



POSUDEK OPONENTA BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

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

Název práce: **"Lost in Interpretation" – Redundancy and forward inferencing in simultaneous interpreting (SI)**

Autorka práce: **Nela Kratochvílová**

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

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

Short characteristics of the thesis

The thesis deals with the process of simultaneous interpreting and most importantly with two phenomena involved – redundancy and anticipation. The theoretical background for the thesis is based predominantly on the work of Chernov. His theory is applied on samples of interpreted texts from English to Czech by three anonymous interpreters in order to demonstrate whether the theoretical starting points are manifested in practice.

The work is divided into eight chapters. After the introductory chapter, the author explains her methodology, introduces her data, and summarizes the various tasks an interpreter has to deal with. The focus of the work is laid on Chapters 5 and 6, which deal with semantic redundancy in language and anticipation, respectively. In these chapters, the author illustrates Chernov's conclusions with examples from her own analysis.

Overall assessment

The theme of the thesis goes beyond the areas covered in classes, so it is clear that the author has shown courage to venture into, for her, untrodden areas of language investigation. And it is also clear that she has made a lot of effort to acquaint herself with the issues of interpreting in order to provide an in-depth analysis.

However, I do have some comments which mostly concern the overall structure and methodology.

If the main objective of the work is to "demonstrate the applicability of Chernov's theory" (p. 5), it seems appropriate to describe the theory thoroughly through quotations and original examples first and then apply/compare/contrast the theory in one's own experiment. However, it appears that the theory is explained already using the author's examples taken from her own analysis, so the borderline between the theoretical starting point and her own application is blurred. If the readers are not fully acquainted with Chernov's theory, they are unable to verify whether the application and interpretation of the theory on the samples is correct.

For example, is *last* in *When I was here last two years ago* really a manifestation of language redundancy (pp. 24-25)? The adverb *last* does not seem to have the same syntactic function in the sentence as *two years ago*, which provides the time anchor for the past tense, as suggested in the analysis.



It is also unclear whether, for instance, deleting *but you know, first major political speech, and it was* reduces the "opportunities to grasp the meaning" (p. 34), or whether the omission of the reference to *fans of The Clash* is a deliberate act of compression. The last example for all, how can we assume that the interpreter applied syntactic compression if the translation is obviously wrong and the translator was simply struggling with the interpretation (I am referring to Data Sample 22, p. 38)? My major point is that the text does not provide clues to compare Chernov's original ideas with the analysed text. I believe that a clear division of the theory from the experiment would enhance the overall quality of the thesis.

Also, I am not sure whether all the aspects of SI are applicable on such short samples. It is then only natural that the examples are found "forcefully" and the phenomena not found in the samples are left without illustration.

From this it follows that we are left with the impression that it is not clear what the real purpose of the experiment (author's own term) is – whether it is the application of Chernov's theory on her own sample or the provision of her own examples to illustrate the theory.

The text is written in good English with only scarce mistakes. Also, it is commendable that the author aims to achieve gender balance in anaphoric reference, but the overuse of the forms *(s)he* and *him/her* and the like lower the readability of the text. I would consider different morphological means to achieve the same effect.

For the discussion during the defence I suggest the clarification of the unclear parts mentioned above.

Práci **doporučuji** k obhajobě.

Navrhovaná klasifikace: **velmi dobře**

04.06.2018
Datum

Podpis