



POSUDEK OPONENTA BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

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

Název práce: **A Comparative Analysis of Linguistic Devices Used in English-Written Menus**

Autor práce: **Jiří Dytrich**

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

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

Short characteristics of the thesis

The thesis analyses the language of menus from three categories of British restaurants based on their price range. Using a set of descriptors, the author provides findings in what aspects the menus in the given categories of restaurants differ and suggests the implications of such findings.

Overall assessment

The thesis is clearly structured, provides an in-depth analysis, and is written in a readable language.

My major reservation concerns the ultimate purpose of the analysis. There appear to be two parallel goals in analysing the language of menus, namely a) what communicative means the restaurants use in addressing the customers, i.e., how they (wish to) present themselves in terms of marketing, and b) what the language of menus tells us about the type (or concept) of the given restaurant. Both approaches are relevant, but, in my opinion, they should be clearly distinguished.

This initial ambiguity leads to the following questions:

On what basis were the descriptors selected? Some descriptors appear to aim at the first goal (for example, the use of filler words or the use of French terms, both used as strategies to improve or underline the status of the restaurant, respectively) while others appear to provide the information about the type or concept of the restaurant (or example, the use of terms from ethnical cuisines or the use of "your choice" terms as the former simply implies the types of dishes served and the latter may refer to a different concept of the restaurant, the one that provides a selection of basic dishes which the customer may combine).

Is the division of restaurants according to the price range only sufficient? And according to what criteria were the price ranges divided? As has been said, I believe that the analysis provides more information about the types of restaurants which do not have to necessarily coincide with the price range, e.g., there can be ethnical restaurants or specific concept restaurants which are expensive. Or, at least, the price ranges should, in my opinion, be matched with certain types of restaurants.

Some comments of minor importance:



The addition of the “mid-range” category (in contrast to Jurafsky’s work) appears to be valuable; however, an overall evaluation of what the addition brings appears to be missing as in some descriptors the “mid-range” category is not “somewhere between” the low-cost and expensive categories while in others it is. Especially in the former cases, what does it say about these restaurants?

How are the sub-chapters “Regional findings” relevant? Is it merely an interesting piece of information or do they have some other validity?

Finally, I have some questions to the analysis itself.

Is the reference to the provenance of the dish always of the same nature? For example, *British* in *British chicken* (p. 40) appears to refer to the origin of the meat, i.e., the chicken was produced in Britain, while *Jamaican* in *Jamaican chicken patty* (p. 40) appears to refer to the style of preparation (most likely the chicken itself was not imported from Jamaica). In other words, the purpose of the use these geographical terms seems to differ.

Is the categorization of *spicy* under filler words correct (p. 44)? Unlike the other terms, this appears to bring some information on the hotness of the meal thus again having a different communicative function. Also, perhaps, *fresh* in connection to herbs may convey a different meaning than *fresh* used in connection to cream (p. 46) as it seems to be reasonable to distinguish fresh herbs from dried ones (these being typically used in preparation of dishes, too).

Despite my comments/questions above, I believe that the thesis is written in a high standard, and after the clarification of the issues during the defence, I recommend “excellent” as the final grade.

Práci doporučuji k obhajobě.

Navrhovaná klasifikace: **výborně**

23. 8. 2021

Datum

Podpis