



POSUDEK VEDOUcíHO BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

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

Název práce: **Analysis of humour in the TV series Friends**

Autorka práce: **Anežka Literová**

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

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

Stručná charakteristika práce / Short characteristics of the thesis

The aim of the thesis is analyse the FRIENDS sitcom series in terms of the types of linguistic humour. Before the actual analysis, which is the core of the thesis, the author provides an overview of various theories of humour. She then delimits the two basic types of linguistic humour, namely violation of conversational maxims and wordplay. The analysis itself is based on the instances of linguistic humour expressed by the individual characters.

Celkové zhodnocení / Overall assessment

The text is readable and overall the thesis is coherent. Even though the topic has been elaborated on before by different authors, Anežka takes her own approach to the analysis.

However, there appear to be a few shortcomings.

In her analysis, the author does not take into account the theories of humour described in the theoretical part, especially those based on incongruity and superiority. The incorporation of these theories seems relevant, for example, in her treatment of metaphor (p. 44), which she approaches from the perspective of violation of maxims only. The topic of metaphor in humour would thus deserve further theoretical grounding. It is the perspective of incongruity (described at p. 18) that appears to be relevant as the humorous effect in this particular situation is achieved by the incongruity between the domains of women and flavours of ice cream. Also, the perspective of superiority appears to play its role as women are "downgraded" to tastes of ice cream and the character who uses this metaphor comes out as the winner of the situation (as described in the theory).

The perspective of the superiority theory could also be applied in the analysis of the types of humour in individual characters. The superiority theory comes into play as we often laugh *with* Chandler, "the funny guy", who comes out as the winner in the humorous situations by intentionally violating different maxims (e.g. the example with Paul, p. 29), whereas we laugh *at* Phoebe who violates the maxims unintentionally, ending up a loser (e.g. the one at p. 27).

For this reason, I am not sure whether the decision not to distinguish between an intentional and unintentional violation of maxims (p. 36) is fortunate. Although it is true that sitcom situations are not natural conversations, as they are created by the sitcom's authors, the characters do violate the maxims either intentionally or unintentionally, a fact that has its significance.

The structure of the analysis based on individual characters lacks its justification. Although she states that she will structure the analysis according to individual



characters, the author fails to explain the reason for such an approach. The reason at hand seems to be the distinction between the different types of humour in individual characters, i.e. the distinction briefly suggested in the conclusion of the thesis.

Also, better clarity of the analytical part would be achieved by structuring the examples according to the different types of violation of maxims, not chronologically, with examples illustrating these types. This way the work would highlight prevailing tendencies and would not make the impression of a list of individual cases.

In spite of the reservations described above, I believe that the author has dealt with the topic successfully. The good impression is also achieved by a high standard of language with a handful of mistakes only.

Suggested questions for the defence:

Could you please provide additional theoretical grounding for the use of metaphor in humour?

Are there any other tendencies emerging from the analysis of humour in individual characters on top of those (Chandler and Phoebe) described in the conclusion?

Práci doporučuji k obhajobě.

Navrhovaná klasifikace: výborně

2.6.2020

Datum

Podpis