

Filmová a televizní fakulta AMU v Praze / Film and TV School of Academy of Performing Arts, Prague

FAMU International

Posudek magisterské diplomové práce / Thesis Evaluation Form

Student:Grégory Montaldo

Název práce / Title of the Thesis:

BLUE KITANO: The Motif of the sea in the cinema of Takeshi Kitano

Jméno autora/ky posudku / Name of the thesis opponent:

...Mgr. Petra Dominková, P (FI).....

Hodnocení obsahu a výsledné podoby diplomové práce / Evaluation scale:

A – výborně / excellent

B – velmi dobře / very good

C – dobře / good

D – dobře s výhradami / good with minor mistakes

E – dostatečně / suitable for defense

F – nedostatečně / fail – not recommended for defense

- Hodnotící kritéria a podíl na známce / Evaluated parameters and weight:
- *Vyplňte u každé položky evaluaci dle výše uvedené škály. / Please fill in the evaluation for each parameter according to the scale above.*

	Hodnotící kritéria / Evaluated parameters	Váha/Weight	Grade (A-F)
1	Vhodnost zvoleného cíle / Relevance of the chosen subject	5 %	B
2	Práce naplňuje zadání / Thesis covers the chosen subject	5 %	D
3	Stanovení metodologie a její adekvátnost / Choice of an adequate methodology	10 %	E
4	Relativní úplnost zpracované literatury ke zvolenému tématu / Research of the relevant sources and bibliography	10 %	C
5	Schopnost kriticky vyhodnotit a použít odbornou literaturu / Ability to critically process and use the relevant sources and literature	10 %	D
6	Logičnost struktury práce, souvislost jejích kapitol, užití stanovené metodologie / Structure of the work and chapters, use of the chosen methodology	20 %	D
7	Dosažení cíle práce, původnost, přínos / Was the goal of the work achieved, quality and originality of the result	20 %	C
8	Jazyková a stylistická úroveň práce / Language and style	10 %	D
9	Dodržení citační etiky a kvalita poznámkového aparátu / Citation ethics and quality of citations*)	10 %	D

**) Pokud se v textu vyskytují přejaté pasáže bez udání zdroje, hodnocení této kategorie je F. / If the work uses parts of the other texts without citing them properly, the evaluation of this parameter is F.*

Navrhované hodnocení diplomové práce (kalkulace bude doplněna pracovníkem katedry) / Suggested final grade (<i>will be calculated by the department</i>):	D
---	---

Slovní hodnocení práce (V případě přílohy, prosíme, připojte datum a podpis) / Verbal evaluation of thesis (in case of separate attachment please add your signature and date):

Prosíme, zdůvodněte zejména případné hodnocení „Nedostatečně“ / Please provide reasoning particularly in case of „Fail“ evaluation

Doporučený rozsah do 2700 znaků / Recommendation: up to 2700 characters

Grégory Montaldo has chosen for his thesis a truly captivating theme: the sea as a character in Takeshi Kitano's films. It is not clear, though, why he spent the whole introduction (and most of the thesis itself) talking about other motifs and themes present in Kitano's films – those seem unrelated to the theme that Grégory wants to explore. Not even “[t]he political scope of [Kitano's] work” (p. 8) can tell us anything about the sea. Overall, it seems that the thesis – despite its original and promising theme – does not offer much more than the superficial discussion of few scenes happening close to the sea.

The thesis has a lot of formal faults – sometimes it is not even clear what Grégory means (e.g. “the gentle repetition and regularity of its plots is reminiscent of the sack and the surf”, p. 2; „Kitano is a hapax“, p. 7), and the text would for sure need a proofreader as it is full of mistakes (“One might wonders“, p. 4; „he has misses the film,“ p. 36; you cannot „entertain“ an obsession, p. 4). Some notes are written in French instead of English (see p. 39), at one point even in the text itself we read “Gaston Bachelard qui étudie l'imagination matérielle de l'eau, parle de l'eau comme un élément de la mort désiré” (!, p. 56) – it almost seems that the author is taking that part from already existent work. Grégory is somewhat negligent to the formal side of his thesis, that contains a variety of fonts, used randomly throughout (see notes at p. 2, for example), italics are used here and there without particular logic behind, the citations are not unified either – the reference to the page should be “p.” followed by a space and number while Grégory is using in some cases capital P and number of the page follows just after the P without a dot and a space – it is a minor mistake, of course, but truly frequent. Occasionally, the sources are entirely missing (e.g. note no. 2 on page 2 is indeed not general knowledge, not the author's explanation, it is clearly taken from an unknown source).

Sometimes, the conclusions of the author are quite sudden, as on pages 6– 7 when the fact that “the sea also appears in the arts “ leads the author to the conclusion that “This clearly illustrates the special bond the Japanese maintain with Nature.” Well, not really. Neither the “return to the sea [...] help[s] us to understand what it means to be an adult in the modern Japanese society” (p. 9) Overall, the conclusions Grégory is making are quite sudden and do not seem to be connected much with the material discussed.

Grégory refers to the variety of the sources (perhaps even too many), but rarely they are used to support his ideas about the role of the sea in Kitano’s films – the thesis consists of the list of the quotes (some of them are too lengthy) whose reference to the subject of the thesis is not always clear and that are usually not developed further by the author. The quotes are almost never followed by the author’s commentary, which the scholarly work would require. The format of quotes is not unified either and does not correspond with the rules – longer quotes should be in a block, for instance.

The essay is at some parts repetitive – for instance, we learn that Kitano was a comedian on pages 2, 9, and 17, while it is always brought up as something new, worth mentioning. At various parts of the thesis is Kitano compared to various directors, while sometimes it is unclear how does it relate to the sea, the subject the student explores (e.g. Chaplin’s connection to the sea is never discussed).

The author repeatedly forgets what is his focus (sea) and discusses a variety of themes that are relevant only slightly if at all (e.g. challenged characters in Kitano’s films, pp. 19 – 22; suicide, pp. 47 – 51; gender studies, p. 58).

Overall, I have to state that discussing the sea in the Kitano’s films seems to be a wonderful idea, but it is heavily underdeveloped. Grégory is missing a focus that this kind of work needs. The thesis would need to be significantly restructured so it may be assessed by better grade.

Still, though, there is quite a lot of work seen behind it, the author proved that he did do certain research on the subject and I believe that the thesis can be recommended for the defense – I suggest it is assessed by the grade D.

**Práci doporučuji k obhajobě / Thesis is recommended for the defense:
(Zakroužkujte odpověď / Please circle the answer)**

ANO/YES – ~~NE/NO~~

Pokud je hodnocení jakéhokoliv kritéria uvedeného výše F, práce nemůže být doporučena k obhajobě. / If the evaluation of any parameter above is F, thesis cannot be recommended for defense.

Datum/Date:

19th of September 2021

Podpis/Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized first name followed by a long horizontal stroke.