POSUDEK VEDOUCÍHO BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

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

Název práce: **Semantic fields of differing British and American lexis**

Autorka práce: **Veronika Kadlecová**

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: Mgr. Petr Kos, Ph.D.

Oponentka bakalářské práce: Mgr. Helena Lohrová, Ph.D.

Short characteristics of the thesis

The main objective of the thesis is to find out in what semantic areas (semantic fields) of the English lexicon we can expect the highest number of concepts that are expressed differently in British and American English. This objective was set in view of the fact that most sources that deal with the differences in vocabulary between British and American English are conceived as mere lists in an alphabetical order with no internal structure.

The work first describes some theoretical issues connected to the theme of the thesis and then mostly discusses individual semantic fields apparently most frequently occurring within the selected sample of pairs.

Overall assessment

Overall, the work fulfils the goals set at the beginning. Its structure is logical and leads to meaningful conclusions. The author first defined the notion of semantic field, which she faithfully followed in her analysis, described the general differences between the two geographical varieties of English, and then focused solely on the differences in the lexicon. The results are clear in delimiting the general semantic fields in which terms differ expressing an identical concept.

There is one area, however, that would need further elaboration, namely the use of N-grams. The author does not provide a clear explanation why she uses them and what they are meant to illustrate. It their purpose is to illustrate the fact that the differences are not "black and white", that in both varieties both terms may be used although with a different frequency, then this aspect is not further elaborated and commented on. Also, the graphs are not used systematically, so we cannot abstract any general tendencies. It makes the impression of randomness.

Furthermore, the graphs do not necessarily reflect a real situation. For example, the forms *shop* and *store* can in both varieties denote both nouns and verbs with different meanings, so having the graph based on the form only may lead to skewed conclusions. Another problem may be polysemy, as the author admits herself. For example, both *flashlight* and *torch* are nouns, but *torch* may in both varieties be used for a different concept. Another example may be the comparison of *trainer* and *sneaker*. So, if we strictly follow the onomasiological approach, i.e. we aim to analyze different terms for identical concepts, these graphs are not very valuable.

Among the minor mistakes that appear in the work I would mention a wrong citation of the source at p. 12, where Heusinger is not the author of the passage but an editor of the collection of articles, an occasional use of citations without the author's own comments (p. 12) and some minor language lapses.

Filozofická
fakulta
Faculty
of Arts

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

As I already mentioned the work fulfils the goals set at the beginning, provides meaningful conclusions and thus meets the requirements for a bachelor's thesis. I fully recommend it for defence.

Práci doporučuji k obhajobě.

Navrhovaná klasifikace: velmi dobře

_____19.8.2019_____
Datum

_____
Podpis