

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA

Filozofická fakulta

Zápis o obhajobě disertační práce

Akademický rok: 2019/2020

Jméno a příjmení studenta: Mgr. Petra Tušlová
Identifikační číslo studenta: 68886858

Typ studijního programu: doktorský
Studijní program: Historické vědy
Studijní obor: Klasická archeologie
Identifikační čísla studia: 381428

Název práce: Roman and Late Antique Pottery from Ancient Thrace, Selected Assemblages from the Yambol District

Pracoviště práce: Ústav pro klasickou archeologii (21-UKAR)

Jazyk práce: angličtina

Jazyk obhajoby: čeština

Školitel: doc. PhDr. Peter Pavúk, Ph.D.

Oponent(i): Nicholas Frederick Hudson

Billur Tekkök Karaöz

Datum obhajoby: 29.05.2020 **Místo obhajoby:** Praha

Hlasování komise: prospěl/a: 5 neprospěl/a: 0

Průběh obhajoby: 14:00 The chair of the board Prof. Jan Bažant started the defence, introduced himself, members of the board present and opponents present, introducing also the defendant to the committee.
14:01 The supervisor, doc. Peter Pavúk, presented briefly his evaluation of the student's studies and the progress on the dissertation as such, given in more detail his written report.
14:02 The defendant, Mgr. Petra Tušlová, presented the main themes of her dissertation. She pointed out in particular:

- The state of research concerning the pottery studies of Roman period in the Yambol district is relatively poor. The little material that is published comes almost exclusively from burial mounds, with only few line drawings available. There are almost no synthetic studies. Due to the burial contexts, only a selection of shapes is available. There is also no data for the 4th century and later, when burial mounds were abandoned. There is no fabric description in the publications.

- Her study focused on three sites available for her study thanks to the Yambol distr. Museum: a Roman period to Late Antique settlement of Yurta-Stroyno, excavated by herself and her team; an in situ destruction of a Late Antique (6th century AD) house in Dodoparon; and a burial mound of Palauzovo. The largest assemblage was that of Yurta, creating a backbone for the outline of the principal wares and fabrics (32.000 fragments, 554 drawings). Majority of the Roman period pottery turned out to be of local production, with most imports (amphorae and pottery) coming from the SE Anatolia, some rare import categories originate from N Italy and S Gaul. In Late Antiquity the absolute majority of production is

local. Due to many later disturbances the Stroyno material was treated largely as a survey assemblage. In Dodoparon, being a single closed context, the study focused on the function of the building as mirrored by the assemblage. Each vessel was inventoried on its own. In Palauzovo the entire vessels were treated in the same methodology as in the previous case. Numerous poor quality vessels in the burials (skewed, poor slip, badly cut bases, etc.) make the author suggest that burial pottery was produced as such with lesser care.

- In general, the fine pottery bears throughout the studied period a clear Hellenistic influence, while the handmade pottery of the Thracian tradition continues from the 6th century BC until the Late Antiquity without change.
- Throughout the studied period, local production was fully capable of covering local needs.
- imports (pottery and mainly amphorae) arrive mostly from Asia Minor – both in the Roman period and Late Antiquity
- there is a significant breaking point in pottery production in the 5th century AD

14:26 The first opponent, prof. Dr. Billur Tekkok, presented the main points of her report, stating that she recommends the submitted dissertation for defence. She made these questions to the student:

- She pointed out the similarities between the Yambol and the Dardanelles/Troy region, even in similar proportions
- it would be interesting to see the inland connection and the role of military, also the vessels in Dodoparon (a strainer) could be linked with cheese production and could suggest that the house was not self-sufficient but it could have been linked with the military
- local production of wine and of LR2 amphorae proposed in the study is questionable
- It would be worthy to try and associate the decline of pottery production with historically documented events such as the Gothic and Herulian invasions or the 3rd century earthquake...

14:36 The second opponent, Prof. Dr. Nicholas Hudson, presented the main points of his report and also recommended the submitted dissertation for defence. He put these questions forward:

- He appreciated the author's hands-on knowledge and all information she deals with, though he would recommend a more rigorous control and more detailed explanation of the mental process and of the methodology with which the data were presented.
- He commented on the idea of specific production of pottery for burial practices – the presented vessels seemed to him to be of decent quality. Is the hypothesis of burial pottery corroborated by absence of such vessels in the settlements?

14:41 The student reacted to the opponents' comments and their questions.

- methodology and inconsistency: the candidate fully agreed with critique, she is currently working on the publication in which reorganisation of the study from methodological point of view, and tightening the narrative, is the main task.
- burial pottery: no corroboration in settlements but there is strange recurrence of crooked pottery in the graves in Straldža, Kabyle and Palauzovo. It remains a working hypothesis that failed pottery was sold for burial purposes
- cheese production: comparison with sites identified convincingly as dairy farms, and in which strainers are represented in vast numbers, show that in Dodoparon such interpretation is not likely.
- local production of Late Roman 2 amphorae: is postulated based on preliminary results of petrographic analyses and on discussion with Romanian colleagues.

14:48 The opponents (and the supervisor) commented on the performance of the student.

- both opponents were content with the responses

14:49 The chair of the board opened the discussion.

These persons spoke in the following discussion:

PP: The methodological problem raised by prof. Hudson are contingent on education system,

NV: There are different discourses, different ways of saying things – we are much closer to the German discourse than to Anglo-American one

NV: Dolia were briefly mentioned when discussing Late Antiquity. Do they appear only then or had they existed before?

PT: They did exist; they were not discussed because none was found in the Stroyno excavations, but they are common in surveys in the region. Dolia in the region have the same shape from the Hellenistic to Roman period

14:56 The chair of the board ended the defence itself and the board initiated a private meeting on classification of the dissertation defence.

The chair of the board announced to the student and persons present the result of the defence: The board voted (by raising hands), number of the members of the board 7 – number of the members of the board present 5 – positive votes 5, negative votes 0. The dissertation defence was classified pass.

Klasifikace obhajoby:

prospěl/a (P)

Předseda komise:

prof. PhDr. Jan Bažant, CSc.

Členové komise:

doc. PhDr. Mgr. Luboš Jiráň, CSc.

doc. PhDr. Peter Pavúk, Ph.D.

Mgr. Jana Maříková-Kubková, Ph.D.

PhDr. Natalie Venclová, DrSc.