

Opponent's Report on Zuzana Buriánková's Diploma Thesis:

“Adaptation—Mimesis, Transformation, Interpretation”

Ms. Zuzana Buriánková seeks to illumine certain aesthetic properties and strategies of the topic area of adaptation across the cultural forms of film and literature. The one-hundred and thirteen page diploma text contains six component parts: “Introduction”, “Categorization of Adaptation”, “Contemporary Theoretical Approaches to the Film Adaptation”, “Interpretation”, “Conclusion”, “Resumé” and “References”.


As concerns the language, the thesis is generally well written. But there are a rather high volume of very irritating lapses or typos given the level at which the candidate is discoursing otherwise; here are some textual supports:

- 1) ‘a story than’ shd be ‘a story more than’ (7)
- 2) ‘thus mimetic world’ she be ‘thus the mimetic world’ (10)
- 3) ‘inidicates’ shd be ‘indicates’ (12)
- 4) ‘immitation’ shd be ‘imitation’ (12)
- 5) ‘by imitating of the world’ shd be ‘by imitating the world’ (12)
- 6) ‘differantiation’ shd be ‘differentiation’ (13)
- 7) not ‘Sanscrit’ but ‘Sanskrit’ (17)
- 8) not ‘an meanings’ but ‘and meanings’ (17)
- 9) not ‘to the Homer’s Odyssey’ but ‘to Homer’s Odyssey’ (20)
- 10) not ‘an non-ideological’ but ‘a non-ideological’ (21)
- 11) not ‘emplyoing’ but ‘employing’ (21)
- 12) not ‘dificult’ but ‘difficult’ (25)
- 13) not ‘Faithfull’ but ‘Faithful’ (31)
- 14) not ‘deversions’ but ‘diversions’ (31)
- 15) ‘interdisciplinary’ needs something like ‘interdisciplinary approaches’ or ‘interdisciplinarity’ (32)
- 16) ‘can not’ shd be ‘cannot’ (34)
- 17) ‘Jonze’s’ shd be ‘Jones’s’ (35)
- 18) ‘Holywood’ shd be ‘Hollywood’ (37)
- 19) ‘noone’ shd read ‘no one’ or ‘nobody’ (39)
- 20) ‘contemplats’ shd be ‘contemplates’ (57)
- 21) ‘other’ shd be ‘others’ (61)
- 22) ‘comprehesnion’ shd be ‘comprehension’ (72)

The vast majority of this diploma work, all the same, remains a very fine read.

As regard the content effects of the piece I should adduce the following mentions from Zuzana that well reveal the high level at which she works in the thesis: “Constant interaction between film and literature leads to the diminishing and deconstructing of their boundaries, causing their fundamental features to become transmigrant, ubiquitous” (5), “it can be said that approaches seeking to dismantle the hierarchy and look for a way to embrace film and literature in a culturally productive manner are quite rare” (7); “In my thesis I shall attempt to approach adaptation as a full-value counterpart to the original” (8), and so Zuzana essays precisely that in regard to an intensely focused comparative analysis of Virginia Woolf’s *Mrs. Dalloway* and Michael Cunningham’s *The Hours* and then by extension a good reading of Stephen Daldry’s 114 minute film, *The Hours*, which itself effects cross-linkages between the novels authored by Woolf/Cunningham; the candidate’s arguments are sound and rigorously supported; nevertheless a question subtends the whole topic area of the thesis and that is, to wit, the more form question of the nature of the two cultural media, literature and cinema, and if they really do in a profound way have much to do with one another; one film director, Andrei Tarkovsky, for example, writes of the “irreconcilable differences, stemming from the essential disparity between word and screened image” (*Sculpting in Time*, 62); clearly the candidate recognizes such controversies and questions of form; yet the question is posed here once more of what else she would attempt to contribute to the aforementioned debate on the footholds of her thesis-work.

Pre oral exam mark: výborná-/1-



Erik Sherman Roraback, D.Phil.
16 May 2007