

La Sapienza

Valutazione tesi 35 e 36 ciclo

**BAGOZZI VALENTINA**

## **Evaluation form for PhD dissertation**

### **Evaluation form**

Title of the thesis

The Women's Decameron, a legitimation of women's authorship

Affiliation of the reviewer

Ornella Discacciati

Associate Professor of Russian Language and Literature

Dipartimento di Lingue, Letterature e Culture Straniere

Università degli Studi di Bergamo

Report

Valentina Bagozzi's thesis examines Voznesenskaya's *The Women's Decameron*. The thesis is divided into two parts respectively entitled *Methodology and Context* and *Textual Analyses*. Each part is coherently subdivided into chapters that explore, in terms of the methodology adopted, the complex theme of feminist criticism, exploring with intelligent use of a vast bibliography a number of essential questions: the relationship between western feminist criticism and Russian feminist criticism from both the Soviet and post-Soviet eras, the point of view on women in a literary tradition such as the Russian one, at first sight, purely masculine or at least dominated by male authors, the link in Russia between feminist criticism and dissident movements. In the second part Bagozzi analyses the role played by female body in the narrative process and raises the crucial issue of women's authorship. This is the most innovative part of the thesis and Bagozzi does well to go beyond the question of the value of Voznesenskaia's work to broaden the discourse to critical issues of great relevance to both gender studies and the Russian literary canon. Bagozzi's work was carried out with diligence and seriousness, the bibliography is adequate and the analysis of the work is interesting. The candidate made good use of the required extension period and the final product demonstrates the acquisition of a solid methodology for the investigation of literary works.

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

I find this thesis interesting and appreciate how the work was conducted. Perhaps the candidate could have shown more incisiveness in her exposition, but the result is still

positive.

Evaluation file (optional)

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.

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: 11/20/2023

Reviewer: Discacciati Ornella