

Ms. Natálie Horká's B.A. thesis – review written by the opponent

Ms. Horká's B.A. thesis, *Recitation, Reference, and Reworking: Literary Allusions in the Plays of Eugene O'Neill*, is a clearly structured work with an exact focus. While making her own argument, Ms. Horká is relying on a reasonable number of rather demanding and truly contemporary secondary sources, and is able to demonstrate deep understanding of all the nuances presented; and consequently use only those that are actually relevant for the analysis itself. As to the choice of her primary material, she decided to deal with the following pieces: *Long Day's Journey Into Night*, *A Moon for the Misbegotten*, *Desire Under the Elms*, and *Mourning Becomes Electra*. While I fully understand the logic of her selection and see it as justified indeed, I wonder whether she should not have footnoted – or at least mentioned in the conclusion – some other O'Neill's titles as well. Could she thus briefly discuss whether that would have contradicted her findings, or rather enriched the repertoire of her examples?

All the chapters, then, provide an extremely solid analysis of the individual devices (that is, recitation, reference, and reworking), and also point out the purpose they were meant to serve. While I believe that is not without the merit, I would have considered a chronological approach, too, and would have liked to see some development in this regard. Maybe to prove that O'Neill was either more – or less – reluctant to search for inspiration in the literary tradition at the beginning/towards the end of his creative career, and looked for original ideas only.... And finally, the very last question I would wish Ms. Horká to ponder on, partly in connection with the previous one, I think. It has to do with the fact that Eugene O'Neill's position as the founding father of the American drama is firmly established these days, which results in, in my opinion, an interesting paradox: how come American, once he is clearly alluding to the European literary canon?

I feel obliged to stress, though, that those reservations I expressed are marginal, consistent with my view that the role of the opponent is to be critical. This being the case, I am suggesting the following grade: excellent/ „výborně“. But the final result will depend on the review written by the supervisor and Ms. Horká's performance during the oral defense.

PS I have to applaud Ms. Horká's level of academic English – way above the average for a B.A. thesis

PSS There is one minor flow in her Czech summary, though: not „intertextuální forma“, please; the correct term would have been „rozměr“ or „dimenze“

Dr. Hana Ulmanová

Prague, July 28, 2019