

**Swein BATICLE, Franco–Czechoslovakian relationship during the First Republic through *La Revue Française de Prague*. BA thesis. Prague, Charles University, Faculty of Humanities 2018, 44 pp.**

*reader's assessment*

The submitted BA thesis by Swein Baticle deals with the interesting topic referring to the relations between France and Czechoslovakia during the inter-war period how they were reflected in the journal *La Revue Française de Prague*. The author tried to apply the discourse analysis of published articles. The problem, however, is that she was halfway through her work only. The text is in some places more descriptive than analytical. The proclaimed discourse analysis focused on the language use 'beyond the sentence boundary' was used in the chapter focused on the year 1938 only. I consider it the best part of the thesis.

Baticle is not the first who analysed this journal. Alain Soubigou dealt with the same topic already in the 1990s, but his work is not mentioned at all: Alain SOUBIGOU, *La revue française de Prague 1922-1938. Relations culturelles et propagande*, Mémoire de DEA, sous la direction de Catherine Durandin et Antoine Marès, INALCO, Paris 1991, 2ème éd. 1994. Nevertheless, my main objection concerns the fact that the author, probably due to a lack of time, does not comment, without any clarification, all numbers of the journal but only those published in the 1920s and in 1938. She so divested herself of the possibility to cover the potential changes of perspective in comparison with the 1920s. Except for the chapter on Munich 1938, the author insufficiently reflects the broader context, i. e. reasons for the choice of topics and how they resonated with the situation in inter-war Czechoslovakia. That is why she did not avoid, among others, various clichés and expressive statements. For example, in the context of the 1620 events (p. 5) she writes: “The country flooded by emigration becomes subject of Germanization.” In fact, it is not possible to speak about the Germanization of the Czech lands until the reforms of Maria Theresia and Joseph II. Without the knowledge of broader context, it is not possible to answer such crucial questions, like what was the place of this review among other journals in Czechoslovakia, for whom in Czechoslovakia and in France was the review intended and what response among readers it provoked. In this sense it would be useful to use the method concerning the history of writing and reading elaborated by Roger Chartier. It means to follow the relationship between the author, text and reader. We do not learn much about the members of the editorial board and how they changed in time. We also do not find much about the chief editor Daniel Essertier and his educational background and political profile. It is not enough to state that the contacts between the Czechs and Frenchmen had an anti-German character,

without concretizing different forms of this orientation. I also miss the critical evaluation of used literature which would avoid the author from the uncritical acceptance of some statements.

My further remarks are of formal character. The author does not distinguish what is the difference between sources and literature, what titles represent sources from the viewpoint of the studied topic and what not. From the used terminology it is evident that her knowledge of English is insufficient, for example: discourse (not discursive) analysis, journal (magazine rather means a fashion journal which is not the case of this Revue), section instead of rubric, etc. The book by Mila Lvová 1968 cited in the footnote 117, p. 39 is not mentioned in the list of literature. It is so not clear if the author read it or not.

In spite of all criticism I am of the opinion that the BA thesis of Swein Baticle in fact meets the requirements placed on the work of this type. That is why I recommend to give her *a grade 3*.

Prague, 5 September 2018

Dr. Roman Zaoral