

La Sapienza

Valutazione tesi Belia Gajic Canestrella

CANESTRELLA SABRINA

Evaluation form for PhD dissertation

Evaluation form

Title of the thesis

Die Vielstimmigkeit als Häresie: Systemkritik, Resistenz und Subversion in der DDR-Literatur

Affiliation of the reviewer

Università degli Studi di Udine

Report

Compared to the first version, the doctoral thesis appears more focused on a theoretical level, also because it has been expanded in some essential aspects, such as the general introduction. This led to greater clarity in the definition of the links between the theoretical context, in particular Bourdieu's sociology and his study of the concept of heresy, and the works and authors examined in the textual analysis part. The addition of a long subchapter explaining the choice of items to be treated for the theme of heresy in the GDR contributes to a better understanding of the objectives, although it would also be desirable to outline to what extent the concept of heresy can also be applied to other great exponents of East German literature, e.g. Heiner Müller or Christa Wolf. The analysis of the texts is also more elaborate in the new version and leads to good results. Despite not having in-depth knowledge of Slavic literatures, the comparative incursions with comparisons with Russian and Czechoslovakian literature seemed completely convincing and interesting. At the same time, the still not always systematic use of the secondary bibliography means that in some cases the candidate relies excessively on personal ideas to analyze the texts. If sometimes the operation succeeds thanks to good intuition, in other cases it remains on a level that is perhaps still too superficial. The effect of this attitude is a different quality of work outcomes; for example, the part on Kunze seems more successful than the others, perhaps due to the candidate's greater "empathy" with the subject matter.

Overall, although it could be improved in some aspects, I believe that the work has now reached the qualitative level necessary to be admitted to the discussion for obtaining the title.

Confidential report (it will not be shown to the candidate)

Evaluation file (optional)

File caricati:
[canestrella_evaluation.pdf](#)

Presentation and clarity

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The reviewer should be able to read the text without difficulty. This implies that the dissertation is clear and 'user friendly', without duplications or repetitions.

Integration and coherence

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The manuscript should present logical and rational links between different parts of the thesis.

Introduction to scientific background

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The text should contain a satisfactory introduction to the scientific background which is relevant to the research, preparing the reader to the exposition of the problem.

Review of relevant literature

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The candidate must have a detailed knowledge of original sources, have a thorough knowledge of the field, and understand the main theoretical and methodological issues.

Statement of research problem

None Poor Average Good Excellent

A clear statement of the research problem should be made, together with specific hypotheses, predictions, or questions which the research is designed to address.

Originality

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The research must be the candidate's own work. The degree of independence may vary according to the research topic.

Contribution to knowledge and scientific relevance

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The dissertation should be substantial enough to be able to form the basis of two articles on refereed journal, a book or research monograph.

Mastery of the English language

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The candidate must be proficient in written English and show mastery of appropriate scientific/technical language.

The thesis can be considered for a 'cum laude' award

Yes No

A major goal of the review process is to evaluate if the present version of the thesis is:

- 1) adequate as is
- 2) require minor revision
- 3) require major revision

for admission of the candidate to the defense of the work in front of a national evaluation

board.

Accept as is Minor revision Major revision

Date: 6/27/2024

Reviewer: Costagli Simone