

## Posudek bakalářská práce

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Autor: <b>Mgr. Maria Galuzina</b>  | Číslo studenta: |
| Název práce: <b>The God Sobek in Ptolemaic and Roman times. A Confrontation of the Cult of Sobek in Krokodilopolis and Kom Ombo</b> (Bůh Sobek v Ptolemaiovské a Římské době. Srovnání kulta Sobka v Krokodilopoli a Kóm Ombo) |                 |
| Rozsah: <b>133</b> stran celkem, z toho:<br><b>91</b> stran textu, <b>15</b> stran bibliografie, <b>27</b> stran příloh  |                 |
| Posudek vypracoval: <b>PhDr Filip Coppens, PhD</b> (vedoucí práce)   |                 |

### General Evaluation

The topic of the paper "*The God Sobek in Ptolemaic and Roman times. A Confrontation of the Cult of Sobek in Krokodilopolis and Kom Ombo*" and related issues and questions are clearly defined in the introduction to the volume. The author has gathered, studied and presented in a logical manner a large amount of material on the cult of Sobek in the Fayum and Kom Ombo, in addition to paying attention to the nature of the relationship and mutual influences between both regions. The specific character of Sobek, next to his relationship with other deities is likewise aptly discussed.

Throughout the work, the author has managed to present a unified and coherent text in support of the central theme. The argumentation is clear and for the most part supported with appropriate evidence. The author has likewise demonstrated the ability to critically work with the material, although room for improvement is present, both in the formal aspects of the study as well as the use of source material (see further for details). Compilation works, such as encyclopedias or general overviews and guidebooks, 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.

Overall the study indicates that the author is capable of working in a scientific and critical manner with historical documents as well as modern research and publications.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 the requirements expected 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 "velmi dobře".**

## I. Formální kritéria

|   | výborně                  | velmi dobře              | dobře                    | dostatečně               | nedostatečně             |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Vědecký aparát</b>   |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Jednotnost citací, bibliografie a poznámkového aparátu            | <input type="checkbox"/> | X                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Citování použitých cizích myšlenek (dobrá vědecká praxe)          | <input type="checkbox"/> | X                        | <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                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | X                        | <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   | <input type="checkbox"/> | X                        | <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 study is not always as consistent in layout, style, language, abbreviations etc as one would like. The general layout and style leaves on occasion somewhat to be desired, which could have been avoided by a thorough final check of the finished manuscript. For example:

- The text and footnotes are not “justified” or “aligned”, giving the entire study a somewhat unfinished and slightly sloppy look.
- A discrepancy occurs between the numbering of the chapters 2.4 and 2.8 in the table of contents and in the text itself.
- The sequence of individual entries into a single footnote lacks a distinct organization (not

alphabetically, not chronologically, not according to importance).

- The references to one and the same publication in the footnotes are not always consistent. For example the specific volume of the *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* is sometimes rendered as “Bd.2” and sometimes as “Bd 2”
- Most of the rulers mentioned in the text are accompanied, between brackets, with the dates of their reign, but at times this information is absent. This is for instance the case for following rulers: Amenhotep III (p. 11), Amenemhat III (p. 15), and Caracalla (p. 68).

The author demonstrates throughout the paper good knowledge of the specific **terminology** associated with the topic of study. The paper is written in a straightforward style, making it – for the most part – 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 text in its entirety would profit from an **English** language check. Next to the regular misuse (or absence) of the definite and indefinite articles throughout the volume, the syntax of a number of passages could also still be improved. On occasion it is also not clear whether the author, in dates, refers to e.g. 2 AD or second century AD (e.g. p. 36); 3 AD or the third century AD (e.g. p. 27)

The **method of referencing**, in both footnotes and bibliography, is for the most part clear-cut and citations are rendered according to the expected format. The author occasionally does not refer to the exact pages of the study that she used as a source. Sometimes the pages are omitted entirely; sometimes they refer to the whole of the article and not to the relevant pages within the article. A few examples to illustrate this point:

- In footnote 14, the author provides a reference to M. Zecchi's, *Geografia religiosa del Fayyum*, to illustrate that Shedet/Krokodilopolis was the most important cult center of Sobek in the Fayum, but omits the exact pages for the reader to consult. A reference to pages 37–61 would have been appropriate.
- In footnote 58, the author refers to Horst Beinlich, Regine Schulz and Alfred Wiczorek, *Egypt's Mysterious Book of the Faiyum*, Dettelbach 2013 to point out the close connection between Sobek and Horus without indicating the chapter or exact pages in the volume.
- In footnote 95, a reference to the ticket-oracles in the Demotic archive of Soknopaiou Nesos, the author lists Bresciani, *L'archivio demotico del tempio di Soknopaiu Nesos nel Griffith Institute di Oxford*, Milan 1975, but omits adding the relevant pages (pp. 2–11 in this case).

- Footnote 169 refers to the entire volume of Bitelli, Capasso, Davoli and Pernigotti on the excavations at Bakchias in between 1993 and 2003, but omits the exact page on which the link between Temple B and the god Sobek the Shedtite – Horus residing in Shedet is supposedly made – making it impossible for the reader to verify the statement without reading the entire book.
- Footnote 425 refers to the large offering altar in the forecourt of the Kom Ombo temple, providing the entire article of Herbert Ernst (ZÄS 129, pp. 12–19), while the relevant pages are only 18–19.
- Footnote 435 refers to Sternberg’s study of the Horus-myth from Edfu (pp. 21–35), while the correct reference should be to the chapter on Kom Ombo (pp. 110–118).
- Occasionally the author makes comments of the type “most Egyptologists agree ...” (e.g. p. 42), but without any reference to who these scholars are and where they published their ideas.

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 detract from the overall quality of the paper or interfere with the communication of ideas. One can for instance mention the following examples of misspellings and other minor errors in text and footnotes: “Labirinth” instead of “Labyrinth” (p. 11), “oriental” instead of “orientale” (p. 31); “sumirized” instead of “summarized” (p. 49), “era us” instead of “er aus” (pp. 50, 56), “symbolizinig” instead of “symbolizing” (p. 52); “astronimocal” instead of “astronomical” (p. 54), “crocodile” instead of “crocodile” (p. 56), “Harachtee” instead of “Harachte” (pp. 56, 57), “Wiesabaden” instead of “Wiesbaden” (pp. 9, 66, 69, 98, 101), “complied” instead of “compiles” (p. 67), “Ptolemaios” instead of “Ptolemaios” (p. 69), “eas” instead of “es” (p. 82) etc.

The **illustrations** have for the most part been chosen appropriately to accompany the text of the paper. A general plan of Egypt with an overview of sites from Ptolemaic and Roman times, as e.g. published in several works of G. Hölbl, might have been more suitable than a map from Google Earth. In a number of instances (e.g. figures 7 and 24) the quality of the images is not ideal. It is unfortunate that the author did not provide plans of the individual settlements with a cult installation for Sobek in the Fayum (e.g. in the case of Soknopaiou Nesos, Karanis, Narmouthis e.a.) as it would make it easier for the reader to follow the author’s description of the site and monuments. It would also provide the ideal visual counterpart for the description of the typical temple type of the Fayum on pages 44-45.

## 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 prvázanost            | 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               | <input type="checkbox"/> | X                        | <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              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Přiznání možností a hranic práce s materiálem        | <input type="checkbox"/> | X                        | <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                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | X                        | <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 – providing first an overview of all sites in the Fayum with a cult dedicated to Sobek, followed by an overview of the specific nature of the god, its relation to other deities as well as festivals and oracles associated with the crocodile deity. The same, clear structure is maintained in the part dedicated to the cult of Sobek in Kom Ombo. As a result the paper represents a

unified entity. The work as a whole would have benefited from a slightly larger and more detailed conclusion, focusing more exhaustively on the many links and influences between, as well as the very specific nature of Sobek in the Fayum and Kom Ombo, and highlighting the main finds of the research.

The subject of the paper is for the most part clearly set within its context and a detailed overview is presented of previous studies on the topic. The author has gathered and studied a large number of resources related to the topic of the paper. A few comments should be made in regard to the (lack of) use of a number of sources:

a) It is rather surprising and unfortunate that the author, one exception notwithstanding, did not make more use of the study of W. J. R. Rübsam, *Götter und Kulte in Faijum während der griechisch-römisch-byzantinischen Zeit*, Bonn 1974, especially since in this particular study all sites with cult installations to Sobek and all different forms and manifestations of Sobek, which are discussed in the thesis, feature in extenso. The study of Rübsam also points out (pp. 27-28) the existence of a joint cult for Suchos/Sobek and Arsinoe II, as well as the occurrence of Pnepheros as another manifestation of Suchos in Bakchias (p. 71), not discussed in the thesis. A reference to this study of Rübsam would not be out of place in for instance footnote 65, instead of a reference to the *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*. Another relevant study missing is M. Molcho, "Crocodile breeding in the crocodile cults of the Graeco-Roman Fayum", *JEA* 100 (2014), 181-193.

b) The following references could still be added to:

- Footnote 52, referring to the Middle Kingdom worship of Sobek the Shedtite in Medinet el-Fayum: Habachi, *ASAE* 52 (1954), 463–464 and 479, and Wild, *BIFAO* 69 (1971), 115, fig. 6.
- Footnote 76 on the architecture of the temenos and the cult practices within, could be enriched with M. Stadler, "Interpreting the architecture of the *temenos*: demotic papyri and the cult of Soknopaiou Nesos", in Capasso – Davoli (eds.), *Soknopaiou Nesos Project I* (2003-2009), Pisa 2012.
- Footnote 83, regarding pWien Aeg 9976 and the dating of the temple of Soknopaiou Nesos: H. Goedicke, *WZKM* 75 (1983), 7–18.
- Footnote 208 should contain a reference to the publication of the hieratic version of the "Book of the Fayum" from Roman times by Bagnani, and not to the article by John Tait (in O'Connor – Quirke, *Mysterious Lands*, p. 201), on which page Bagnani is not even mentioned.
- Footnotes 369 and 381: pBerlin 6750 was also discussed in detail by G. Widmer, "On Egyptian

religion at Soknopaiu Nesos in the Roman Period (P. Berlin P 6750)", in S. Lippert – M. Schentuleit (eds), *Tebtynis und Soknopaiu Nesos: Leben im römerzeitlichen Fajum. Akten des Internationalen Symposions vom 11. bis 13. Dezember 2003 in Sommerhausen bei Würzburg*, Wiesbaden 2005, 171–184. The article could also have been used in the subchapter on Soknopaiou Nesos (pp. 17–21).

c) The author makes at times extensive — and sometimes exclusive — use of secondary sources of a compilatory nature, such as encyclopedias (e.g. *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, *Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt* or Bard's *Encyclopedia of the Archaeology of Ancient Egypt*) or general overviews and guidebooks (e.g. Wilkinson, *The Complete Temples of Ancient Egypt* or Aufrère – Golvin – Goyon, *L'Égypte Restituée*) without providing the primary studies on the topic or the primary source material. A few examples to illustrate this point:

- Footnote 202: The reference to a guidebook is completely out of place, especially given the large amount of work that J.-F. Quack has dedicated to the "Book of the Temple" over the last two decades. One would expect a.o. the following references instead: J.-F. Quack, "Der historische Abschnitt des Buches vom Tempel", in A. Assmann – E. Blumenthal (eds.), *Literatur und Politik im pharaonischen und ptolemäischen Ägypten. Vorträge der Tagung zum Gedenken an Georges Posener*, (BdE 127), 1999, pp. 267–278; J.-F. Quack, "Das Buch vom Tempel und verwandte Texte – ein Vorbericht", *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 2 (2002), pp. 1–20; J.-F. Quack, "Die Dienstanweisung des Oberlehrers aus dem Buch vom Tempel", in H. Beinlich – J. Hallof – H. Hussy – C. von Pfeil (eds.), *5. Ägyptologische Tempeltagung, Würzburg, 23.-26. September 1999*, (ÄAT 33.3), Wiesbaden 2002, pp. 159–171 and many, many more.
- Footnote 487: Instead of a mention to the work of Zaki, one would have liked to see a reference to the actual New Kingdom inscription mentioned in the body of the text – i.e. Urk. VIII, 41.
- On page 82 the author mentions "the sanctuary of Sobek in Gebel el Silsila", with only a reference to R. Wilkinson, *The Complete Temples*, p. 208. In general one would have liked to see a reference to the recent entry (2012) in the online *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology* by A. Kucharek (<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2x73c8bz>) with an overview of all relevant literature on the subject. The reader is left to guess which temple is meant – the destroyed temple of Ramses II? The sanctuary is more likely to be a rock shrine, containing depictions of Sobek – as is for instance the case in the recently studied chapel of Senenmut; see e.g. A. Kucharek, "Senenmut in Gebel es-Silsilah", *MDAIK* 66 (2010), pp. 143–159 (initial publication: R. A. Caminos – T. G. H. James, *Gebel el-Silsileh I. The Shrines*, ASE 31, London 1963, pp. 53–56).

The translation/transliteration of some ancient Egyptian terms can on occasion be improved:

- p. 18: Isis Nepheres did not derive from *Is.t nfr.t*, but *Is.t s.t nfr.t*: “Isis of the beautiful throne” (e.g. Wb. IV, 4, 19 for the epithet) instead of “Beautiful Isis”.
- p. 33: *p3 ššc hfti Sbk* refers to the sacred **way** or **route** of Sobek, not the sacred voice.
- p. 34: *r3.w nw hwt-ntr* are not “utterances of the **things** of god”, but rather “Spells of the **temple**”.
- p. 83: *m-h3.t wi3 Rc* is not “**in the nose** of the bark of Ra”, but “**at the head** of the bark of Ra”.
- p. 84: *šd-bg* is not “the one who **knows** the flood”, but “the one who **saves** the flood”.

One should still mention that the Labyrinth of Hawara is associated with Amenemhat III, not Amenhotep III (p. 11)

#### Overall conclusion

The author has managed to gather, study and present in a coherent manner a large amount of detailed information on the cult and cult sites of Sobek both in the Fayum and Kom Ombo, as well as the nature of the relationship and mutual influences between both regions. The specific character of Sobek in either area, next to his relationship with other deities is likewise appropriately discussed. The work shows potential, but the overall impression is partly marred by inconsistencies in the layout and style of text and footnotes, and the occasional absence of references to primary material, whether studies or the source itself.

Overall the study meets the expectations of a BA paper and I would recommend that the study should be accepted for defence in front of the appropriate committee.

Hodnocení: velmi dobře<sup>1</sup>

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



15.01.2016

Datum

Podpis

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