

Assessment of the Bachelor's Thesis

Author of thesis: Karin Petrič

Title of thesis: Truth in Fiction

Assessment of the primary advisor

Assessment of the opponent

Author of the assessment (first name, last name, workplace): Tereza Stejskalová, KF FAMU

Evaluation of the content and final form of the thesis (A/excellent – B/very good – C/good – D/good with objections – E/satisfactory – F/unsatisfactory – not recommended for defence)

Suitability of the selected objective and work approach A

Relative completeness of the literature used for the selected topic A

Ability to critically evaluate and use professional literature A

Logicity of the thesis structure, connection of its chapters B

Language and stylistic level of the thesis A

Compliance with citation norms (should the text repeatedly contain adopted passages without citing the source, the work cannot be recommended for defence) A

Sufficient extent of image attachments, justifiability and suitability of attachments, graphic layout A

Originality of the thesis, contribution to the development of the field of study A

Overall evaluation of the thesis A

Verbal evaluation of the thesis including questions that the diplomate must address in his/her thesis defence:

Karin Petrič's thesis deals with the complicated relationship between truth and fiction in the oeuvre of the Iranian director Abbas Kiarostami. Karin undertakes a detailed close-reading of a number of Kiarostami's films to explore them not only thematically but also with regard to their form. The close readings form the core of the thesis and they contribute to a thoughtful, critical analysis of the films. The thesis manages to outline significant patterns and key strategies in the Kiarostami oeuvre and develops an understanding of the films' form, craft and meanings. Namely, Karin focuses on how Kiarostami's films (both feature films and documentaries) are self-reflective, how they foreground their own constructedness and artifice to make the spectator at all times aware that what she is watching is fiction, not a reality. Karin shows how the truth of what Kiarostami wants to convey lies primarily in what he omits, what he chooses not to reveal, and in many films, these absences are related to death as the traumatic, unrepresentable Real

of life. In all cases, these moments of void or incompleteness serve to call on us to become co-creators of meanings of his films, to find in them our own truth. Thus they count on a spectator willing to engage with his films in great depth, as a kind of spiritual journey. Karin's close-readings are thoughtful and careful, she critically examines secondary literature and incorporates it into her own argument. Most importantly, she manages to outline key strategies of Kiarostami's art.

Questions:

In your thesis, you center on Kiarostami as the "auteur" of his films. By sidelining other conditions of production of these films (other collaborators, social/political/economic conditions) do you not risk contributing/fetishizing a certain kind of a "cult of personality"?

You write that Kiarostami does not aim at involving the spectator emotionally (but intellectually, critically). Yet, it seems to me his films do engage emotions and seek some sort of attachment and emotional engagement, intimacy with the spectator only they do not do it through "cinematic illusion". Can you elaborate on the role of emotions in his films?