



POSUDEK OPONENTA BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk a literatura (dvouoborové studium)**

Název práce: **Chomsky and Pinker: A Comparison of Two Linguists Concerning Modern Linguistic Issues**

Autorka práce: **Karolína Voráčková**

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Helena Lohrová, Ph.D.**

Oponent bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Petr Kos, Ph.D.**

Stručná charakteristika práce

The thesis deals with the views of Noam Chomsky on language and then contrasts them with ideas of another American linguist, Steven Pinker.

The thesis is divided into two major parts. The first one briefly introduces Chomsky's reaction to behaviourism and presents a description and an explanation of his theories, namely Universal Grammar and Generative Grammar. It also summarizes how his work was received in the scientific community, naming his supporters and critics.

The second part, which is apparently the main focus of the work, contrasts Chomsky's views with those of Steven Pinker. Here the author gives us a detailed record of their debate on two major linguistic issues, namely the recursion-only hypothesis and the evolution of language. This contrastive approach is accompanied with some critical remarks.

Celkové zhodnocení

The author has decided to deal with theoretical issues rather than with some applied study and has chosen a rather demanding topic, as the ideas of Noam Chomsky are often difficult to grasp for linguistics students.

The first part, which provides a summary of Chomsky's ideas, is well-structured and clear. Nevertheless, one is left with a feeling that some issues could be explained in more depth; facts are often stated without further clarification, examples etc. An example of this could be the chapter on Chomsky's critics (p. 9), which, in my opinion, fails to clarify which of his ideas are opposed and in what way. This can be justified by the fact that this chapter is a mere warm-up for the chapters that follow.

The part on the debate between Chomsky and Pinker on the two issues is a real highlight of the work and makes it worth reading. The author shows good understanding of the issues described, and the arguments develop naturally. She seems to have covered all the aspects of their discussion and presents them well to the reader. Occasionally she tries to add some critical comments, but this is not the main purpose of the work. The value lies in the fact that she makes the discussion on these, sometimes rather difficult, theoretical issues more palatable to philology students and I would recommend all of them to read it.

The work includes occasional grammatical and punctuation mistakes.



Filozofická
fakulta
Faculty
of Philosophy

Jihočeská univerzita
v Českých Budějovicích
University of South Bohemia
in České Budějovice

Práci **doporučuji** k obhajobě.

Navrhovaná klasifikace: **výborně**

31. 5. 2016

Datum

Podpis