high priest of Thoth, to include iconographic elements from three distinct cultures in the decorative program of his tomb. The author clearly demonstrates that the combination of iconographic details from various cultures is almost exclusively limited to reliefs depicting scenes of daily life, while traditional ancient Egyptian motives are used continuously in cultic scenes, and reliefs dealing with the deceased reaching the afterlife. An extensive bibliography (12 pages) concludes the paper.

Overall the study clearly indicates that the author is capable of working in a scientific and critical manner with historical documents as well as modern research and publications. The study conforms, both in form and content, to all requirements for an excellent BA paper. As such I would recommend that the study should be accepted for defence in front of the appropriate committee and rated as "**výborně**".

Hodnocení: [1] **výborně**

Doc. PhDr. Filip Coppens, Ph.D.
Czech Institute of Egyptology
Faculty of Arts
Charles University   02.06.2023

---

[1] Škála: výborně – velmi dobře – dobře – neprospěl