

**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: Barkha Naik .....

Název práce / Title of the Thesis:

Characters and Relationships through Food and Drink in Indian Cinema

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

Mgr. Martin Hříbek, PhD.....

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 %	A
2	Práce naplňuje zadání / Thesis covers the chosen subject	5 %	A
3	Stanovení metodologie a její adekvátnost / Choice of an adequate methodology	10 %	B
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 %	B
6	Logičnost struktury práce, souvislost jejích kapitol, užití stanovené metodologie / Structure of the work and chapters, use of the chosen methodology	20 %	A
7	Dosažení cíle práce, původnost, přínos / Was the goal of the work achieved, quality and originality of the result	20 %	A
8	Jazyková a stylistická úroveň práce / Language and style	10 %	A
9	Dodržení citační etiky a kvalita poznámkového aparátu / Citation ethics and quality of citations*)	10 %	B

*\*) 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 (will be calculated by the department):	<b>B</b>
--	----------

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*

The subject of this thesis is indeed a very relevant window into Indian culture through the cinema lens and I would agree with the author that Indian society with complex and overlapping systems of food-related injunctions and prohibitions perhaps lends itself more productively to such an analysis than other cinematic traditions. As the author states: „Indian films would indeed starve without food scenes“ (p. 73). The films selected as primary material of this study are well-chosen, however a discussion of the rationale of this selection would be desirable. There is also little reference to food and food scenes in World cinema and how this analysis could be possibly linked to previous work on this subject. References to wider cinematic context seem to appear only in the discussion of *Dangal* via Koike. Even within Indian cinema a bit of genealogy of certain motifs would add another dimension to the thesis, e.g., the motif of a wife serving her husband without eating herself has been a multivocal and powerful device for a long time, say in Satyajit Ray's *Charulata* to name just one example. As for the theory, Barthes is only mentioned at the beginning but not used for the analysis later.

On the other hand, I particularly liked the way the food scenes were described and contextualised to a non-Indian reader, the efficiency of this exercise validates the subjectivity of the author's approach which the author confessed in the Conclusion. The Conclusion also sets the limitations of the study very well.

On minor issues:

- a/ The Czech abstract reads like a machine translation; even in such a case, the DeepL software produces better results.
- b/ Imprecise referencing of citations –page numbers of the original works are missing.
- c/ Citations should support the author's argument, not fill in or replace the authorial text as in the Introduction. See also a string of quotations instead of author's own explanation on page 13.
- d/ The Khilji dynasty rulers were certainly not „Mughal Kings“ (51)

Overall, a very good thesis.

---

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

YES

*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: 23.9.2022

Podpis/Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized initial 'A' followed by a series of connected loops and a horizontal tail.