



POSUDEK VEDOUCÍHO 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.**

Stručná charakteristika práce

The aim of the thesis is to introduce the contribution of Noam Chomsky to the field of theoretical linguistics and discuss the perception of some of his controversial hypotheses through the lens of a younger-generation linguist, Steven Pinker. The body of the thesis is formed by six chapters, the first and last of which constitute an Introduction, and Conclusion and Discussion sections. Chapter Two (Noam Chomsky's revolution, pp. 2-11) then introduces the rise and acclaimed success of Noam Chomsky in the context of what is sometimes called 'the Chomskyan linguistic revolution'. As part of this lead-in to the thesis, the author selects and presents some of Chomsky's most widely discussed, and allegedly most innovative, theories: Universal grammar and Generative grammar. In Chapter Three (Chomsky v. Pinker, pp. 12-25), the thesis starts to develop the contrastive perspective on Chomsky's work. Specifically, the Chapter examines two of Chomsky's influential propositions towards which Steven Pinker holds an opposing view. These include: recursion-only hypothesis, and the emergence of language by natural selection. A critical analysis of the individual arguments is undertaken. Chapter Four (Response, pp. 26-33) advances the debate further through a critical assessment of a more recent development of both Chomsky's and Pinker's ideas. To this effect, the author introduces and discusses critically two additional papers; one published by Chomsky *et.al.* (2005) entitled "The evolution of the language faculty: Clarifications and implications", and the other – Pinker's and Jackendoff's response – published in the same year as "The nature of the language faculty and its implications for evolution of language (Reply to Fitch, Houser, and Chomsky)". The thesis concludes with a Summary section (pp.35-37) in which the author provides a tabular summary of the key propositions and respective counterarguments presented. The Conclusion and Discussion (pp. 38-41) bring the thesis to a well-rounded close.

Celkové zhodnocení

The thesis provides a fine example of secondary research. The author very ably demonstrates her command of reading around the topic and of selecting resources that are critical in order to undertake the research in sufficient depth. She scopes her research question in full agreement with the research objective and performs a critical analysis of the materials examined. Finally, she produces a well-structured piece of work, underpinned by clearly formulated arguments, and driving to a well-rounded conclusion.



The entire text comes across as highly coherent, containing relevant information that incrementally progresses the line of argument sustained. The overall structure is logical and well balanced. The analysis is undertaken forensically and systematically. The level of English at which the author is able to formulate her own arguments on issues that are considerably complex is of more than adequate standard.

Adding to the author's profile, it is worth of appreciation that throughout the work on her thesis the author exhibited a high level of independence, both in terms of her research and of writing up her findings.

Apart from several typos and occasional phrasing that could be improved upon, I have no major critical comments to make. The thesis fully satisfies the requirements set for BA theses.

Práci **doporučuji** k obhajobě.

Navrhovaná klasifikace: **v ý b o r n ě**

06 June 2016

Datum

Podpis