

Opponent's Report on Karoliná Jelínková's MA Diploma Thesis:

“William Faulkner's Light in August: Constructing Race in the Community”

Ms. **Karoliná Jelínková** seeks to illumine, from an interdisciplinary social-theoretical interpretive tack, the many-sided concept of race in William Faulkner's major-style period novel, Light in August. The one-hundred and four page diploma text contains seven primary subdivided units of written work.


Ms. **Jelínková's** thesis contains much quite fine textual-analytical work to be acknowledged. Some of the more impressive sections of work with Faulkner and with language may be found on pages 5, 6 12, 46 and 47 wherein some of the spotlighted concerns include gossip meanness and the very power of such gossip to spawn a community, so-called.

I would like to ask the candidate 1) about Faulkner's own private asseverations on the concept of race, if any would be adduced for this purpose? There is of course one notorious one in which Faulkner would be on the side of the regressive interpretive perspective.

All the same, does the candidate sense that 2) Faulkner's work on language is more a diagnostic tool for understanding race, or is it more a way for us to see how the dialectical functioning of the social fiction of race may operate in a major author's exertions in fiction? Put differently, 3) does Faulkner's effort in writing Light in August contain some deeper more core content that would be complicitous with forms of “white power”? Also, 4) is Faulkner's critique of race a positive (prescriptive) or a negative task (i.e., falsifying normative takes on the topic area)? In addition, 5) would the candidate point out any insufficiencies or discordances in Faulkner's otherwise special capacity to measure the complexity of the notion of race? 6) Does Faulkner's interrogation of race invite another ascertainment of the notion as of yet to be thought or invented?

As concerns the prose style, the thesis is generally very well composed. But there are some lapses or accidental difficulties/typos such as when we should not read the “_” on page 8 paragraph 1, and where we should read “, which was” not “, that was” (10), “the approaches” not “the the approaches” (20), “homogeneous” not “homogenous” (49), “such a clear inscription” not “such a clear inscription” (78), “exactly the” not “exactlythe” (81), “that Joanna” not “that to Joanna” (83), “becomes a nymphomaniac” not “becomes nymphomaniac” (84). All in all, this diploma thesis, nevertheless, remains a pleasure to read; for these abovementioned errors constitute the majority in this study.

Recommended mark: výborná



Erik S. Roraback, D.Phil.
7 September 2006