

Review of a BA Thesis

Supervisor

Reviewer

Author of the thesis: Mgr. Anna Chejnová	
Title of the thesis: Ritual offerings of honey in temples of the Ptolemaic and Roman Era (Rituální obětiny medu v chrámech Ptolemaiovské a pozdější Římské doby)	
Number of pages: 83 pages in total, including: 71 pages of text, 8 pages of bibliography, 4 pages of tables	
The review author: Assoc. Prof. Filip Coppens, Ph.D., Czech Institute of Egyptology, FF UK	

Brief evaluation of the thesis:

(The selected subject, the structure of the thesis, the author's argumentation and critical assessment of the subject)

The topic of the paper, *Ritual offerings of honey in temples of the Ptolemaic and Roman Era*, and related issues and questions are clearly defined in the introduction and methodological chapter of the volume. The subject is moreover appropriately positioned within its historical context as well as in the context of previous research.

The author presents, throughout the study, her thoughts in a clear and logical manner, making her line of reasoning easy to follow. The argumentation is moreover for the most part supported by appropriate and detailed evidence, although occasionally compilation works, such as encyclopedias or general overviews, predominate as the main reference source.

Overall the study clearly indicates that the author is capable of working in a scientific and critical manner with historical documents as well as modern research and publications.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/excellent"**.

I. Formal criteria

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Sufficient	Insufficient
Scientific aspect of the thesis					
Unified form of references, bibliography and notes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sufficient referencing to other scholars' works (suitable scientific practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Formal aspect of the thesis					
Structure of the thesis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarity of form (Table of contents, division of chapters, etc.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Captions to figures and tables	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Language					
Clarity and comprehensibility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Orthography, grammar, diacritics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scholarly terminology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Form and visual aspect					
Layout, font size	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Selection and quality of figures, tables and graphs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Commentary on the formal aspects of the thesis:

The study is organised in a comprehensible manner, with individual chapters and subchapters marked coherently. The layout of the entire volume is clear-cut. The paper is written in a clear style, making it easy for the reader to follow the argumentation of the author and concomitantly unnecessary to reread passages several times.

Throughout the author demonstrates good knowledge of the specific terminology associated with the topic of research. Compilation works, such as encyclopedias or general overviews, at times predominate as the main reference source in some subchapters, but the author elsewhere shows the ability to find and refer to more detailed studies of very specific topics.

The bibliography and the reference system are used according to expected standards, but some studies referred to in the main body of the text are absent in the bibliography. This is for instance the case of S. Cauville, *Dendara. Le Temple d'Isis I. Traduction*, OLA 178, Leuven: Peeters 2009, and S. Cauville, *Dendara. Le Temple d'Isis II. Analyse à la lumière du temple d'Hathor*, OLA 179, Leuven: Peeters 2009 (e.g. mentioned on pages 56 and 59).

In the bibliography itself, publications by individual authors are not always organised chronologically – as is the case with Sylvie Cauville on page 77 – or occur twice (e.g. Janák on page 79).

The text contains some lapses in the orthography as well as 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. One can for instance mention the following examples of minor oversights in text and layout:

- At the very outset, “Obsah” should be “Table of contents”
- The author commonly uses ‘’ although “ ” also occurs (e.g. page 1).
- The numbering for figures 2 and 3 (page 5) should be reversed.
- The transliteration font was not always correctly applied. This is most obvious in Table 1, but also on other occasions throughout the text (e.g. footnote 85 on page 19).

II. Subject matter

	Excellent	Very good	Good	Sufficient	Insufficient
Structure of the thesis					
Overview of previous studies on the subject (and theoretical background)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Logical interconnections within the structure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarity of argumentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Work with literature					
Selection of scholarly literature on the subject	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Using relevant literature in argumentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Critical assessment of the literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Methodology					
Formulations of questions and hypotheses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Selection of sources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transparency of the criteria for the selection of sources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Acknowledgment of the limits of the study of the sources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Results					
Clarity of the hypotheses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reasoning of the hypotheses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Integration into scholarly studies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Commentary on the subject matter:

The topic of the paper – ritual offerings of honey in temples of the Ptolemaic and Roman era – and the questions posed by the author on the theme are clearly established in the introduction (pages 1–2) and methodological chapter (pages 12–15). The author has managed to organize the work in a logical manner, keeping track of her main research questions. As a result, the paper represents a unified text with plain argumentation supported by appropriate evidence and source material.

While the core of the paper focuses on the presentation of honey to deities during the very last stage of temple development in ancient Egypt – the Ptolemaic and Roman period – the author did well to open with a detailed historical overview of the various uses and meaning of honey throughout the entire history of ancient Egypt (pages 3–11). The overview touches upon a variety of aspects associated with honey, ranging from its uses in food preparation, mummification, and medicine, but also its mythological background, without which it would be much harder to fully comprehend the occurrence of certain motives in the decorative program of Ptolemaic and Roman times.

The central part of the thesis is subsequently formed by the presentation, description and analysis of all currently known scenes that depict the offering of honey, occasionally in combination with other products such as bread or figs, from king to deities in temples of the Ptolemaic and Roman era (pages 16–66). The author has presented each of the twelve scenes at the very core of her research in a very systematic and clear-cut manner. The scene's specific location within the temple is plainly marked and an image (drawing or photograph) of the relief is provided, together with information on previous studies and translations of text and image. All important elements of the individual scene are described in detail, covering the offering itself, as well as a detailed description of the provider-king and the divine recipient(s).

The author is to be commended for including valuable information on each particular space, ranging from halls and chapels to doorways, in which the scenes occur, as it provides additional information on the specific nature and function of these scenes (which never function on their own, but as part of a larger space, where they interact with other scenes). This information is of importance to better understand the character of the honey offerings within a temple context, as is clearly demonstrated by the author in the conclusion to the work (pages 67–71) and associated tables, where she combines the gained information from text, image and space – but also the aforementioned historical background – to provide an insight into the meaning and reason for the occurrence of these offerings upon temple walls in the Ptolemaic and Roman era.

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/excellent”**.

Final result: ¹ výborně/excellent (1)

Assoc. Prof. PhDr. Filip Coppens, Ph.D.

Czech Institute of Egyptology

Faculty of Arts

Charles University

01.09.2023

¹ Excellent – Very good – Good – Insufficient