

Posudek bakalářská práce

vedoucí práce

Autor: Vendula Dědková	Číslo studenta:
Název práce: Osídlení a sídlištní struktura ptolemaiovských a římských Théb	
Rozsah: 55 stran celkem, z toho: 47 stran textu, 8 stran bibliografie	
Posudek vypracoval: PhDr. Filip Coppens, Ph.D. (vedoucí práce)	

General Evaluation

The topic of the paper, *Osídlení a sídlištní struktura ptolemaiovských a římských Théb* (*Settlement and Settlement Patterns in Ptolemaic and Roman Thebes*), and the questions posed by its author are reasonably clearly defined in the introduction, but not satisfactorily researched or worked out.

Overall the study clearly indicates that the author is, for the time being, not yet capable of identifying literature appropriate for the study of the topic in question or working in a scientific and critical manner with historical documents as well as modern research and publications. The author makes throughout the paper extensive — and sometimes exclusive — use of secondary sources of a compilatory nature, without identifying or referring the primary studies on the topic or the primary source material.

As a result, the study does not conform, both in form and content, to the requirements for of BA paper. As such I would recommend that the study **should not be accepted for defence** in front of the appropriate committee and rated as “**neprospěla**”.

I. Formální kritéria

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

Formal aspects of the study

The study is organised in a comprehensible manner, with individual chapters and subchapters marked in a coherent and logical style. The format and layout of the text leave little to be desired.

The bibliography and the reference system are used according to expected standards and are, a few exceptions notwithstanding, formatted correctly. The main body of the text, as well as the footnotes and bibliography, contain some lapses in the orthography as well as misspellings, but they are limited in number and do not interfere with the communication of ideas. One can for instance mention the following examples of misspellings in the text: p. 23: čecky for česky; p. 25: centurm for centrum; p. 36: králelm for králem, or p. 37: okoolí for okolí.

A number of other oversights include:

- Footnote 7, on page 12, mentions Arnold 1992, but the study is missing from the bibliography (unless Arnold 1999 is the intended reference).
- Falivene is mentioned in the footnotes (e.g. notes 15 and 16 on page 13), but the study is absent in the bibliography. The following study is most likely meant: M. R. Falivene, "Geography and Administration in Egypt (332 BC – 642 CE)", in R. S. Bagnall, *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, Oxford 2009, 521–540.
- Bowman, A. K. 1976: Papyri and Roman Imperial History. *JRS* 66, 153-173 is mentioned in the bibliography (p. 49), but nowhere else in the main body or footnotes of the study.
- The reference in the bibliography to M. el-Saghir, *Le camp romain de Louqsor*, Cairo 1986 should actually be M. el-Saghir – J. C. Golvin – M. Redde – E. Hegazy – G. Wagner, *Le camp romain de Louqsor*, MIFAO 83, Cairo 1986. As a matter of fact, one should still add the following references to this topic: I. Kulikova – D. Karelin, "The Roman Imperial cult temple at Luxor: its architecture and possible connection between Roman and Egyptian cultures", in G. Rosati – M. Cristina Guidotti (eds), *Proceedings of the XI International Congress of Egyptologists, Florence Egyptian Museum, Florence, 23-30 August 2015*, Oxford 2017, 720-721, and especially M. Jones – S. McFadden (eds.), *Art of Empire: the Roman frescoes and imperial cult chamber in Luxor temple*, New Haven-London 2015.

Coptic and Greek are reproduced in the correct font and form throughout the work, yet in a study focused on ancient Egyptian material, be it during the Ptolemaic and Roman era, the absence of a transliteration font for ancient Egyptian terms and designations is unacceptable, especially given that several fonts are freely available online – for example the commonly used *Umschrift_TTn v3.0* at <http://wwwuser.gwdg.de/~lingaeg/lingaeg-stylesheet.htm>. In this regard, see for instance the following occurrences: p. 13 and 25: pA-sj instead of *p3-sy*; p. 25: Was.t instead of *W3s.t*; p. 30: TA-Hw.t-n-pA-ih instead of *T3-ḥw.t-n-p3-ih*; p. 32: tA-mAwt instead of *t3-m3wt*; p. 36: DmA for *Dm3*, and p. 42: As.t for *3s.t*

The illustrations are limited in number, but of decent quality. A lot more illustrative material could have been added, as the author failed to identify a vast number of recent publications with very detailed plans and images (see the evaluation of the paper's content next).

II. Obsahové hodnocení

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

Evaluation of the content

In the introduction to the study (pp. 10-11), the author sets out the aims of the study (*“ucelený přehled o určení, organizaci a vývoji osídlení v thébské oblasti (na východním i západní břehu Nilu) v ptolemaiovské a římské době”*) and provides a brief overview of the contents of the following six chapters. Overall, the author never very clearly states what is understood by the designation ‘Thebes’ in

the study – the traditional city (East and West bank), the traditional district (*sp3.t*), the fourth Upper Egyptian nome, or the entire Upper Egyptian region. The introduction appears to indicate that the author understood it as the traditional city, covering the East and West bank, but according to the table of contents and the subchapters in Chapter 7, where Pathyris and Hermonthis are included, it appears to be the Fourth Upper Egyptian nome.

Following the introduction, the next four chapters presents a very concise overview of the history of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt (*Řekové a Alexandr Veliký*, p. 12; *Ptolemaiovská doba*, pp. 13-16, and *Římská doba*, pp. 19-20), with a specific subchapter on the contacts and relations between Ptolemaic Egypt and Rome from the third to the first century BC (*Kontakty ptolemaiovského Egypta s Římem*, pp. 17-18).

The four chapters in question are problematic from a number of viewpoints. First and foremost, one must question the **relevance** of including several chapters (over a quarter of the paper) on a very general, overly selective overview of the history of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt in a study specifically focused on settlements in the Theban region. An overview of the history of only the Theban region in Ptolemaic and Roman times would have been much more to the point, but in these four chapters the author only refers to specific events in this region on a few occasions. A major extension of subchapters 7.2 and 7.3 (pp. 24-28) should instead have featured as the opening chapters to the study. Overall, this part of the study is for a large part based on secondary studies of a compilatory nature, but rarely on primary research publications.

Secondly, a historical overview of a period lasting over seven centuries in less than ten pages is always problematic as it leads on the one hand to **oversimplification** (specific events are often much more complicated than is possible to present in an overview of a few paragraphs/pages), but also to the very **selective choice** of what (not) to present. In this particular study, the author has been very selective regarding the historical events mentioned in the chapters, excluding, without giving proper reasons, a number of occasions of the utmost importance for the understanding of this period in the history of Egypt. A few examples to illustrate this point:

- a) In subchapter 3.2 (p. 15), the author refers to the revolt in Upper Egypt following the battle at Raphia in 217 BC, but for reasons unknown completely omits any reference to the revolts taking place in the Delta roughly at the same time (217-185 BC, to be exact) – although the reason behind the revolts in Lower Egypt were very similar to the one in Upper Egypt and had a likewise

devastating effect on the Ptolemaic administration of the country. The subchapter also mentions the revolts in the Theban region during the periods of 132-131 BC and 90-88 BC, but omits any reference to the revolt of 165 BC in the Thebaid (mentioned a.o. in Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* XXXI, 17b and in the archive of Hor of Sebennytos from the Sacred Animal Necropolis in Saqqara, a.o. T. C. Skeat – E. G. Turner, *JEA* 54 (1968), 199-208). In general on the revolts, the author would do well to consult A.-E. Véisse, *Les "révoltes égyptiennes": Recherches sur les troubles intérieurs en Égypte du règne de Ptolémée III à la conquête romaine*, (Studia Hellenistica 41), Leuven 2004; B. McGing, "Revolt Egyptian Style: Internal opposition to Ptolemaic rule", *APF* 43 (1997), 273-314 and C. Préaux, "Esquisse d'une histoire des révolutions égyptiennes sous les Lagides", *CdE* 11 (1936), 522-552.

- b) In chapter 4, the initial contacts between Rome and Egypt in the third century BC are briefly referred to (i.e. the initial contact in 273 BC mentioned in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*, XX.14 and the relations between both states during the Second Punic War), but any reference to the important negotiations the Roman senate conducted on behalf of the Ptolemaic state during the Fifth and Sixth Syrian/Seleucid War are omitted, including the crucial Roman embassy to Eleusis in 168 BC – a historical moment in time not only for Ptolemaic Egypt but for the entire Eastern Mediterranean world. For historical sources of this moment, see a.o. Polybios, *Histories* XXIX 27 and several Demotic ostraca from the archive of Hor of Sebennytos in Saqqara (a.o. 71/2-131 [5399]/both recto and verso, and G7-26 [455]/verso). For the relations between Ptolemaic Egypt and the Roman republic, I would recommend still the consultation of the following works: A. Monson, *From the Ptolemies to the Romans: Political and economic change in Egypt*, Cambridge 2012 and S. Pfeiffer (ed.), *Ägypten unter fremden Herrschern zwischen persischer Satrapie und römischer Provinz* (Oikumene 3), Frankfurt 2007. In general on this period, one might also consider the following works in Czech: L. Bareš "Pod nadvládou Řeků a Římanů", in L. Bareš – R. Veselý – E. Gombár, *Dějiny Egypta*, Praha 2009, 124–154, and L. V. Wellner, *Ptolemaiovci. Z makedonských hor na trůn faraonů*, Praha 2010.
- c) In the same Chapter 4, the author mentions on page 17: "Když byl kvůli dynastickým sporům v roce 164 př. n. l. vyhnán Ptolemaios VIII. Euergetes II. z Egypta do exilu svým bratrem Ptolemaiem VI. Filometorem, obrátil se na Řím s prosbou o pomoc a **jako odměnu za znovu dosazení na trůn mu odkázal ve své závěti Kyrenaiku.**" This is incorrect. The author most likely refers in this case to the last will of Ptolemaios VIII Euergetes II from 156/5 BC of which a copy was kept in the Temple of Apollo in Cyrene (i.e. *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 9.7). In his testament, Ptolemaios VIII leaves his "kingdom" (most likely all Egyptian territories, not only

Cyrenaica) to the Roman senate only in case he would happen to die before having acquired a legitimate successor.

- d) Chapter 5, dedicated to Roman Egypt, is limited to a subchapter on the reign of Augustus and one on Diocletian. The author provides no reason for concluding the historical overview of Roman Egypt with the reign of Diocletian (the change from principate to dominate is mentioned in the introduction, but the actual situation is much more complicated than the author suggests). The author has also omitted any reference to events that affected life in Roman Egypt – e.g. the *Constitutio Antoniniana* (212 AD, reign of Caracalla) or the visit of the Emperor or members of the imperial family to Egypt (e.g. Germanicus in 19 AD, Vespasianus and Titus in 69 AD, Hadrianus in 130-131 AD, Marcus Aurelius in 175-176 AD, Septimus Severus and family in 199-200 AD and Caracalla in 215-216 AD – with Germanicus, Hadrianus and Septimus Severus actually visiting the Theban region). For the history of Roman Egypt, I would still recommend that the author consults, among other works, also E. Schaub, *Geschichte des römischen Ägypten: von der Eroberung unter Octavian/Augustus bis zu Diocletian*, Rahden/Westf. 2017; K. Lembke – C. Fluck – G. Vittmann (eds.), *Ägyptens späte Blüte. Die Römer am Nil*, Mainz 2004; G. Hölbl, *Altägypten im römischen Reich. Der römische Pharao und seine Tempel I* (Sonderbände der antiken Welt. Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie), Mainz 2000, esp. 9-46.

Overall, when referring to an important historical document (whether ancient inscription, object, antique author, etc.), the author commonly refers in the footnote only to a general overview from which the information derived, but almost never includes in the references the necessary information on the *editio princeps* or primary studies for the inscription/source. For example, when discussing the important trilingual stela of C. Cornelius Gallus on page 19, the only reference given is to the overview article of Herklotz in C. Riggs, *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt*, Oxford 2012. One would have expected, as the absolute minimum, information on the inventory number of the stela – i.e. CG 9295 – and currently the most up-to-date and very detailed study by F. Hoffmann – M. Minas-Nerpel – S. Pfeiffer, *Die dreisprachige Stele des C. Cornelius Gallus*, (Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete. Beiheft 9), Berlin 2009. One could still envisage adding references to the work of A. Bernand – E. Bernand, *Les inscriptions grecques de Philae I–II*, Paris 1969 and the original study of A. Erman, “Eine trilingue Inschrift von Philae”, *SPAW* 20 (1896), 469–482.

On other occasions, the author refers to antique authors in the main body of the text, but references to these works are missing in the footnotes. A few examples to illustrate this point:

- Page 12: “Ve zhruba o půl století mladší Odesseji je Egypt **zmíněn již skoro 20x** a hned 4 zmínky mluví o jeho bohatství a úrodnosti země” — Reference to the exact pages of Homer’s work are missing.
- Page 17: “Jejich příběh je dobře známý z děl **Plutarcha, Cassia Dia i Shakespeara.**” — Not a single reference to any of these works is present.

At times paragraphs consist for the most part of a translation, followed by some paraphrasing of the original study from which the information was taken. Although the author does provide a reference in a footnote, one has to question the correctness of such an approach. For example, on page 23 one reads:

“Théby mohou také označovat celý 4. hornoegyptský nom, ve starších obdobích nazývaný nom žezla (WAs.t, česky Vaset). V ptolemaiovském období byl rozdělen na 2 části, Perithébský nom na východním břehu od Medamudu po Luxor s hlavním městem v Diospolis Magna (plus severní část břehu západního) a nom Pathyrský zahrnující například Džeme, Hermonthis či Pathyris.”

To be compared with D. Klotz, *Caesar in the City of Amun. Egyptian Temple Construction and Theology in Roman Thebes*, (MRE 15), Turnhout 2012, p. 12:

“Thebes can also refer to the entire fourth Upper Egyptian nome, which in Egyptian texts was traditionally called W3s.t. In the Ptolemaic Period, this district was split into Perithebas in the north-east (Medamud, Karnak and Luxor) and Pathyris in the south and west (Djeme, Armant, Pathyris, modern Gebelein).”

Throughout the work, the author stays very much on the surface, making very general claims and often not providing the relevant references. In a number of cases, the claims made by the author are (partly) incorrect. A number of examples to illustrate this point:

- Page 10: “**Po nějakou dobu** byly dokonce i městem hlavním.” — One would expect the author to be much more specific and provide (at least approximate) dates.
- Page 15: “Ptolemaios IV. Filopatór bývá **obecně považován za slabého a neschopného panovníka ...**” — This idea is for the most part based on Polybius, *Historiae* V, e.g. 107.1 and XIV 107.1 (reference missing), but one would have liked to see a more nuanced comment, based on the latest research.
- Page 15, note 29: “*Onnophris – řecké jméno pro Usira jakožto krále*” — *Onnophris* is not the Greek name for Osiris as king, but rather the Greek adaptation of the Egyptian term *Wennefer* (*wn-nfr*), often used in association with Osiris when he is appropriated the role of king, especially during the first millennium BC.
- Page 24: “**Podle mnohým antických autorů** bylo nejstarším městem Egypta ...” — Not a single reference is given to a single author.

- Page 24: “Význam města trochu stoupl až v **osmé dynastii**, kdy **jakýsi Antef** založil dynastii *thébských králů* ...” — The author most likely wished to refer to either Sehertawy Intef I or Intef III of the Eleventh Dynasty. No reference is given.
- Page 28, note 85: “Diodóros I 46.7 uvádí, že ze **47 chrámů** na západním břehu za Ptolemaia I. fungovalo pouhých 17 a z nich jenom zlomek zůstal funkční ještě i v 1. století př. n. l.”. This is incorrect – Diodorus Siculus does not refer to 47 temples, but 47 **tombs** in the Valley of the Kings: “Now the priests said that in their records they find forty–seven tombs of kings; but down to the time of Ptolemy son of Lagos, they say, only fifteen remained, most of which had been destroyed at the time we visited those regions, in the one hundred and eightieth Olympiad [i.e. 60–56 BC].”
- Page 31, note 104 refers to O. Uppsala 608 and O. Leipzig 2200 and page 42, note 160 to P. Lips. 1 97, but omits any reference to the *editio princeps* or other relevant studies of these ostraca and papyrus. On the same page 31 “Hermiova archivu” is mentioned, again without any reference to relevant studies.
- Page 32: “Když se podíváme na **mapy** pořízené Napoleonovou expedicí v 90. letech 18. století, ...” — References to the plans in the *Description de l’Egypte* are missing.
- Page 34: “jejich studium je možné hlavně díky akvarelům, které v 19. století pořídil J. G. Wilkinson ...” — No reference to Wilkinson is made in the footnote.
- Page 36: “**V démotických textech** se vesnice označuje jako *DmA*” — No references to the demotic texts in question.
- On several occasions the author refers to the *Trismegistos* database (e.g. p. 29, note 93; p. 33, n. 109; p. 35, n. 133; p. 36, n. 136), but with the exception of p. 41, n. 157, provides no link to the exact webpage of the database nor the date of consultation.
- Page 46, note 72: see now, a.o., D. Rutica, *Kleopatras vergessener Tempel: das Geburtshaus von Kleopatra VII. in Hermonthis. Eine Rekonstruktion der Dekoration*, (Göttinger Miszellen Occasional Studies 1), Göttingen 2015.

In **Chapter 6** (*Vesnice versus město*, pp. 21-22), the author introduces the concept of city, town and village in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. Surprisingly, a number of basic studies, dedicated to settlements and settlement development, have not been consulted, such as J. McKenzie, *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt. 300 BC – 700 AD*, New Haven-London 2007, esp. 151-172; S. Snape, *The Complete Cities of Ancient Egypt*, London 2014, esp. 124-139; or J. McKenzie, “The architectural style of Roman and Byzantine Alexandria and Egypt”, in D. M. Bailey (ed.), *Archaeological research in Roman*

Egypt: the proceedings of the Seventeenth Classical Colloquium of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum, held on 1-4 December, 1993, Ann Arbor, MI 1996, 128-141.

The authors understanding of the government of the four *poleis* in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt (i.e. Alexandria, Naukratis, Ptolemaios Hermaiu and Antinoopolis), as presented in this chapter, is partly incorrect. On page 21, the author states that “*Tato 4 města stála tak trochu mimo správní systém popsaný v kapitolách 3 a 5, neboť měla vlastní správní organizace (městskou radu – búlé, lidové shromáždění – démos) a s tím související i určitou míru nezávislosti, alespoň co se týče vnitřních záležitostí.*” This is not entirely correct, as from 30 BC the Greek inhabitants of Alexandria lost the right to hold the *boule* or city council. This right was only returned to these citizens in 200 AD.

In **Chapter 7** (*Théby*, p. 23-46) the author aims to provide an overview of all known settlements in Thebes dated to the Ptolemaic and Roman era. According to the literature list and footnotes, the author does not seem to have consulted any of the standard lexica or encyclopaedias on ancient Egypt. This includes works such as W. Helck – E. Otto – W. Westendorf (eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie I–VII*, Wiesbaden 1975–1992; D. B. Redford (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt I–III*, Oxford 2001; or K. A. Bard (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Archaeology of Ancient Egypt*, London 1999. One could also still mention the *Topographical Bibliography* of Porter and Moss, freely available at <http://www.griffith.ox.ac.uk/topbib.HTML>. All these works contain useful references to the topic of research, whether on settlements in general or specific sites discussed in the paper. Likewise, the author appears not to have worked properly with the Online Egyptological Bibliography, currently at the Griffith Institute in Oxford: <http://oeb.griffith.ox.ac.uk/> (freely available for students of Charles University via <http://pez.cuni.cz/>). As a result, the overview presented in the chapter is very incomplete and for a large part outdated, lacking almost all recent publications on the topic.

The absence of almost any reference to the recent work by the *Centre Franco-Égyptien d'Étude des Temples de Karnak* is glaring, especially since annual reports and a large number of other publications are continuously made available online at: <http://www.cfeetk.cnrs.fr/index.php?page=bibliographie>.

This includes, among many other studies, the following, richly illustrated annual reports that contain a mass of information on recent research regarding Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine settlements in and around the Karnak temples:

- B. Abd El-Sattar – C. Thiers, “French-Egyptian Centre for the Study of the Temples of Karnak. Activity Report 2017”, Luxor 2018.

- M. Abdel Aziz – C. Thiers, “French-Egyptian Centre for the Study of the Temples of Karnak. Activity Report 2016”, Luxor 2017.
- M. Abdel Aziz – C. Thiers, “French-Egyptian Centre for the Study of the Temples of Karnak. Activity Report 2015”, Luxor 2016.
- A. H. Karar – C. Thiers, French-Egyptian Centre for the Study of the Temples of Karnak. Activity Report 2014, Luxor 2015.
- A. H. Karar – C. Thiers, French-Egyptian Centre for the Study of the Temples of Karnak. Activity Report 2013, Luxor 2014.
- ...

A selection of other relevant studies on Ptolemaic and Roman settlements in and around the Karnak temples that should have been consulted – and referred to – include (overview limited to the period from 2010 onward; in reality there is still much more material missing in the literature list):

- M. Boraik, “Excavations of the Quay and the Embankment in front of Karnak Temples. Preliminary Report”, *Cahiers de Karnak* 13 (2010), 65-78.
- M. Boraik – T. Faucher, « Le trésor des bains de Karnak », *Cahiers de Karnak* 13 (2010), 79-100.
- M. Boraik – S. El-Masek – T. Fournet – P. Piraud-Fournet, “The Roman baths at Karnak, Between River and Temples. Architectural Study and Urban Context”, in: B. Redon (ed.), *Collective Baths in Egypt 2. New Discoveries and Perspectives* (ÉtudUrb 10), Cairo: IFAO 2017, 221-265.
- R. David, « Quand Karnak n’est plus un temple... Les témoins archéologiques de l’Antiquité tardive », *Cahiers de Karnak* 16 (2017), 147-165.
- R. David, « Karnak au début de la période byzantine. Caractérisation d’une production locale », in : D. Dixneuf (ed.), *LRCW 5 - 2 Late Roman coarse wares, cooking wares and amphorae in the Mediterranean Archaeology and archaeometry*, (ÉtudAlex 43), Cairo: IFAO 2017, 963-974.
- B. Durand, « Un four métallurgique d’époque ptolémaïque dans les annexes du temple de Ptah à Karnak », *Cahiers de Karnak* 15 (2015), 181-188.
- T. Faucher – L. Coulon – E. Frangin – C. Giorgi, « Un atelier monétaire à Karnak au IIe s. av. J.-C. », *BIFAO* 111 (2011), 143-166.
- H. H. Marey Mahmoud – M. F. Ali – E. Pavlidou – N. Kantiranis, “Characterization of plasters from Ptolemaic baths: new excavations near the Karnak temple complex, Upper Egypt”, *Archaeometry* 53 (2011), 693-706.
- A. Masson, « Interpréter le matériel grec et chypriote dans un contexte religieux et thébain : l’exemple du quartier des prêtres de Karnak » in G. Gorre – A. Marangou (eds.), *Culture et*

présence matérielle grecque dans la vallée thébaine , des Saïtes aux Ptolémées (VII e - I er s. av. J.-C.) . Actes de la table ronde organisée à Rennes , le 8 novembre 2012, Rennes 2015.

- M. Naguib, "A Ptolemaic Kitchen in Front of the Temples of Karnak", in R. David (ed.), *Céramiques ptolémaïques de la région thébaine* (CCE 10), Cairo: IFAO 2016, 165-190.
- B. Redon – T. Faucher, « Les Grecs aux portes d'Amon. Les bains de Karnak et l'occupation ptolémaïque du parvis ouest du temple de Karnak », in G. Gorre – A. Marangou (eds.), *La présence grecque dans la vallée de Thèbes*, Rennes 2016, 121-134.
- E. Serdiuk, « L'architecture de briques crues d'époque romano-byzantine à Karnak : topographie générale et protocole de restitution par l'image », *Cahiers de Karnak* 16 (2017), 373-392.
- C. Thiers – P. Zignani, « Le domaine de Ptah à Karnak. Premières données de terrain », *Cahiers de Karnak* 14, 2013, p. 493-513.
- ...

Because of this oversight, the important settlement near the Ptah temple on the Amun domain at Karnak is, among several other settlements in this area, completely missing from the study.

A similar case as for the Karnak temple can be made for the other localities the author presents in the paper. For example:

- On the topic of settlements in and around the Luxor temple, important information can be obtained from J. Kościuk, "Late Roman housing in the area of the Luxor temple", *Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte* 50 (2011), 37-74, and J. Kościuk, "Two bath buildings on the western side of the sphinx' avenue in Luxor", *Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte* 50 (2011), 75-100.
- Some information on Petemut (Medamud) might be found in C. Heurtel, « Une correspondance copte entre Djémé et Pétémout », in L. Pantalacci (ed.), *La lettre d'archive: communication administrative et personnelle dans l'antiquité proche-orientale et égyptienne; actes du colloque de l'Université de Lyon 2, 9-10 juillet 2004*, Cairo 2008, 87-108.
- For settlements at Medinet Habu: M. Römer, „Straßen - Menschen - Häuser: zur Topographie des koptischen Djeme“, *Enchoria* 29 (2005), 79-105.
- For the Roman settlement at Deir Shalwit: S. Hasegawa, "Some aspects on material culture in Roman village site at Theban area", *Orient* 43 (2008), 107-117.

Moreover, a number of settlements are clearly marked on the first plan (Obr. 1, page 9) and dated to Ptolemaic and/or Roman times, but some of these places are not discussed anywhere in the study. This includes for instance the settlement of Touthion (near Armant).

In the abstract to the study, the author claims to provide an *“Aktuální přehled dostupných archeologických a epigrafických dokladů, včetně informací obsažených v dílech antických autorů...”*. In light of this, one would have liked to see for each individual settlement an overview of the available sources – the archaeological remains, the epigraphic material (both are without much distinction mixed together in the subchapters of chapter 7) and the antique authors. A study dedicated to references in the works of antique authors is however completely missing. It would have been worthwhile to establish whether in the works of Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Pausanias, Tacitus and Ammianus Marcellinus – to name but a few – references to the settlements in the Theban region actually occur.

Overall, in most subchapters on the various settlements on the Theban East and West bank, little to no attempt was made to provide a description of the general layout or the layout of typical houses or other structures.

Chapter 8 (p. 47), the conclusion to the study, does not provide any insight or overview on the settlements in Ptolemaic and Roman Thebes or its development over time – as was the paper’s aim as stated in the introduction (*“ucelený přehled o určení, organizaci a vývoji osídlení v thébské oblasti (na východním i západní břehu Nilu) v ptolemaiovské a římské době”*, p. 10)

Conclusion

The author based her work for the most part on a few general studies, but failed time and again to do proper research, using standard methods commonly in use, and as a consequence a vast amount of recent information is completely missing from the study, despite the fact that it is easily available in the library of the Czech Institute of Egyptology and/or freely available online on reputable websites of Egyptological institutions, such as the *Griffith Institute* at Oxford or the *Centre Franco-Égyptien d’Étude des Temples de Karnak*. As a result, the study does not represent an actual or up-to-date overview on settlements and settlement development in the Theban area.

The author, moreover, took a very selective and unscientific approach to the literature and source

material that was gathered and more often than not failed to refer in a proper manner to the *editio princeps* and/or primary studies of ancient sources or other material.

In conclusion, the paper clearly indicates that the author is not yet able to identify relevant literature or to appropriately question and examine ancient documents and modern research in a critical manner. As such the study does not meet the expectations of a BA paper.

Hodnocení:¹

Neprospěla

16.08.2018

PhDr Filip Coppens, PhD
Czech Institute of Egyptology
Charles University, Prague

¹ Škála: výborně – velmi dobře – dobře – neprospěl