

POSUDEK DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE

Jméno a příjmení studenta: Bc. Kristýna Mykytyn
Název diplomové práce: Pojetí prostoru v současné britské próze / Postmodern Space in Contemporary British Fiction (Graham Swift)
Vedoucí diplomové práce: PhDr. Alice Sukdolová, Ph.D.
Oponent diplomové práce: Mgr. Renata Janktová, M.A., Ph.D.

I. Cíl práce a jeho naplnění:

- ~~1. Cíl práce byl stanoven a naplněn v souladu s tématem~~
- ~~2. Cíl práce byl naplněn se specifickými nedostatky~~
- ~~3. Cíl práce byl adekvátní, ale jen částečně naplněný~~
- ~~4. Stanovený cíl nebyl naplněn~~

II. Struktura práce:

1. Logická, jasná a přehledná
2. ~~Přiměřená~~
3. ~~Uspokojivá~~
4. ~~Nevhodná~~

III. Práce s literaturou:

- ~~1. Výborná: zvoleny a použity vhodné prameny v patřičném rozsahu, přesná práce s citacemi, kritická analýza zdrojů~~
- ~~2. Velmi dobrá práce s adekvátními prameny v patřičném rozsahu~~
3. Průměrná práce s literaturou
- ~~4. Slabá, chybná nebo nedostačující~~

IV. Prezentace a interpretace dat:

- ~~1. Systematická, logická prezentace, originální a důsledná interpretace~~
- ~~2. Velmi dobrá prezentace dat, úspěšný pokus o jejich interpretaci~~
- ~~3. Uspokojivá prezentace i interpretace dat~~
- ~~4. Neodpovídající prezentace, nedostatečná analýza výsledků~~

V. Formální stránka:

- ~~1. Odpovídá všem stanoveným požadavkům~~
- ~~2. Obsahuje drobné formální chyby~~
- ~~3. Nesplňuje některé zásadní požadavky~~
- ~~4. Nesplňuje většinu stanovených požadavků~~

VI. Jazyková úroveň práce:

1. Výborná
2. ~~Velmi dobrá~~

3. Dobrá
4. Podprůměrná

- VII. Náročnost zpracování tématu:
1. Velmi vysoká
 2. Vysoká
 3. Střední
 4. Nízká

- VIII. Přínosy práce:
1. Originální zpracování a názory, předkládá nová zjištění
 2. Práce je v daném oboru přínosná, ale neobsahuje originální a nová zjištění
 3. Průměrné, omezené využití výsledků práce
 4. Nedostatečné, práce nemá jasný přínos pro obor

Vyjádření oponenta diplomové práce:

Kristýna Mykytyn has chosen excellent texts to analyse the concept of space (and time) in postmodern novels. In her theoretical section she introduces Bakhtin's idea of the chronotope and uses Smethurst's treatise on its employment in postmodern texts, including Swift's *Waterland*, as a starting point for her analysis. In defining literary postmodernism, she posits it as a continuation of modernism and outlines its main features, such as fragmentation, the dissolution of boundaries between fact and fiction, intertextuality etc. The notion of the "spatial turn" is explained, with references to Foucault's and Lefebvre's theories. The theoretical part also includes sections on contemporary British fiction and contemporary British authors that place Swift in the relevant literary landscape. Numerous analogies to Swift's work are found especially in McEwan's fiction. Finally, Swift's own work is outlined in adequate detail, including examples of criticism. The analytical part of the thesis is thorough and obviously based on careful reading of the novels. There are some excellent commentaries, for example, on Price representing the postmodern voice in *Waterland*, relativising the possibility and value of historical knowledge, and delegitimising epistemological, and hence moral, authority by rejecting explanation. The suggestion to approach landscape as a character in the novel is another good point. Regretfully, most of sections 6.9 "Here and Now" and 6.10 "An Empty Space", are modelled on Del Van Janik's essay (1989) and cannot be considered original (see below). In the *Out of This World* analysis, the role of the visual and the preoccupation with perception and representation of reality as well as the problems of perspective and objectivity are emphasised. Ms Mykytyn is right to draw attention to the problematisation of historiography and telling stories – one of the themes shared with *Waterland*. She also notes the abundance of rhetorical questions, or simply questions left unanswered in *Out of This World*, which also contributes to the absence of the didactic tone distinguishable in *Waterland*. This difference is rooted in the chosen form: *Waterland* is conceived, as Ms Mykytyn mentions, as a (text)book carrying a teacher's message to his pupils, whereas *Out of This World* uses the form of personal testimonies (journal). I appreciate the wide use of quotations from the primary texts for illustration, even though sometimes they could be better embedded in the text or followed up with a comment or brief discussion.

The main obstacle in evaluating this thesis is the problematic use of secondary sources, which makes it very hard to assess the degree of originality of Ms Mykytyn's text. The most prevalent problem is poor paraphrasing that uses original passages from sources without

marking them adequately as verbatim quotes, even if references are placed at the end of the paragraph. In one case (second paragraph on p. 17), almost the whole paragraph is taken verbatim from the source text, Smethurst (2000, p. 17). Such instances, even though in lesser extent, occur throughout the theoretical section (pp. 2, 12, 14, 15...). Note 43 on p. 14 is an example of flawed paraphrasing and inaccurate referencing: searching for „the city's truth“, „glittered substance“ are Donald Presiozi's assertions and wordings quoted by Balshaw & Kennedy on p.5, not Balshaw & Kennedy's own (Balshaw & Kennedy is an edited work). In addition, they ought to be placed in quotation marks as they are verbatim borrowings. On a few occasions (pp. 30, 35, 42), Ms Mykytyn's wording is very close to uncited online sources. Finally, some sections in the analytical part (incl. those mentioned above) use phrases or parts of sentences from secondary sources used in the theoretical section without appropriate references.

To conclude, this thesis shows a great amount of research effort and critical engagement with the text, which deserve to be appreciated. The text is written in excellent English and makes an enjoyable and interesting read. Nevertheless, I regret to say that the referencing errors reduce its quality as an academic text considerably. (One reason for the borrowing of language may be the struggle to find appropriate expression in English for the complex issues dealt with in the thesis. However, this still requires proper marking and acknowledgement of source texts.)

Práce s výhradami splňuje základní požadavky kladené na tento typ prací, a proto ji doporučuji k ústní obhajobě.

Navrhovaná známka: velmi dobře

Otázky k obhajobě:

1. I like the idea of landscape being such a prominent player in the novel that it becomes an actor/character in the story. Regrettably, it is not developed further in your thesis. Can you explain this and provide some examples?
2. You address the cyclicity of human and natural history dominating both the thematic and formal structure in *Waterland*. How do you interpret the fragmented narrative structure and the discontinuity imposed by photography in *Out of the World*? How does this narrative strategy stand in relation to the fusion of time and space proposed in *Waterland*?

Podpis oponenta diplomové práce:

Datum: 7. 8. 2022

*nehodící se škrtněte