



FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA  
Univerzita Karlova

## Zápis o obhajobě disertační práce

Akademický rok: 2023/2024

**Jméno a příjmení studenta:** Mgr. Bc. Kateřina Gajdošová  
**Identifikační číslo studenta:** 23490138

**Typ studijního programu:** doktorský  
**Studijní program:** Historické vědy  
**Studijní obor:** Dějiny a kultury zemí Asie a Afriky  
**ID studia:** 472218

**Název práce:** Between Dao □ and Fa □: intertextual analysis of the Warring States period cosmological texts  
**Pracoviště práce:** Katedra Blízkého východu (21-KBV)  
**Jazyk práce:** angličtina  
**Jazyk obhajoby:** čeština  
**Školitel:** doc. Mgr. Lukáš Zádrapa, Ph.D.  
**Oponent(i):** Mgr. Dušan Vávra, Ph.D.

prof. Steven Victor Burik

**Datum obhajoby:** 08.12.2023    **Místo obhajoby:** Praha  
**Termín:** řádný

**Průběh obhajoby:** 10:12 The supervisor introduces the candidate, her previous studies and works in the fields of philosophy and sinology, her stay at the Academia Sinica in Taiwan, participations in the workshops focused on Chinese philology with the world specialists in the field, and her publications. The supervisor also appreciates her expertise in both philosophy and philology. He considers the thorough approach to the problem of the excavated texts and her criticism of the Aristotelian and Platonic bias of the Western readers of early Chinese texts. The candidate employed the pre-Socratic philosophers as well as the philosophy of M. Heidegger and the processual philosophy to overcome this bias. The supervisor supports her thesis for defence.

10:25 The candidate presents her thesis. Since 2016, she has pursued the idea of the closeness of Legalism and Daoism and the shared ideas of early Chinese cosmologies. She found the framing of the debate on this topic misleading, biased by the ideas of physics and metaphysics. She identifies the common features of such cosmologies with processuality, oneness, mutual interdependence of things. She also focused on the topic on naming and takes it out of the context of representation of a given reality and presents it as a structuring moment in undifferentiated whole becoming cosmos. She also resituated the subject from substantivist position and redefines it as the locus of decision-making. She sees her work as undone and wants to remove the last bits of essentialism and representationalism from it in the future.

10:36 Stephen Burik appreciates the objective of the dissertation and its constant pursuit throughout the chapters. He is personally interested in the question of the relation between naming as a form of essentialism.

10:40 Dušan Vávra highly esteems the work and its objective. The dissertation goes too far in the sense of reducing the whole early Chinese philosophy into one frame. He would also prefer to get rid of the Daoist vs. Legalist dichotomy. He also shows a circularity in the use of quotations chosen to prove the argument. He also questions her approach to the theory of Meyer. The cosmology is sometimes presented as a basis of Chinese thought, on the other hand as an innovation of the Warring States period. He asks about not integrating the problems in Laozi 51. Does the cosmology underlie the Confucian self-cultivation as well? Some philosophies emphasize the human role as distinct. Where is there the continuity between Nature and culture.

10:47 The candidate responds to the opponents:

The work lacks the reference to the translation of the *Taiyishengshui* by Hall and Ames.

Burik: Naming and essentialism. Candidate: Name is a sound which is also a process. It resonates with the things so it participates in the flux ontology.

Burik: Why not use the immanentist approach? Candidate: Immanentism has been used as a hidden transcendentalism. The crack in reality remained. Treating the One should have been also translated as a verb.

11:02 Vávra: Nature/culture distinction. Some philosophies emphasize the human role as distinct. Candidate: The sage sees the ways in which the cosmos develops and can use the names as the tools for creation and participate in the process generating the cosmos.

Vávra: Can we call this co-creating? Candidate: Yes. The distinction lays in the level of attributing the agency to the humans.

The circularity: The candidate is aware of having used the method she had criticised. She needed to make a choice but is prepared to defend her argument also on other excerpts.

Dirk Meyer and argument-based texts: His argument was used but not explicitly.

Laozi 51 was not included but the relevant problem of differentiation is discussed in the work.

Cosmology vs. Confucianism and the problem of innovation: There is a shared cosmology as the background of all the strands of thought, or at least shared elements that enable the emergence of various philosophies. Confucianism can be seen as a reaction to the fluidity.

11:23 The questions are being raised by the committee.

Berounský asks about the references to mythology and rituals.

Candidate: They permeate the texts.

Lomová: Can we talk about a variety of cosmologies in early China?

Candidate: I was working with the cosmologies and searching for their smaller common denominators. This objection is very pendant and demands work in the future.

Vávra: You made a distinction between implicit and explicit cosmology during the discussion. It should have been included in your work.

Zádrapa: It is very improbable that all people shared the same cosmology across the Zhou period and society. Material sources would be taken in account.

Berounský: Universal cosmologies are usually advocated in the context of imperial policies.

Candidate: The reality is structured differently in various

cosmologies but their elements are never excluded from the changes.

11:39 The open discussion is closed.

Internal discussion of the committee and reviewers follows. The committee unanimously decided for voting by acclamation.

11:44 The head of the committee announces that the thesis was defended successfully.

This report was written by Jakub Otčenášek.

<b>Klasifikace obhajoby:</b>	prospěl/a (P)	
<b>Předseda komise:</b>	prof. PhDr. Olga Lomová, CSc.	.....
<b>Členové komise:</b>	doc. Daniel Berounský, Ph.D.	.....
	doc. Mgr. Lukáš Zádrapa, Ph.D.	.....
	Mgr. Jakub Hrubý, Ph.D.	.....