

## Posudek Bakalářská práce

vedoucí práce       oponent

Autor: Bc. Dana Bělohoubková	Číslo studenta:
Název práce: „Egejský list“ z chrámu Amenhotepa III. V Kóm el-Hittánu: zmapování současného poznání	
Rozsah: 72 stran celkem, z toho: 44 stran textu, 6 stran bibliografie, 21 stran příloh	
Posudek vypracoval: Filip Coppens, Ph.D.	

### General Evaluation

The topic of the paper, the so-called “Aegean List” of the Kom el-Hettan temple of Amenhotep III, and questions related to the interpretation of the list are clearly defined in the introduction. The subject is appropriately positioned within its historical context as well as in the context of previous research.

Throughout the work, the author has managed to present a unified and lucid text in support of the central theme. The argumentation is clear and logical and supported with appropriate and detailed evidence, while keeping different points of view in mind. The author likewise has demonstrated the ability to critically work with the appropriate material, although some room for improvement is present (see *infra*; “evaluation of the content”).

The obtained results of the work plainly indicate that the author’s research can be considered a contribution to our understanding of the so-called “Aegean List” of the Kom el-Hettan temple and as such it evidently exceeds expectations related to a BA paper.

## I. Formální kritéria

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

### Formal aspects of the study

The paper is organized in a very comprehensible manner, with the 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 paper is written in a very lucid and straightforward style, making it very 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 text and footnotes contain an absolute minimum of misspellings or misuse of punctuation.

The method of referencing, in both footnotes and bibliography, is likewise clear-cut and citations are rendered according to the expected format. Occasionally one wonders why certain footnotes (e.g. note 14 on page 23) were not incorporated into the text itself.

The illustrations have been chosen appropriately to accompany the text of the paper. In almost all instances the reference to the source of the images is given correctly, with the exception of figure 10 (namely, the reference to Haeny (1981: 58) is incorrect. The expected illustration (Haeny 1981: 56, fig. 9) is replaced by Haeny (1981: 110, fig. 16) for no immediate apparent reason). In a number of instances (e.g. figures 26 and 29) the quality of the images is not ideal.

## II. Obsahové hodnocení

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

### Evaluation of the content

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.

The subject of the paper is clearly set within its context and a detailed overview is presented of previous studies on the topic. In the overview of the interpretation of individual toponyms in the "Aegean list" (pp. 21-23) one could however still add the following two studies: J. Bennet, "The Geography of the Mycenaean Kingdoms", in: Y. Duhoux – A. Morpurgo Davies (eds.), *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World 2*, Leuven 2011, 137-168 and Y. Duhoux, *Des "Minoens" en Egypte? "Keftyou" et "les îles au milieu du Grand Vert"*, Leuven 2003.

The author has gathered and studied a large number of resources related to the topic of the paper and has shown that she is more than capable to work in a critical and scientific manner with the appropriate material. A few comments should be made in regard to the (lack of) use of a number of sources:

1) At times one feels that the study would have benefited by integrating and comparing some of the conclusions postulated with more general works on the topic in questions.

a. In the chapters on the New Kingdom temples in general (3.1) and the temple of Amenhotep III at Kom el-Hettan in particular (3.2) any reference to the detailed studies of Stefanie Schröder and Martina Ullmann on "temples of a million years" are missing (S. Schröder, *Millionenjahrhaus. Zur Konzeption des Raumes der Ewigkeit im konstellativen Königtum in Sprache, Architektur und Theologie*, Wiesbaden 2010; M. Ullmann, *König für die Ewigkeit. Die Häuser der Millionen von Jahre. Eine Untersuchung zu Königskült und Tempeltypologie in Ägypten*, ÄAT 51, Wiesbaden 2002). For more recent information on the reuse of material in the temple of Merenptah one could refer to H. Jaritz – S. Bickel, *Untersuchungen im Totentempel des Merenptah III*, Beiträge Bf 16 (1997).

b. The subchapters on the sed-festival as part of the decorative program of the Kom el-Hettan and Luxor temples (pp. 39-40) would have benefited by being placed in a much larger context and against the background of the studies of e.g. E. Hornung – E. Staehelin, *Studien zum Sedfest*, AH 1, 1974 and E. Hornung – E. Staehelin, *Neue Studien zum Sedfest*, AH 20, 2006, and specifically for the Luxor temple: W. Waitkus, *Untersuchungen zu Kult und Funktion des Luxortempel*, *Aegyptiaca Hamburgensia* 2, 2008.

2) In a number of instances, especially regarding specific objects or inscriptions, references are only made to secondary literature and not to the primary study/source. For example, the mention of

pAnastasi I (p. 23) has no references, while one would ideally have like to see BM EA 10247 and a reference to A. H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Hieratic Texts* and H.-W. Fischer-Elfert, *Die satirische Streitschrift des Papyrus Anastasi I. Übersetzung und Kommentar* (ÄA 44). Similar examples: the inscriptions from the tomb of Rekhmire (p. 22) or the statue of Weret-Hekau (p. 39)

While the occasional lack of a number of resources, especially those that would place the topic in a broader context, indicate an opportunity for further enhancement of the paper, the obtained results of the research clearly indicate the author's abilities not only to appropriately question and research Egyptological material and data, but also to contribute to the further development and better understanding of specific topics of ancient Egypt. In light of this the paper evidently exceeds expectations related to a BA paper.

**Hodnocení:**<sup>1</sup>

**výborně**

16.05.2014

Datum

Podpis



<sup>1</sup> Škála: výborně – velmi dobře – dobře – neprospěl

**Univerzita Karlova v Praze**  
**Filozofická fakulta (2)**  
**Český egyptologický ústav**  
**110 00 Praha 1, Celetná 20**