



## POSUDEK OPONENTA BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

---

Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk a literatura, Německý jazyk a literatura**

Název práce: **Interference v překladech německých rodilých mluvčích do angličtiny/ Interference in English Translations of German Native Speakers**

Autorka práce: **Tereza Kučerová**

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

Oponent bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Tomáš Jajtner, Ph.D. et Th.D.**

---

### Short characteristics of the thesis

Tereza Kučerová's thesis deals with the aspects of interference in German-English translations of German native speakers. The theoretical part (Chapter 1-4) presents the methodology of the work, introducing the contrastive and error analyses as tools for pursuing such a study. Kučerová discusses the potential of the contrastive analysis to predict translation errors on all levels of language (lexical-semantic, morphological, syntactic and stylistic) and the "capacity of the error analysis to distinguish two types of errors – *performance errors* and *competence errors*" (p. 22). In Chapter 5 ("Results evaluation"), the author sums up the results of the research both in relation to the translations of secondary school students she works with and the effectiveness of the two mentioned forms in the fields of contrastive linguistics and translation studies.

### Overall assessment

Overall, the thesis is written in a very clear and pleasing English with exceptionally rare language errors (the only real hesitations, perhaps, being the variation between "syntactic" and "syntactical" or "translation studies" and "translational studies"). The line of argument in the thesis is easy to follow and the work is well-structured. Moreover, the final tables and statistics, including the photocopies of the actual translations give the impression of a carefully prepared piece of work.

Nevertheless, I do have some reservations. The first one concerns with the overall approach of the thesis, because it never seems to thematize the difference in the performance of students taught by different methods of EFL teaching. Surely the performance of the students is influenced not only by the interference of their mother tongue, but also by the method used for the acquisition of the target language. In fact, one of the most debated questions in EFL teaching is precisely the amount of reference to the learners' first language.



Secondly, issues related to grammatical case and its reflection in the actual translations would also deserve more than cursory and, thus, necessarily, simplistic remarks we find on p. 13.

Perhaps the weakest part of the contrastive analysis is the short and rather misleading reference to the development of the English language and the relation of OE to Celtic languages, or some unspecified "German invasion" on p. 10. Although there have been some studies suggesting some degree of influence of Celtic languages on English in the OE period, it is a generally established fact that this influence was remarkably minimal. Indeed, we still know relatively little about the circumstances of the coexistence of the two communities (Celtic and "Old English") in the immediate aftermath of the Anglo-Saxon invasion, but the impact of Celtic language/s in English can be more or less reduced to placenames, very rare loan words and perhaps some phonetic and phonological patterns (as suggested by a recent study of P. Schrijver: *Celtic influence on Old English: phonological and phonetic evidence*, 2010). What, of course, is relevant, is the way the Germanic substrate mixed with patterns of Norman French and the significant change English underwent between ca. 1100-1400 AD. This, however, is completely omitted in Kučerová's simplistic and misleading analysis of the difference in the development of English and German.

Nevertheless, this work does fulfil the requirements for a BA thesis and **I do recommend** it for the defence. I propose the following grade: **very good** (velmi dobře).

3. 6. 2015

---

Datum

---

Podpis