

Diploma thesis oponent review: Dimitra Surlantzi The Wild Duck by Henrik Ibsen Characters analysis and visual interpretation Character analysis and visual interpretation

The subject of the diploma thesis is the analysis of Ibsen's Wild Duck, which leads to visual interpretation in the form of a theater production project.

After the introduction, there is an extensive section dealing with the life and work of Henrik Ibsen, an analysis of his style in the context of time, philosophy and art. Like the story of the game that follows, or examples of older productions, it's a good introduction for further consideration.

I very much appreciate that the author can formulate topics that interest her on the text. For her, it is primarily a conflict of reality and ideal, illusion and truth. These are topics that can resonate in our society as well. Nevertheless, the story does not move to the present, but until the 1980s, which make it more suitable for displaying the middle class life- illusion. This is a consideration I respect, and I do not want the author to suspect that she is only subject to a certain fashion wave of retro aesthetics, although she has several times reported in her text to the anti-aesthetic movement. In any case, the analysis of these themes is very good in the context of philosophical trends and sociological views.

The problem for me arises when this intellectual analysis is to be transformed into a particular visual scenic formation. The source for the author is "Panelák" as a sociological element and, in this case, aesthetic. I can agree with that. What, however, actually takes place on the stage as an apartment, and the Ekdal Studio does not act like "panelák" flats on me. Not an aesthetic, it corresponds to buildings from the second half of the last century, but an architectural disposition. For the author, the idea of a central location of space, which is in Ibsen's text an uninhabitable space under the roof rather invisible, was a fundamental idea. She took it as a glass atrium where she visualized the images of the characters that enter it. This is a very striking interpretation. It means that the viewer clearly sees that everything that is related to this space is really just an illusion. There are no rabbits, no hen, old Ekdal does not really shoot there, there is not even a wild duck. But on the contrary, the final shot and death are real. The question for me is how this interpretation helps Ibsen's play. Maybe it would work better on stage than in my imagination. Well, I respect. I find it harder to respect what makes this decision in space. Ekdal's atelier grew up in a large villa or luxury apartment with a central glazed atrium, with the feeling of other space around this central hall, as the doors do not lead to specific rooms, but the characters are to appear in different doors. I hardly believe that a family living here considers a piece of butter to be a luxury. I would not have these questions if the space was more abstract. But the space wants to be an apartment and wants to be a big apartment. Instead, the opening party at the Werle's House will take place on the proscenium with a black curtain and designer furniture. So, at Werle's, the guests are in a tight space, and at Ekdal's apartment a more opulent party could take place. I admit, however, that my thinking may be too realistic. Then I protest for audiences with too realistic thinking just like me.

The designs are processed well. The scene model is at a decent level, as well as photos of individual situations. If the project should be implemented, I would consider the technical documentation to be insufficient.

I strongly recommend the work for the defense. I propose a "C" rating.

Prague, 8.6. 2018 MgA. Martin Černý