

External Examiner's Report on the Dissertation of Milos Rohacek

“Metal Finds in Western Anatolia in Second Millennium BC”

Submitted in 2023 at the Department of Classical Archaeology

I. Brief summary of the dissertation

The thesis deals with metal finds found in Western Anatolian dating to the Second Millennium BC sites. It aims to provide a regional overview of the metalworking through the systematic survey of the literature, as a result of which 1286 objects are included in the catalogue and the analysis. As Western Anatolia cannot be regarded as a single geopolitical entity the author conducts the analysis by dividing it into two main regions as coastal and inland, which then further subdivided into micro-regions. The typological analysis of the metal finds is carried out in terms of their function as primary criterion and their type as secondary criterion. The conclusions of the thesis rely on the geographical distribution patterns of only the functional type that reflects the primary criterion.

II. Brief overall evaluation of the dissertation

The strong aspect of the thesis lies in the comprehensive catalogue of the metal finds that reflects a unique work that contributes to the enhancement of the state-of-the-art. The thesis has also weak aspects that are related to the analytical approaches. The thesis covers ca. 800 years, and it does not take the chronological phases into account in the analysis of typology, context and distribution patterns. As a result, the data of the ca. 800 years is put together regardless of diachronic developments. It is stated that Peter Pavuk's chronological sequence for the 2nd millennium BC Western Anatolia was used that proposes a tripartite periodisation. Although such a sound chronological foundation was presented, its employment in the analysis was not at appropriate level. In addition, the section on metal sources and contemporary the metallurgical activities does not include adequate level of information.

III. Detailed evaluation of the dissertation and its individual aspects

[Please provide a detailed evaluation of the dissertation. Among other things, this evaluation should consider the criteria listed below (preferably providing examples from the text to illustrate all critical points). You can either organise your comments separately, according to the individual criteria, or formulate a longer overall summary addressing all the criteria at once.

1. Structure of the argument

The main objective of the thesis, which is to survey the metal finds from Western Anatolia in the 2nd millennium BC systematically, is most welcomed contribution that

enhances the state-of-the-art by presenting an extensive catalogue. The thesis also however has weaknesses in the analytical approach combining the typological, chronological, spatial and contextual data. As a result, although the argumentation is lucid enough, more analysis was expected in the way mentioned above. The dissertation is clearly structured from the thematical perspective, however, not convincingly from the diachronic and spatial perspective. The presentation of the typological analysis in relation to the catalogue is a scientific achievement that shows the set objectives are reached although there are weaknesses that could be improved.

2. Formal aspects of the dissertation

The author is coherent in the use of abbreviations, syntax of bibliographical references, but not in the spelling of Turkish place names. The footnotes are formatted correctly. The language of the dissertation is generally grammatically correct but it is not free of linguistic infelicities as there are repeating minor mistakes in English. The dissertation is visually well-presented, and graphically well-formatted.

3. Use of sources and/or material

The author works transparently with secondary sources. All relevant sources concerning metal finds are made use of but sources related to the metallurgical aspects are not included at adequate level. The sources are employed in a methodologically correct manner. The methodology used for data collection and analysis are coherent except for the individual steps by means of chronology in data analysis is not satisfactorily justified and well executed. The method of data collection and processing is in line with the main research question that have some weaknesses. The interpretation of the results proposed by the author follow from the results of the empirical research or sources on which the work relies.

4. Personal contribution to the subject

The author employs the primary and secondary sources to propose an original, organically formulated contribution to the field that has its strength in a substantial catalogue and typological analysis.

IV. Questions for the author

1. Is it possible to present a typological analysis separately for Middle Bronze Age as well as Late Bronze I and II?
2. Is it possible to show a diachronic development in metal finds from Middle to Bronze Age?
3. Are there any differences in the spatial distribution of the finds between Middle Bronze, Late Bronze I and Late Bronze II?
4. Is it possible define the interregional connections of Western Anatolia with the neighbouring regions by means of metal finds regarding chronological and spatial perspective?

V. Conclusion

The thesis is successful in the achievement of the main objective and present a comprehensive catalogue and typological of the metal finds in the 2nd millennium BC in Western Anatolia. However, the thesis can be improved by a more detailed chronological and spatial analysis along with further integration of technological data gained from metallurgical analysis.

I provisionally classify the submitted dissertation as *passed*.

20.12.2023

KOZAL