

Department of Montage

Final Thesis Evaluation

Author: Samani Estrada Ramos

Title: **La Mansion de Araucaima under Brechtian Eyes**

Evaluation by the Thesis Mentor

Author of Evaluation (name, surname, department): Martin Čihák, Montage

Evaluation of the content and resulting form of a theoretical Thesis:

Appropriate choice of Thesis objective and approach.....	C
Relative completeness of the literature search in relation to the topic	C
Ability to adopt a critical approach and use specialised literature sources	C
Logical structure of the Thesis, continuity and proportionality of chapters	C
Linguistic level and style	D
Compliance with the bibliography standards (no thesis may be recommended for defence if there are multiple quote sections indicating no source in the text).....	D
Sufficient extent of images, justification for and appropriateness of such images, graphic representation.....	C
Originality of the Thesis, contribution to the field of interest	C
Overall Evaluation of the Thesis (A-F)	C

(*explanation: A = outstanding performance exceeding the criteria above, B = above-average performance with minimum errors, C = average performance with an acceptable level of error, D = acceptable performance with a higher level of error, E = performance merely satisfying the criteria, F = unacceptable performance*)

Recommendations:

The individual verbal evaluation of the theoretical Thesis includes a paragraph summarising the contents and conclusions of the Thesis; presents a more detailed evaluation of the aforementioned criteria, particularly the justification for the D, E, F grades; points out the positive features of the Thesis, particularly if the grade is A, B; formulates the questions for the student to answer during the defence; in conclusion, the evaluation gives a clear statement on whether the author has demonstrated the ability to work creatively and independently in his/her chosen area of research or not, whether the Thesis meets the standard requirements for final theses or not, whether the Supervisor/Opponent recommends the Thesis for defence or not, and the proposed grade. Typically, the verbal evaluation takes 1 standard page; if there are no objections to the Thesis, it may be shorter. With theses where there is nothing to criticise, an additional question should be asked as to where the student should direct his/her subsequent research.

Individual verbal evaluation of the theoretical Thesis:

The content of this thesis is briefly expressed in subtitle “Study of Mayolo’s dramaturgical and montage intentions from a Bertold Brecht theoretical point of view.”

Samani is able comprehensibly explain his ideas. Many formulations are not only clear, but even clever. Unfortunately, what I’m missing is Samani’s expression of his personal-professional attitude. This thesis could be written (almost in the same way) by somebody else without any experience as an editor.

I would like to appreciate the comparative chart (table - p. 38-39) of Epic form of Theatre (Brecht) and Mayolo’s *La Maison de Araucaima*, but it could be accompanied by more elaborated commentary.

During our consultations Samani accepted some of proposals concerning the arrangement of the images etc. He made an advanced step in formal organization of his thesis, but there are still many lacks of “formal rules” and “logical conventions”:

Why the image 26 (p. 54) is smaller than the images on previous pages, even if it is the single shot where Don Gracio is turning directly to the camera (to the audience)?

Thesis contains a lot of typing errors – f. e. mistyped numbering of chapters and subchapter: p. 30 - II.a., p. 43 - II.B., p. 55 – II. (instead of III.), p. 64 – III. (instead of IV.) etc. There is a disorder in the use of italics type, quotation marks, sometimes there are missing the pages and sources of quotations. (p. 17 there is “quotation” of Zillmann, 1991, but there is no item by Dolf Zillmann in a bibliography.) Exactly say there is no Bibliography! Samani used the term References, in which are mixed together the books with films and even some of them are not mentioned. (p. 6. *The night of living death* (Berdet, 2016), p. 7 – *Carne de tu Carne* (*Flesh of your Flesh*, english: *Bloody Flesh*) etc.

Despite the remarks and comments mentioned above, Samani’s thesis meets the standard requirements for final thesis. I recommend it for defence and propose the grade **C**.

Questions for the student to answer during the defense:

Q 1: The term Montage is frequently used in the whole text, but is absented among the Keywords. Why the term **Editing** is mentioned there, but is never used in the main text?! (only once in Abstract and also in the name of our department).

Q 2: Discuss the use of Shklovsky’s term “**defamiliarization**” (regarding his article *Art as A Technique*), comparing it with Brecht’s “**Verfremdungseffekt**“ in the context of montage of *La Mansion de Araucaima*.

Q 3: (p. 64-66) Samani, can you explain us more detailed your term **irreverent filmmaking**, and what are its typical features concerning the process of montage.

Date:17. 09. 2022

Signature: