



FACULTY OF ARTS  
Charles University

## Report on defence of dissertation thesis

Academic year: 2023/2024

**Student's name and surname:** Giacomo Cavillier  
**Student's ID:** 29588423

**Type of the study programme:** doctoral  
**Study programme:** History  
**Branch of study:** Egyptology  
**Study ID:** 585041

**Title of the thesis:** THE "CLIFF TOMBS" IN THE THEBAN NECROPOLIS: STUDY OF A FUNERARY STRUCTURE IN THE XVIII DYNASTY  
**Thesis department:** Czech Institute of Egyptology (21-CEGU)  
**Language of the thesis:** English  
**Language of defence:** English  
**Supervisor:** prof. PhDr. Jana Mynářová, Ph.D.  
**Reviewer(s):** Antonio Morales

**Date of defence:** 09.09.2024    **Venue of defence:** Praha  
**Attempt:** regular

**Course of the examination:** Vzhledem k přítomnosti předsedy disciplinární komise FF UK Perušiče byla obhajoba zahájena v 11:10.

Předseda komise představil členy komise a proděkana pro vědu prof. V. Cvrčka.

Školitelka (Prof. PhDr. Jana Mynářová, Ph.D.) představila kandidáta a poreferovala o průběhu studia.

2018, Cliff Tombs at Thebes  
was fulfilling duties regularly  
due to COVID, traveling and works at Thebes interrupted, mostly continued online  
wide range of scholarly interest, many publications in Italian, limited reach

JAEI article commended  
Dissertation: work is mainly descriptive, analytical component missing, lacks initial question or clearly formulated hypothesis; many passages without proper citations  
Navrhované hodnocení: neprospěl (failed)

Student představil práci.  
hard research, works in Egypt from 2005, subject of thesis based on 20 years experience in Egypt  
funerary structures identified as a special kind of tomb during a short period of 18th Dynasty (Amenhotep I - Thutmosis III), no comprehensive publication of these structures until now

methodology: 5 years finding the paths of community of Deir el-Medina to reach parts of the necropolis (graffiti, traces of paths, geomorphology)  
System of paths to reach each sector of the necropolis  
Question of later reuse of the tombs (graffiti)  
Map of all graffiti, but some are no longer visible (recorded by Černý), identification of position of the scribe making these graffiti  
Maps of individual sections  
Documentation inside tombs not possible (no permission), difficult access to the tombs  
Selected bibliography based on the type of research  
Hatshepsut's tomb - selection of space  
visibility of the tombs, where they are visible from  
accessibility of the tombs and question where they are accessible from  
Thutmose III - change; typology of these tombs  
three tombs discovered in the thesis based on external features (only possibility, no entrance into tombs made)

Posudek oponenta (Antonio Morales)  
very complicated topic, lack of textual information, complex area and difficulties with field work  
valuable work in terms of field work  
connection of information from various tombs and paths, accumulation of data, some are published, some well enough (perhaps too much work done for too little information)  
connection with Middle Kingdom aspects, valuable, some ideas not well enough sustained  
the identification of some new shafts very interesting  
accumulation of data very interesting, but only in few occasions the author goes deeper into the topic, too immersed in description, not enough explanation  
E.g. the date when the type stop „due to some changes“ but not explained any further  
presentation of the new typology after Thutmose III would help understanding the development  
amount of data very interesting, but lack of analysis  
reiteration and repetition, problems with language  
chapter 1 the best - but it's not the core of the thesis, but it is still superficial, ideas mentioned but not explored in enough detail and referenced  
photos sometimes presented in the dissertation, and sometimes in the appendix  
a large overarching map would be very desirable  
connection of tombs from Deir el-Bahri with the original structures at Deir el-Bahari - the idea is a little forced. NK connected with MK, but not explained sufficiently. The positions of the tombs with respect to the temple of Mentuhotep II are problematic already, the thesis offers ideas, but they are not substantiated, previous similar work not referenced  
work in situ done, but satellite photos and other analyses were not done - not enough information on the path: ancient, modern, produced by modern excavators???  
bibliography - problem of the selection of bibliography, lot of things are missing, references to important works missing, especially when the works contradict the ideas of the thesis.  
geomorphological section also lacks references to several very important works  
A lot of work behind the thesis, ideas but not explored in detail, it lacks several important aspects  
The work is good enough to be considered, but much more could be done with it  
Turnitin gave 50% analogy, most came from the dissertation itself, some are not - self-plagiarism?

Navrhované hodnocení prospěl (passed)

Posudek oponenta (Prof. Loprieno Gnirs)

overall evaluation concludes that it is a comprehensive study covering all known tombs of the type, geological environment and details, the candidate adds only a limited amount of information the author fails making clear which information is his own and which has been published by others

analyses and conclusions are close to long published results, some are not referenced

The thesis misses number of relevant publication on the subject published over the past 10-15 years, most of the results of the thesis have already be noticed and published

scope of the work - stratigraphy, hydrology, rock falls and landslides and changing geomorphology are missing

relevance of MK culture, but not analysed enough

work shows aspects of intermediate stage, and lacks author's analyses and argumentation

Navrhované hodnocení neprospěl (failed)

Reakce studenta

- some studies / a lot of bibliography suggests things but does not give new data

not needed to put it thesis when you do not consider it

some publications did not give any new data, but only hypotheses, considered irrelevant

not enough data on the tombs, GC does his analysis on the planning of the tombs, based on field work / presence in Egypt (6 seasons)

problems of field work: no inspector wanted to go up the cliffs

can make a large overall map, but to have an idea of the entire

necropolis on a single map is not possible to do it in A4

Photos on graffiti are done by GC, some very difficult to find and reach, some graffiti were identified, but could no longer be read

Read some of the suggested bibliography, but did not include it, as they were not relevant

Unlike A. Loprieno Gnirs, GC had only days for the individual tombs, not months

Deir el-Bahri is not that important in the thesis, the focal point is: the external and internal features of the cliff tombs the paths — and

make basis for new research, as until now they were not identified agrees with all points of AM's review. Deir el-Bahri is interesting,

the Dra Abu en-Naga tombs could be connected with the DeB situation

Deir el-Medina - Deir el-Bahari - Dra Abu en-Naga string, linked to a funerary idea

sites connected by the high path

Dotazy

FC: Why not include the research that you are aware of?

GC: because I don't agree with him.

FC: the arguments against the publications should be in the thesis

GC: I do not include it, because I choose my bibliography, and I do not agree with him.

HV: a lot of effort and field work in the work; but was surprised by not including the work of those that he does not agree with — including and reacting to it would make the thesis much more accessible to the reader

AM: this is a problem

GC: Have you been on the site?

HV: no, but that's irrelevant

GC: the site is difficult to reach

HV: You are not answering the question

GC: some rock are crashing down, GC checked for them, did not find them, thus does not want to react until he makes sure that the rocks are or are not there. Now makes comparison with other sites that have the same situation; climbing is not possible

HV: The point is how GC proceeded in the argumentation, when he does not agree with something, he should argue it in the thesis

MB: cannot skip what you disagree with

-AM: Priority of field work is clear, that is material, descriptive. The field work and primary sources are very important, but then there are secondary sources, but even the work that one disagrees with has to be reacted to. It is previous work on the same topic. We need to record everything that we found, but the lack of the mention of secondary sources is very relevant. This way, it looks like some works were not consulted at all. It's not about agreeing/disagreeing or finding it relevant.

GC: core of the thesis is analysis of the site. Most publications do not give any new data, authors did not make excavations there. In order to react to some of the works, he would need to make his own field work on the site.

AM: This is all about data, but there are opinions, positions, views, which are very important, interpretations, and they all need to be discussed whether there is „new data“ or not. This is basically an obligation to include previous research, no matter what one thinks about it.

GC: Some of the works are very old, and he was there.

AM: Including these works and reaction to them would enrich the dissertation

GC: accepts the points about the bibliography, but intentionally selected bibliography; can include the information

HV: Fieldwork enormous and important, but PhD thesis is something else. Field work should be a tool in the beginning, not the whole PhD; that would need a step further; What is the next step after the basic field work?

GC: PhD research/thesis must be complete; discovery of three new tombs in the cliffs with the results of geomorphology that say that there are probably tombs — this is the result of the PhD, the research is starting; first tentative study of a phenomenon; the thesis is result of five years of field work

HV: Initially, the thesis should have lead to a more overreaching interpretation of the landscape etc., but it is lacking. What will be done with the interpretative part?

GC: No reliefs in the tombs, info only in the graffiti of Butehamun.

FC: What will you do next?

GC: Attempt to add more information through getting into these tombs, get permission to open them. Only excavation will show whether the hypothesis is good.

HV: Appreciates the photos of graffiti. The documentation needs to be revised, the scale of photo and drawing is not the same. Drawings are inaccurate. The work of documenting the graffiti is enormous, but the photographs and drawings would correspond. Some photos are too small, where it is not seen whether the graffiti are invisible or actually still there. Drawings from photos are more precise than from field notebooks.

GC: Documented over 200 graffiti.

HV: yes, but it is important to be precise. Scratched with bronze chisels? Did anyone check bronze?

GC: Maybe copper?

HV: Do you have any evidence that the graffiti was incised with a

chisel? You can actually do it with a stone...

GC: Tools of DeM workers were found and are in museums, the conclusion is natural.

HV: Did anyone make a study?

GC: This is compact marl limestone, it's not easy. The same stone as in the rest of the Theban valley.

HV: The rock is usually sandstone.

JD: A question about the inscriptions. A lot of epigraphic material, there are flaws in the transliteration and translations, How did he work with it?

GC: Checked most of them on site, some are not there anymore. Used the translations of Rzepka, Černý and Spiegelberg, when the graffiti was deleted, nothing can be done. Was able to see most of them.

JD: Many plagiarised passages?

GC: I do not know the regulation, I am writing it from memory.

Geology is taken from valley of the Kings site, waiting for his own geologist to finish his work and check. It will be later changed. The final thesis should be his own work, but can bring pieces together before. These are only some suggestions. In the site discussion there is no plagiarism, in the more general passages there may be, but in Italy this would be OK.

FC: We all do this, take information from previous studies, but you need to make sure that you show that it is somebody else's work (cite it properly). There are whole paragraphs in the thesis written by other people, but they are not referenced properly.

AM: It has to be cited, even if it's rephrased, but when it's not even rephrased, it's a fault.

GC: I checked my thesis, I am sorry for that, I am not aware of this.

AM: Turnitin will tell you where the paragraphs are from. There are references sometimes, sometimes not. It gives 50%

HV: It gives 30%, which is a problem. 5 to 7% should be normal.

GC: These citations are not regarding the tombs but the context. I am sorry for that.

HV: The purpose of the thesis that you can do proper work, including bibliography and citations.

GC: I checked the thesis before to have citations. When I sent the initial stages, it was OK, but the thesis, I did not know.

MB: In many cases you failed to acknowledge the authors, and lately the academic environment is very sensitive to this. For me, this is a serious point.

GC: It is a surprise for me, because I checked all the citations.

Uzavřená část obhajoby

JM: Draft 2021 byl opsán z Getty reports, už tehdy to „zapomněl ocitovat“ a přeformuluje to. To v odevzdané práci udělal. Práce nemá metodologii a research question, je to kopilát (v zásadě kapitola 1 z původního plánu). Na to, že to nestačí, byl upozorněn několikrát v průběhu studia. Překresy gaffit nejsou jeho vlastní práce.

Vyjádření komise:

The thesis is an elaborate catalogue, lacks methodology and conclusions. Despite forewarning on plagiarism, there are still frequent tendencies to not provide references to the original publications.

The thesis does not meet the scientific requirement of a PhD thesis at the Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague

Conclusion: Failed (unanimously)

**Result of defence:** fail (N)

**Chair of the board:** Bárta Miroslav, prof., Dr. ....

**Committee members:** Coppens Filip, doc. PhDr. Mgr. et Mgr.,  
Ph.D. ....

Dušek Jan, doc., Ph.D. ....

Landgráfová Renata, Mgr., Ph.D. ....

Mynářová Jana, prof. PhDr., Ph.D. ....

Vymazalová Hana, doc. PhDr., Ph.D. ....

**I have been acquainted with the protocol:.....**