



POSUDEK OPONENTA BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk a literatura – Biologie pro vzdělávání**

Název práce: **Linguistic expression of sound in bird names motivated by their vocalization**

Autor práce: **Lukáš Gažák**

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

Oponent bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Jana Kozubíková Šandová, Ph.D.**

Short characteristics of the thesis

The present thesis focuses on the way sound is expressed in bird names. For this purpose, the author compiled and analysed a corpus of English bird names which are motivated by their vocalisation. The thesis consists of four chapters, first two being theoretical, devoted to the description of the theoretical background. Chapter three partly presents and comments on research results, conclusions are drawn in Chapter four.

Overall assessment

The introductory chapter describes, apart from the theoretical background, aims of the thesis. Some of them are formulated in a rather immodest manner since, in my opinion, this work is not elaborate enough for outlining “the tendency of how sound perception is expressed in the English language” (p.1).

The second chapter introduces onomasiology, a branch of linguistics concerned with the process of naming in language. It is too brief and superficial to be understood by people who may have encountered this term for the first time. The author correctly mentions several important personalities in the field, but does not describe how their theories are related and what actually their contribution was.

Even though the onomasiological model is further explained in Chapter three, it is done in a rather schematic manner, giving the impression that the author is not entirely sure about this topic. Tables in Chapter three presenting some (maybe partial, maybe complete) results of the analysis are also quite confusing, since it is not at all clear how they are related to the analysis, i.e. whether these are only some illustrative examples, or whether the tables present complete lists of the verbs in question, etc. This should have been explicitly stated and explained. The subchapter focusing on onomatopoeia is also somewhat unclear. Once the author deals with combinations of phonemes, once he skips to syllable structure, which may be confusing even for a quite experienced reader. On the contrary, parts addressing metaphor and metonymy have a logical structure.

What I regard as a serious shortcoming of this thesis is a completely missing methodology section. We do not know anything about corpus compilation, data extraction, how exactly the author worked with the data, etc. The only fact we can find



about the corpus is that it “consisted of 340 names” (p.40, Section 3.5) and that the author somehow extracted these names from a thesaurus of bird names (p.45). All this makes predominantly the quantitative analysis nontransparent. To this obscurity also contributes the nonexistence of an overview or a complete list of all analysed bird names, classified into the particular groups mentioned in the previous chapters of the thesis. Conclusions drawn in the final chapter could have been more elaborate.

As regards the language of the thesis, it is rather average. The author repeats the same information or phrases at some places several times (e.g. in the Introduction or in Chapter three (*What is apparent from Table...*)), the use of first person pronouns *I / we* is rather inconsistent throughout the thesis.

Despite the above-mentioned shortcomings I would like to appreciate originality and relevance of the topic in contemporary linguistic research. The thesis does meet the general requirements imposed on BA theses.

Práci doporučuji k obhajobě.

Navrhovaná klasifikace: dobře

28.5.2021

Datum

Podpis