

## **Linda Kocmichová's PhD. dissertation – review written by the supervisor**

Ms. Kocmichová's PhD. dissertation attempts to analyze three selected novels by J.K. Toole, Kurt Vonnegut, Jr. and Ken Kesey resp., her focus being authority and grotesque in the U.S. literature of the 1960s. The premise upon which the central argument is built – i.e. seeing the 1960s as an era both marked by social and also cultural unrest and then splitting into two distinct periods – is certainly valid, and so is the choice of the relevant secondary sources. Once we decide to interpret the above mentioned authors as revolting, the ideas of „revolting“ philosophers (Foucault, Deleuze, etc) can be reasonably applied upon their works, even though one should bear in mind certain limitations of that project (e.g. chronology) – and that is something Ms. Kocmichová needs to expand on, in my opinion, during the oral defense, even though this does not undermine the importance of her dissertation.

As to the key secondary sources concerning literary theory, Ms. Kocmichová relies mainly on Bakhtin and Vizenor, and it must be pointed out that she was able to establish a very persuasive link here. I believe that the notion of carnival culture can be connected to the notion of a trickster, and thus the individual chapters of her dissertation do not fall apart, even though Ms. Kocmichová could have developed that thought herself even further. Should there be time for that during the oral defense, this is another point worth discussing, even though, again, this does not undermine the importance of her dissertation.

It is my belief that Ms. Kocmichová succeeded not only in providing us with some new insights into the selected novels, but also in claiming that the principles she chose to view as instrumental can be found, in different shapes and degrees, in all three of them. The next step she just hinted at would be to consider their applicability on other crucial novels written during the 1960s, and even though this goes beyond the scope of her interest, maybe she can do relevant academic work in that direction in the future. For example she mentioned Pynchon in several different connections, and thus it would be instructive to hear what one of her opponents, Mr. Olehla, has to add to this.

This being the case, it is my pleasure to recommend Ms. Kocmichová's dissertation for the oral defense.

Prague, April 2, 2012

Dr. Hana Ulmanová M.A.