

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

ÚSTAV ANGLICKÉHO JAZYKA A DIDAKTIKY

Kontrastivní rozbor textového typu: anglický a český jídelní lístek

Contrastive Analysis of a Text-type: English and Czech Restaurant Menus

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

Vedoucí bakalářské práce:

Prof. PhDr. Aleš Klégr

Zpracovala: Eva Hryzbylová

Obor: anglistika – amerikanistika

Praha, leden 2012

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně a že jsem uvedla všechny použité prameny a literaturu.

Souhlasím se zapůjčením bakalářské práce pro studijní účely.

I declare that the following BA thesis is my own work for which I used only the sources and literature mentioned.

I have no objections to the BA thesis being borrowed and used for study purposes.

Praha, leden 2012

Eva Hryzbylová

Ráda bych poděkovala svému vedoucímu práce prof. PhDr. Aleši Klégrovi za poskytnutí cenných rad, pomoc s vyhledáním odborné literatury a za projevenou ochotu při vzniku mé práce ve všech ohledech.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	4
List of Tables	4
1. Introduction	5
2. Theoretical Background	6
2.1 Basic Concepts and Terminology	6
2.1.1. Genre and Text Type	8
2.1.2. Register in Relation to Genre and Text Type	9
2.1.3. Prototype Approach to Genres	9
2.1.4 Style	9
2.1.5. Lee’s Conclusions	10
2.2 “Cinderella” Texts	10
2.2.1. Properties of Colonies	11
2.2.1.1. Properties Distinguishing Colonies from “Mainstream” Texts	13
2.2.1.2. Properties that Colonies Share with “Mainstream” Texts	13
2.2.2. Types of Colonies	15
2.2.3. Colonies and Menus	15
3. Research Project	16
4. Material and Methodology	16
4.1. Material	16
4.2. Methodology	17
5. Analysis	17
5.1. British and Irish Restaurant Menus	17
5.1.1. Formal Features	17
5.1.2. Contents	20
5.1.3. Lexical Features	22
5.1.4. Grammatical Features	24
5.2. Czech Restaurant Menus	27
5.2.1. Formal Features	27
5.2.2. Contents	29
5.2.3. Lexical Features	31
5.2.4. Grammatical Features	32
5.3. A Comparison of English and Czech Restaurant Menus	34
5.3.1. Similarities	34
5.3.2. Differences	35
5.4. The Organisation of a Restaurant Menu as a ‘Cinderella’ Text	38
5.5. English Translations of Czech Menus	41
5.5.1. Features that Correspond to English Menus	41
5.5.2. Features that Do Not Correspond to English Menus	42
6. Conclusions	43
7. References	46
8. Czech Summary	49
9. Appendix	52

List of Abbreviations

LOD Longman Online Dictionary

Sources:

SMI	Shibden Mill Inn
B	Browns Bar & Brasserie
CWP	Cotswold Water Park
BH	Gallagher's Boxy House
H	Hispaniola
C	The Church
E	Elephant & Castle
HL	The Harbour Light Restaurant
KV	Kingsvalley
A	The Angel Inn
T	Troja
ŠD	Švamborský dům
UV	U Vejvodů
S	Sklípek
O	Opat
MD	Mediterran Dubrovnik
P	Pegas
K	Kometa
HH	Hloupý Honza
Y	YVY

List of Tables

<i>Table 1</i> Premodification and postmodification in English menus	26
<i>Table 2</i> Premodification and postmodification in Czech menus	33
<i>Table 3</i> Features of a restaurant menu	40

1. Introduction

The thesis aims to carry out a contrastive analysis of English and Czech restaurant menus. For the purpose of this analysis, samples of English and Irish restaurant menus, Czech restaurant menus and English translations of Czech menus were collected. In the theoretical part of this thesis, the use of the concepts *genre*, *register*, *text type* and *style* by various linguists is examined. Various approaches are presented and conclusions are made as regards the use of these terms. This section is grounded primarily on an article by David YW Lee, “Genres, registers, text types, domains, and styles: clarifying the concepts and navigating a path through the BNC jungle”. Subsequently, a linguistic study called “The organisation of some ‘Cinderella’ texts” by Michael Hoey, who distinguishes specific types of texts that include a restaurant menu, is presented.

In the second part of this thesis, samples of English and Czech menus are examined from various aspects. Firstly, structural and linguistic features of English menus are explored. Analogically, the same method is employed in the analysis of Czech menus. The comparison of these two groups of menus is expected to reveal similarities and differences between them.

Subsequently, Hoey’s characterisation of specific text types will be applied on a restaurant menu. The confrontation of his description with the characteristics of English and Czech menus determined in the preceding sections of this thesis will show what type of text a restaurant menu can be classified as and to what extent it corresponds to Hoey’s specific group of “Cinderella” texts.

Finally, English translations of Czech restaurant menus are compared to English menus. On the basis of this comparison, similarities and differences between English menus and English translations of Czech menus are described. The analysis of English menus identifies a set of conventions that are characteristic of this particular type of text. Through the comparison of English menus and English translations of Czech menus common mistakes that typically occur in these translations will be discovered.

The aim of this thesis is to conduct an analysis of a specific text type – a restaurant menu. This thesis is also expected to describe undesirable deviation from English conventions, which can be found in English translations of Czech menus. As it is essential to adhere to the established conventions in order to meet the customers’ expectations, this thesis has the additional objective to aid translators in improving the quality of translations by avoiding mistakes that violate these conventions.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Basic Concepts and Terminology

The theoretical part of this thesis presents an outline of the key concepts *genre*, *register*, *text type* and *style*, which are relevant for the subject matter of this thesis. This first section discusses the concepts *genre*, *register*, *text type*, and *style*, using David YW Lee's (2001) article "Genres, registers, text types, domains and styles: Clarifying the concepts and navigating a path through the BNC jungle" as the main source of information on various linguists' approaches. It is generally known that linguists view these terms in different, or even opposing, ways. According to Lee (2001: 38), though, greater consensus as regards the understanding of these concepts exists than it seems. In the following sections, various approaches to the concepts are compared and contrasted on the basis of Lee's thorough study. Finally, his conclusions as regards the use of the studied concepts are presented.

2.1.1. Genre and Text Type

Lee (2001: 38) begins his discussion by claiming that Biber (1988) and the linguists from the Expert Advisory Group on Language Engineering Standards (1996) agree that it is possible to distinguish *genre* and *text type* by the criteria on which each category is based. Whereas *genre* is a category assigned on the basis of external, i.e. non-linguistic, criteria such as the intended audience, purpose and activity type, *text type* is based on the internal, linguistic characteristics of texts (Lee, 2001: 38). In addition, *genre* refers to a conventional, culturally recognised grouping of texts (Lee, 2001: 38). According to Lee, the view that genres are "recognised as having a certain legitimacy as groupings of texts within a speech community" (Lee, 2001: 38) is accepted by Swales (1990, pp. 24-27), who claims that genres are "owned" by particular discourse communities. An important point is that text types are groupings of texts that are similar in terms of their form, irrespective of their genre classifications (Biber, 1988: 206).

Lee suggests that this highly restricted use of the term *text type* is "an attempt to account for great variation within and across genres" (Lee, 2001: 39). In other words, genres may contain texts that are different in terms of their linguistic characteristics, by which they may be classified under various text type categories. Nevertheless, it is necessary to point out that, according to Lee (2001: 39), specific categories or possible labels of text types have not been established yet.

Lee (2001: 40) further elaborates on this subject matter by discussing Biber's suggestions as regards text type categories. Biber (1989) proposes eight text types, for

example “informational interaction”, “learned exposition” and “involved persuasion”. Nevertheless, these text types do not seem to be satisfactory to Lee, who claims that these text types should be considered only as indicative rather than final due to the questionable “statistical validity, empirical stability, and linguistic usefulness of the linguistic ‘dimensions’ from which Biber derives [them]”. Lee (2001: 39) adds that linguists often do not present any specific examples of text types or possible labels for particular text types. Apparently, it is difficult to determine them, since none of the suggestions provided by various linguists have been widely accepted by the majority of linguists.

Interestingly, Lee mentions that only external criteria are used for classification of texts in corpora. He finds a possible explanation for this practice in Atkins, Clear & Ostlers’s work (1992), who claim that if texts were selected for inclusion in a corpus only by internal criteria, the corpus would not provide any information “about the relation between language and its context of situation” (Atkins, Clear & Ostler, 1992: 5).

Apart from Biber’s and the EAGLES author’s views on the concepts *genre* and *text type*, Paltridge’s (1996) position is also discussed in Lee’s article. Paltridge makes a distinction between *genres* and *text types* on the basis of external and internal criteria as well. Nevertheless, Lee (2001: 39) emphasises that Paltridge’s internal criteria differ considerably from those of Biber’s and thus his use of the term *text type* is different from Biber’s. Paltridge even lists a number of genres and adds examples of text types to them. The text type labels are: “procedure”, “anecdote”, “description”, “exposition”, “problem-solution”, “recount”, “report” and “review” (Paltridge, 1996: 239). Nevertheless, Lee suggests that a better term for the *text types* in Paltridge’s sense is “discourse/rhetorical structure types” (Lee, 2001: 40), since they are not based on features, but on rhetorical patterns. It appears that Paltridge’s concept does not offer a satisfactory text type categorisation that would be accepted by other linguists.

In relation to the elusive nature of the concept *text type*, Lee admits that a looser understanding of the term may be useful as well (Lee, 2001: 41). He provides several examples of linguists who tend to use the term in a less restricted manner. For instance, in Faigley and Meyer’s (1983) view the term *text type* covers the traditional rhetorical categories *narrative*, *description*, *exposition* and *argumentation* (Lee, 2001: 41). Similarly, Steen (1999: 113) refers to these four major classes as “types of discourse”. Stubbs (1996: 11) uses the terms *text type* and *genre* interchangeably; he regards both concepts as “conventional ways of expressing meanings: purposeful, goal-directed language activities”. Stubbs’s approach is similar to Kress’s (1989). Although Lee admits that most linguists probably do not make a

major distinction between genre and text type, he believes that it is redundant to have two terms covering the same ground (Lee, 2001: 41). Apparently, Biber (1988: 70) shares Lee's opinion, since he asserts that in a fully developed typology of texts a clear distinction between genres and text types needs to be made.

2.1.2. Register in Relation to Genre and Text Type

Lee begins the discussion of register by providing its definition from Crystal's dictionary (1991: 295), where it is described as "a variety of language defined according to its use in social situations, e.g. a register of scientific, religious, formal English". Lee claims that the two terms *genre* and *register* are often used interchangeably, which is probably due to the fact that they overlap to some degree (Lee, 2001: 41). Nevertheless, he identifies the following distinction between the two concepts: "*genre* tends to be associated more with the organisation of culture and social purposes around language ..., whereas *register* is associated with the organisation of situation or immediate context" (Lee, 2001: 42). Thus, the role of extralinguistic factors and cultural nature of *genre* discussed above seems to be dominant in the use of this term, while *register* seems to refer to a situational variety of language.

Lee (2001: 44) also emphasises the extensive examination of *genre* and *register* that systemic functional grammar has carried out. He points out that differences in opinions exist even among the subscribers to this approach. Martin (1993: 132) views *genre* as being above and beyond *register*, whereas Kress (1993: 35) views *register* as a superordinate term to *genre*, with *register* encompassing *genre* and other components such as dialect, mode, discourse, plot, etc. (Lee, 2001: 44). Although Martin's and Kress's approaches slightly differ, Lee stresses the fact that both theorists situate genre "within the broader context of situational and social structure" (Lee, 2001: 45). Lee's usage of these terms, which will be presented in the last section of this chapter, is close to Martin's.

Furthermore, Lee briefly discusses the work of Sampson (1997), who claims that *register* relates to an individual's idiolectal variation (Lee: 2001, 45). Lee rejects this approach, since it contradicts the established usage. He also remarks that Biber changes his use of *genre* in later works. In his 1995 monograph, Biber defines *register* as "the general cover term associated with all aspects of variation in use," by which he in reality reverses his view of the term *genre* in his earlier studies (Lee: 2001, 45). It appears that *genre* and *register* cannot be fully separated.

2.1.3. Prototype Approach to Genres

Concentrating on genre labels, Lee (2001: 48) claims that they can be of many different levels of generality. Consequently, texts within a broad genre may vary considerably in their use of language. The following approach is Steen's (1999) attempt to account for this variation, which Lee sees as a solution. Steen offers a "prototype approach" to genres, dividing them into different levels of generality: superordinate genres, basic-level genres and subordinate prototypes. Of these three levels, the basic-level category is the one which is most natural to people, as it is simple to conceptualise, and for which exemplars are easy to find. The examples given for superordinate, basic-level and subordinate categories are advertising, an advertisement and a radio ad, respectively. The members of the subordinate and superordinate category are naturally less distinct from each other, whereas basic-level genres are maximally distinct. In addition, Steen offers seven attributes that characterise basic-level genres: *domain*, *medium*, *content*, *form*, *function*, *type* and *language*. Lee (2001: 49) suggests that other attributes, such as *setting or activity type* and *audience level*, be added.

2.1.4. Style

It seems that linguists generally agree on the use of the term *style*. Lee's (2001, 41, 45) view of *style* is that it refers to the individual's use of language in the particular text or discourse. *Style* characterises the "internal properties of individual texts or the language use by individual authors". Lee identifies the level of formality to be the most important stylistic feature. Nevertheless, some linguists may view *style* in a different way. For instance, Crystal & Davy (1969: 10) use the word *style* in the sense of "features which are restricted to certain kinds of social context", which is closer to the use of the term *register* by most other linguists.

Style may be also defined as a language variation reflecting "changes in situational factors, such as addressee, setting, task or topic" (Holmes, 2008: 259). Holmes admits that some linguists view this variation as *register* variation rather than *stylistic*. She adds that other linguists use the term *register* in a narrower sense to describe the specific use of language by different occupational groups. In addition, Holmes (2008: 235) claims that stylistic features may refer to "ways in which people's speech reflects and expresses their group membership". Nevertheless, the provided examples, "ethnic style" and "female *register* [italics added]", are terminologically confusing.

2.1.5. Lee's Conclusions

The aim of Lee's article is not only to outline the various views of the concepts *genre*, *register*, *text type* and *style*, but also to draw conclusions as regards the use of these concepts. He sees *genre* and *register* "as two different points of view covering the same ground" (Lee, 2001: 46). *Register* is used when the text is viewed as language, in other words as a variety of a conventionalised configuration of language. It refers to lexico-grammatical and discoursal-semantic patterns associated with particular situations. By contrast, *genre* is used when the text is viewed as a member of a culturally-recognisable category; it is a culturally recognised artefact formed by conventionally recognised criteria with "specific generic socio-cultural expectations built in" (Lee, 2001: 46), as it is at the same time an instantiation of register. *Genres* are categories established by consensus within a culture and they are dynamic, since they are subject to change over time as conventions are revised. Lee provides the following counterparts as examples: *legal register* and the genre of "courtroom debates", *formal register* and "official documents" (Lee, 2001: 47).

In contrast to *genre*, which is a category assigned on the basis of external criteria, *text type* is determined by internal, linguistic criteria. An important point is that two texts may be classified as two different genres, although they may belong to the same text type. Finally, *style* refers to the individual's use of language in the particular text. Several times in his article, Lee emphasises that although the concepts may be viewed in different ways by linguists, it is important to clarify in what sense the terms are being used.

2.2. "Cinderella" Texts

The present thesis focuses on a restaurant menu, which is undoubtedly a specific type of text. The starting point of the thesis is the assumption that it belongs to the category of "Cinderella" texts described by Michael Hoey (2001). He devotes the whole of Chapter 5 to these texts in his work *Textual Interaction: an introduction to written discourse analysis*. Therefore, Hoey's account is presented in detail in the following sections. It will be also used as the basis for further analysis of restaurant menus in the research project section.

Hoey describes this specific group of texts, which he calls "Cinderella" texts. The name "Cinderella" texts refers to the fact that despite being widespread, these texts have been largely neglected and ignored as text types which cannot be classified under the group of "mainstream" texts, not meeting the required criteria for "mainstream" texts. The category of "Cinderella" texts covers various kinds of texts such as shopping lists, dictionaries, criminal

statutes, bibliographies, cookery books, telephone directories, lonely hearts columns, encyclopaedias, footnotes, TV listings, etc.

The so-called “Cinderella” texts, similarly as “mainstream texts”, can be characterised by certain features that they share. Hoey draws an analogy between ‘Cinderella’ texts and animal colonies such as beehives or ant hills. Both concepts, “Cinderella texts” and beehives or anthills, are formed by a number of independent units, each having their certain function, and they have a certain organised structure.

2.2.1. Properties of Colonies

Hoey (2001: 75-87) names nine characteristic features, i.e. properties, which are typical of “Cinderella” texts. These properties can be further subdivided into two groups on the basis of their relation to “mainstream” texts. The first seven properties comprise the features in which “Cinderella” texts are different from “mainstream” texts, whereas the two last properties may be found in “Cinderella” texts, as well as in “mainstream” texts.

2.2.1.1. Properties Distinguishing Colonies from “Mainstream” Texts

Firstly, the components of a colony are not connected in one and only way and no component part is dependent on its neighbour for meaning. For this reason, the individual components can be shuffled arbitrarily, without affecting the meaning of the text (only its utility may be affected). This feature is so distinctive that it can be considered as a definition of a colony: “a colony is a discourse whose component parts do not derive their meaning from the sequence in which they are placed”.

Secondly, “the adjacent units of a colony do not form continuous prose”. Exceptions exist, when some adjacent sections of a text are cohesive and can be read as continuous prose. What is important is that similarly strong connections exist also between non-adjacent sections. Also, sometimes one section is dependent on another, for example the previous section in the sense that it must be read together with it. For instance, in a dictionary the entry of the word “eccentrically” can be understood only when the definition of the word “eccentric” is read alongside, as the entry for “eccentrically” omits the definition and gives only an example of the word in use.

Thirdly, a colony needs to have a framing context (a “hive”) that provides conditions for the interpretation of the colony or provides a characterisation of the colony. Although this may seem as a feature that applies for “mainstream” texts as well, in the case of a colony the framing context is usually essential for its interpretation. Some colonies have titles that are

helpful for its interpretation, others have titles that characterise the place of origin and content of the colony. For instance, a timetable has a title “Merseyrail, Train Times, From 27 September 1998 Until 29 May 1999 ...”. In this case, the title of the colony is essential for the correct interpretation of its contents. The framing context often includes a label of the text type, a basis for its interpretation and a date of operation or applicability. Moreover, for some colonies, for example news items and programme details in TV listings, the date is the most important part of the title. On the other hand, some colonies, such as shopping lists and bibliographies, do not need any title. Nevertheless, most colonies have a title; colonies without title are in the minority.

Fourthly, a colony usually does not have a named writer. The author is an organisation, or the text may also have multiple authors, while each is responsible only for some parts of the text. Although editors control the text, they are never the authors of the text as a whole. Since readers, or rather users, of colonies do not need to read the text in its entirety, (as each component is in some sense a separate communication,) it is not important who the author of a particular component is. What is more, individual authorship would diminish the authority of regulatory documents such as a statute or a constitution. Similarly, dictionaries and encyclopaedias are granted certain authority due to the absence of a concrete name of the author. Nevertheless, some colonies, for example cookery books and small dictionaries, have a single author stated. Interestingly, although shopping lists have no named author, the user knows who the author is.

The fifth property is that one component can be separated from the rest and subsequently used, while it is not necessary to refer to the other components. This feature is very important. It is typical, for example, of dictionaries, encyclopaedias, journals, cookery books and telephone directories. When using these texts, a number of its components are usually scanned prior to paying closer attention to a particular component. To illustrate this feature, when searching for one’s name on a seminar list, the list is scanned until the name is found and only after that the rest of the details are closely examined.

Closely connected to the previous property is the sixth one, expressing that a component of a colony can join another colony. For example, addresses may be copied from one address book to another, arts report in a newspaper may be reprinted in a collection and small ads may be re-used in more than one context. This property is common, but not universal to all colonies. For example, a class list does not normally reappear in a new context.

As a result of this principle, the set of components of a colony changes through time. The seventh property states that the components of a colony may be added, removed and altered. While carrying out a revision of “mainstream” texts, the author has to ensure that the new component is well integrated with its surrounding text. In contrast, in the case of colonies revision is rather a mechanical process. Provided that no cross-referencing occurs between components, they can be added or removed without making any changes to the surrounding text. For example, statutes are generally subject to amendment or repeal, encyclopaedias are revised and newspapers go through several editions. Nevertheless, some colonies are beyond such revision, e.g. The Book of Proverbs. Other colonies have no opportunity for second editions, e.g. TV listings and journals.

2.2.1.2 Properties that Colonies Share with “Mainstream” Texts

The previous seven properties distinguish colonies from “mainstream” texts, whereas the following two characteristic features of “mainstream” texts apply also to colonies. These two characteristics of “mainstream” texts will be discussed and related to colonies. For “mainstream” texts, Matching relations and Sequence relations, as well as repetition devices, or cohesive links, are typical. Colonies display Matching and Sequence relations as well, for example by alphabetical or numerical ordering of their components. The cohesion of a text is accomplished by semantic relations among sentences and lexical items. These relations can be divided in two classes – Matching relations and Sequence relations. Matching relations occur when statements are considered in respect of what they share or where they differ. Sequence relations occur where sentences are related temporally or logically. “Mainstream” texts include both types of relations.

These Matching and Sequence relations apply to colonies as well, though it is often impossible to infer clause relations between adjacent sections of a colony. The eighth property of a colony is that many of its components serve the same function. Since they serve the same function, there is a weak Matching relation among them. Nevertheless, this statement does not contradict the previous one about the components being independent of each other. Although all similarly functioning components are in a Matching relation with each other, it is not important whether they follow each other immediately. Thus, this type of relation is weak, as any other components could have been inserted between the related components.

Although this eighth property relates colonies to “mainstream” texts, it would be inaccurate to consider colonies as “mainstream” texts, since these are rarely composed solely of matching relations. Colonies are the purest and simplest form of “matching” texts, which

would be intolerable for linear reading purposes. Among “mainstream” texts, simple children’s narratives are most equivalent to colonies, for they are mostly made up of time sequence relations. (It is possible to regard colonies and simple narratives as extreme cases of texts made up of Matching relations and Sequence relations, respectively. All texts in between are more complex in terms of the combination of Matching and Sequence relations.)

Although narratives are dominated by Sequence relations, sentences are bound together at the word/phrase level by links that are of a Matching nature. Analogically, colonies, which are dominated by Matching relations, are bound by Sequential relations. Most colonies make use of arbitrary and non-arbitrary sequence to ensure the utility of the text, for instance to make selection and cross-reference possible. The arbitrary systems include alphabetical and numeral ordering, the non-arbitrary system is ordering by time or date.

Alphabetical ordering is an arbitrary system, for the sequence of letters in the alphabet is only conventional, and it is used primarily in order to ensure the utility of the text. For example, dictionaries, bibliographies, address books, telephone directories, etc. are ordered alphabetically. However, rhyming dictionaries are organised by reverse-alphabetical order, thesauri by combination of alphabetical and numerical systems, crossword dictionaries by the length of words.

Numerical ordering is even more arbitrary than the alphabetical one, as numbers are attached to components without any regard for their formal or content features. This does not apply to cases where numbering indicates priority; such texts are not true colonies. Numerical ordering is used for example in examination papers, exercises, constitutions, hymn books and most shop catalogues. A similar concept, which is termed “superimposed alphabetic ordering” by Hoey (2001: 86), is often used in combination with numerical ordering. In this case components are labelled (a), (b), (c) etc. or 1 (a), 1 (b), 2 (a), 2 (b) etc.

In colonies, ordering by time or date is used less frequently than alphabetical or numerical ordering. The texts which make use of this type of ordering are sometimes more marginal examples of colonies. Although numerically-ordered colonies may be jumbled and renumbered without causing any change to the meaning, in the case of temporally-ordered colonies the times or dates (i.e. temporal markers) must be retained along with the components, otherwise the meaning changes. Examples of temporally-ordered colonies are seminar programmes, repertory theatre brochures and TV listings.

Some colonies, e.g. shopping lists, newspapers and cookery books, do not make use of any of these systems for different reasons. Newspapers and cookery books consist of sub-colonies that are referred to by page number in an index. Strictly speaking, it is the sub-

colonies that do not make use of any ordering system rather than the colony as a whole. Shopping lists are usually used only once and by the author himself, thus the utility is not affected by a lack of ordering system.

It is evident that those colonies that make use of one or more of the ordering systems described above are using Sequence links. Numerical and temporal ordering often functions similarly as conjunctions that signal sequence. By contrast, alphabetical ordering does not have this function, for there is no marker added to the components in order to connect them. Nevertheless, traditional links such as alphabetic sequence links encourage readers to make connections between units. Consequently, readers find the text cohesive, although there is no intrinsic cohesive relation, only a relation created by the context. This principle applies for the Matching links as well.

2.2.2. Types of Colonies

It is important to add that not all colonies display all the properties described above. These types of texts exist primarily because of their practical use, which is reflected in their characteristic features. Depending on the number of properties a colony has, central and marginal colonies can be distinguished. Some colonies, such as a shopping list and a letter page, have fewer properties than, for example, a dictionary and a directory, for they are more likely to be read in their entirety. Some of the properties are more common across the different types of colonies than others. Nevertheless, all colonies share the defining property and the corollary property concerning textual discontinuity.

2.2.3. Colonies and Menus

Although Hoey (2001: 75) at one point lists menus among colony texts, he does not discuss them any further in his study. He also does not specify how many of the seven colony-specific properties (such as the textual discontinuity, the need for framing context, the absence of author, the mechanical revision of the contents, etc.) and those shared with mainstream texts (i.e. Matching and Sequence relations) they display. The question of how much of a colony a menu is will be addressed in the research part below (see 5.4) after analyzing the English and Czech menus.

3. Research Project

In this second part of the thesis, a specific type of a colony text, a restaurant menu, is analysed. Firstly, the material used in the analysis, its selection and collection, and the methodology applied will be briefly described.

4. Material and Methodology

4.1. Material

For the purpose of this analysis, samples of authentic English and Czech restaurant menus were collected. The research was carried out on ten menus from English-speaking countries, the United Kingdom and Ireland, ten menus from the Czech Republic and six menus that are translations from Czech to English.

Since one of the aims of this thesis is to draw general conclusions about a restaurant menu as a specific text type, it is essential to collect a representative sample of menus. To represent English speaking menus, the collected menus come from two English-speaking countries, Great Britain and Ireland. To be more specific, seven menus come from London and a number of places in the North, West, South and South-West of England (Bath, Paignton, Gloucestershire, Hetton in North Yorkshire, Shibden in West Yorkshire), and from two towns in Ireland (Dublin and Galway). Similarly, Czech menus were collected from various towns in the Czech Republic (Prague, Brno, Karlovy Vary, Karlštejn, Kutná Hora, Český Krumlov). Some of the restaurants were discovered through several search servers and some were selected on the basis of personal experience. All of the chosen restaurants serve mostly international cuisine, occasionally with a few traditional meals, which is of accessible prices.

The samples of English translations of Czech menus were deliberately collected in places that are among the most favourite tourist destinations. Thus, two menus are from Prague, two from Kutná Hora, one from Karlovy Vary and one from Český Krumlov. Presumably, tourists from foreign countries visit these restaurants regularly and their English-language menus are thus often used. For this reason, it is expected that the restaurants pay careful attention to the translation. Three of the samples are menus that incorporate the English translation in the Czech version of the menu, so that the Czech and English menu are in reality together in a single menu booklet. In contrast, three of the samples are menus that have the English-language version in a separate menu booklet.

The menus were obtained from the internet, with the aid of the web search engine Google and the web page “Britain’s Finest”. Although the menus were downloaded from the internet, only full versions of menus, not their abridged internet versions, were selected for the analysis. Unlike the abridged internet versions of menus, which mostly serve as a mere reflection of the restaurant’s cuisine and prices, the full versions are the menus that customers obtain in restaurants. This selection criterion is particularly necessary for a thorough and accurate analysis, since only full versions of menus comprise all features of this particular text type. Therefore, the collected menus are usually a scanned copy of a real hard copy menu.

4.2. Methodology

Firstly, British and Irish menus are systematically described in terms of their formal, contents, lexical and grammatical features. The same method is employed in the description of Czech menus. On the basis of the analysis of both groups of texts, conclusions about the similarities and differences between English and Czech menus are drawn.

A further analysis of the restaurant menu as a specific type of text is conducted in relation to the characteristics of “Cinderella” texts, discussed in the theoretical part. It is examined to what extent a restaurant menu fulfils the characteristics of a colony determined by Hoey. The organisation and various features of a restaurant menu are analysed with respect to the individual properties of a colony.

In the last section, six menus translated into English are compared and contrasted with the findings deduced from the previous comparison of English and Czech menus. The examination of the English translations of Czech menus reveals which of their components either meet or violate the conventions established by English menus.

It must be noted that the word *English* is used to refer generally to British, as well as Irish restaurant menus.

5. Analysis

5.1. British and Irish Restaurant Menus

5.1.1. Formal Features

This section focuses on formal characteristics of restaurant menus originally written in the English language. The organisation of the text, as well as the overall appearance is described. The description includes the constitutive components of the text, such as its title, final notes, illustrations and graphic elements.

At the top of the page of three English-language menus, a name of the restaurant is typed in clear and large bold letters. It is always situated in the middle of the page and the restaurant's emblem, illustration or a photo is provided twice. In two menus the name of the restaurant occupies the first page, together with the restaurant's emblem and a brief characterization of the restaurant. In one menu, "The Brasserie" (CWP) appears on the top and the name of the restaurant is located at the bottom of the first page. Similarly, in one menu the title "Bar Brasserie Autumn Menu" (A) is on the top and the name of the restaurant is postponed to the bottom of the last page of the menu.

In three menus the name of the restaurant is omitted entirely and substituted by the following expressions: "A-La-Carte Menu" (H), "Lunch and Dinner" (E) and "Gallery Restaurant" (C). In some cases the absence of the name of the restaurant may be caused by to the fact that the restaurant offers a number of different menus, for instance a *brasserie menu*, a *lounge menu*, an *a-la-carte menu* or a *lunch menu*, thus the kind of the menu becomes the most important information to convey.

The body of a menu is always well arranged in several sections with headings. The usual practise is to divide the text in two vertical columns – meals are situated in the left column and prices in the right column. The organisation and content of the key part of a menu will be discussed in the contents section.

As has been mentioned, prices always occupy the right column. In eight cases, the price is provided with the symbol of currency, i.e. £ (for pound in England) or € (for euro in Ireland). In two cases, the currency is omitted and the price is designated only by a number.

The information about the quantity or amount of meals is mostly omitted. If the weight in ounces is included, it is at the beginning or at the end of the name or the detailed description of a dish. It is abbreviated as *oz*, without a space between the numeral and the abbreviation, for example "Prime 10oz Sirloin Steak" (KV). In one of the menus, ounces are converted to grams: "8oz (227g) Irish Rib Eye Steak" (BH). In one case a note is inserted below the heading of a steaks section, clarifying that "All weights are approximately 256-284g (9-10oz)" (H). Only a few meals, predominantly grilled ones and steaks, in four menus are provided with the information about the quantity of meat. In addition, with certain meals, such as eggs, the number of pieces is specified, such as "3 Eggs" (A).

If beverages are included in the menu, their amount in litres or cups is sometimes provided, for example "Espresso £2.50 per cup" (CWP). When only two items in the section of "Bottled Beers" include the information about their amount, e.g. "Whitstable Bay Organic

Ale 50cl 5.50” (E), whereas all other items are listed without it, it implies that the other beers are of a standard size.

All menus make use of graphic devices, such as special kinds of font, various sizes of font or italics, bold, underlined and coloured letters. The headings of individual sections designating courses are always clearly distinguished from the rest of the text by graphic means. An interesting feature is capitalisation of the names or descriptions of dishes, since the use of capitalisation greatly varies. In three menus, only the initial letter is capitalised. In one menu all full lexical words, i.e. in the case of menus all words except for conjunctions, prepositions and articles, are typed in upper case, e.g. “Soup of the Day” (C). Two menus have all full lexical words in the name of the dish typed capitalised, whereas the whole detailed description of the dish below is in lower case, e.g. “Marinated Olives ... with garlic, chilli and mixed herbs” (B). The rest of the menus seem to capitalise only the most important words, i.e. ingredients, neglecting especially expressions related to the method of preparation, e.g. “Irish Lamb slow-cooked with Cumin & Carrots, topped with Tzatziki” (BH).

One or more items of three menus are framed in order to attract the attention of customers. In one of them the purpose of framing is to highlight certain dishes. The other menu uses a framed square to encourage customers to refer to the blackboard containing specialities and to ask for the children’s menu.

It is customary to provide information and details about the restaurant, for instance its address, telephone number and web page. Contact details are included in five menus, usually at the bottom of the last page. More importantly, the end of the menu includes notes, or footnotes, clarifying the abbreviations used in the main body of the menu. For instance, a footnote may explain that the letter *V*, appearing with or without brackets next to certain dishes, denotes meals that these meals are suitable for vegetarians and the letter *g* or the symbol ✓ denotes gluten-free meals.

Other important notes inform customers about the inclusion or exclusion of the value added tax and gratuity. These notes occur five times and they are expressed in concise, though sufficient sentence. It may, for instance, read “All prices are inclusive of VAT at current rate, but exclude service, which is at your discretion.” (CWP) or “All prices include V.A.T. Service is discretionary but a suggested gratuity of 12.5% will be added to the final bill.” (H)

In most cases, other notes regarding allergies, diets, GM foods, vegan dishes, children’s portions and meals for larger groups are added. Furthermore, special offers and set lunch may be included. Customers may also be invited to see the wine list. Some menus attract customers by emphasising the freshness of food, high nutritive value of food and

quality of their suppliers and even by stressing the popularity of certain dishes. In addition, a few sentences or a whole text concerning the nature and history of the restaurant may be included at the end of a menu. Naturally, each menu uses only a few of these notes. Nevertheless, it seems customary to include at least some of them, since only two English menus fail to do so.

Illustrations and pictures throughout the menu are used only rarely; only one menu has multiple illustrations. In four menus pictures are situated only on pages where the dishes are not listed, usually the first or the last page. Interestingly, a similar picture of food and wine illustrates the whole first page of two menus. In two menus only the picture of the restaurant and ornamental edges serve as decorations. Generally, the design of British and Irish menus is plain, employing only a few elements. Special graphic features are used only moderately in order to make the text attractive and, at the same time, easy to read.

5.1.2. Contents

This part concentrates on the contents of the main body of a menu. The arrangement of meals in sections and columns is examined, as well as the method of presenting dishes.

The body of a menu is probably the most important part, for it contains the list of dishes. The listed items are organised in sections that are provided with headings indicating the type of the course¹, for example *appetisers*, *main courses*, *side dishes*. The order of courses follows the natural pattern of dining, during which meals are consumed in the following order: it begins with starters, proceeds to main courses, and finishes with desserts. Nevertheless, the order of courses as listed in menus slightly varies. Since the naming of courses is a matter that is substantially concerned with the lexical aspect, it will be discussed in the following part that covers lexical features of menus.

The text of a menu is typically arranged in two columns. As has been mentioned above, in the majority of menus the name of the dish is in the left column, whereas the price occupies the right column. In two menus, the text is not organised strictly in two vertical columns with a dish on the left and its price on the right side, as dishes are either arranged in three adjacent columns or the whole text is centre-aligned. As a result, the price is located immediately beside the dish. Nevertheless, even in these two cases, the structure of a dish being followed by its price is observed.

¹ Note: In this thesis, the word *course* is always used to denote the part of a meal (in Czech *chod*), as opposed to the words *meal* or *dish* that denote a single component.

The practice of presenting dishes varies as well; two systems can be distinguished. As each of the systems is applied in five menus, both structures appear to be equally common. Regardless of the kind of system the menu employs, the particular system is adhered to and applied in all sections.

In the first system, the meals are described as a whole in a few words. This single description includes the core ingredient of the meal, as well as the additional ingredients or details about the method of preparation. The whole item is printed in one line. The items may be either connected by prepositions, as in “Garlic Mushrooms in a rich cream sauce” (HL) and “Roast stone sea bass with candied tomato and deep fried basil” (H), or the individual components can be separated by commas, as in “Grilled garlic prawns, pimento peppers, mature gruyere” (A).

In the second system, the description of each meal is clearly divided into two parts. The first part reveals only the main ingredients and style of its preparation, for example “Chicken Ala Brassa” (C) or “Pan Fried Guinea Fowl Breast” (SMI). Alternatively, if the meal is universally known, the first part conveys only its well-established name, such as “Fish & Chips” (B) or “Chargrilled Chicken Caesar Salad” (B).

The second part of the dish is printed below the first one and it provides details regarding the additional ingredients. For example, the first part reads “Battered fillet or haddock” and the second part adds “served with chips, pease and tartare sauce” (CWP). The second part may also serve as an explanation of the title name. For example, the first part reads “Mushroom Bordelaise” and the second one explicates it by enumerating the ingredients “a rich beef, shallot, thyme and red wine sauce with toasted gruyère rye bread” (B). In addition, a full stop after the detailed description of the dish is used in two menus.

Although the first system presents each dish as a whole in a single line, two out of five menus clearly distinguish the main ingredients from the additional ones by bold or larger-sized letters. In all menus that use the second system of presenting dishes, the first part of the meal is graphically distinguished from the second one in a certain way. It is printed in bold, in larger letters, in a different colour or a combination of these devices is used. As a result, the first and most essential part is more prominent than the second one.

A note may be inserted between the course and the listed dishes. The note always refers to the meals listed under the particular course. It may inform about the size of portion or weight of meat, remind customers to allow for a longer time of preparation, as well as add that the meal is served with a specific accompaniment. These notes are included in three menus and they are always graphically distinguished from the surrounding text.

A vegetarian section is included in three menus. Once it is listed together with fish, pasta and salad and twice it occupies a separate section. Two other menus even offer a whole vegetarian menu. Interestingly, a separate section on burgers and a section on omelettes is included twice.

A separate section for beverages is only four times included in the same menu as meals are. Cold drinks are rarely included, since three out of these four menus list only warm beverages and spirits. Consequently, it is more common to list beverages on a separate drinks menu dedicated exclusively to alcoholic and non-alcoholic drinks. In two menus, two or three warm drinks are listed individually without any heading after the sweets section at the end of the menu. In one case, one beverage item is listed at the end of the sweets section. This seems, however, to be a special case, as the item is called “Coffee gourmand” and it consists of “coffee with three tasty treats” (A). Since it is a specific drink that comprises a drink and sweets as well, it may be listed among sweets.

5.1.3. Lexical Features

This section examines the similarities and differences between menus in terms of lexical choices. The choice of words in the title and in the names of courses (i.e. in the headings of individual sections) is examined. The use of synonyms and unusual words is described.

As has been noted in the section on formal features, the titles of five restaurant menus consist of the name of the restaurant. In the case of a brasserie-type of restaurant, i.e. “a restaurant, esp. one that is fairly cheap, and serves French food” (Longman, 1990: 115), the word *brasserie* either substitutes the name of the restaurant or it is added to it. Interestingly, the word *menu* is largely, in six cases, omitted. If the word *menu* is used in a menu, it is exclusively a part of expressions that include the words *brasserie*, *restaurant* or *a-la-carte*, such as in “Bar Brasserie Autumn Menu” (A), “Brasserie Menu” (CWP), “Restaurant Menu” (HL) and “A-la-carte menu” (H).

Courses may be called a variety of names. Since the selection of meals in different restaurants varies, none of the menus among those examined exactly correspond to each other in terms of the names of the courses. For the purposes of a systematic analysis, three basic systems of expressing the types of courses are distinguished.

The first system consists of a sequence of the following words: *starters* or *appetisers*, *main courses* or *mains* that can be further subdivided into meat, fish, vegetarian etc., *side dishes* or *side orders*, and finally *desserts* or *sweets*. In this system, vegetarian meals are

either included in main courses or they occupy a separate subsection within the section on main courses.

The second system uses the expressions *to start* and *to follow*. A menu that uses this system can, for example, read: “To Start, Pasta and Salads, To Follow, Burgers, From the Grill, Side Orders, Desserts” (CWP). Apparently, the headings *to start* and *to follow* are not absolute substitutes for *starters* and *mains*. Based on the fact that dishes from the section *Pasta and Salads* can be ordered in two sizes, small and large, it seems that these dishes may be considered both as starters and as mains, depending on their size. Similarly, dishes from the sections *Burgers* and *From the Grill* can be classified as main dishes. In other words, the dishes from the section called *To Start* are not the only starters and the dishes from the section *To Follow* are not the only main courses in the menu. Therefore, it would be misleading to substitute the expressions *To Start* and *To Follow* for the terms *Starters* and *Main courses*.

The third system offers the greatest variety regarding the course labels, since the headings refer specifically to particular kind of meals. Menus that make use of this system vary considerably in their structure. For example, the sections may be entitled “Apéritifs & Appetisers; Starters; Fish, Pasta, Salad & Vegetarian; Browns Classics & Grill; Side Orders” (B). Another version is “Appetizers and Small Dishes, Soups, Warm Dishes, Homemade Burgers, Omelettes, Special Desserts” (E). Apparently, the words *main courses* or *mains* are omitted and the headings refer specifically to the kind of meals, such as in “Appetisers, Fish Dishes, Quality Extra Mature Steaks, Sweet Menu” (HL) or “Starters, Poultry & Meats, From The Sea, Vegetarian, Side Orders” (C).

Moreover, the third system offers the possibility to include names of courses that are specific to the particular restaurant. Thus, the Browns Bar & Brasserie names one of the sections the “Browns Classics & Grill” and the Irish Gallagher’s Boxy House includes sections called “Boxty Potato Dumplings” and “Tradisiúnta agus Nua” (i.e. “Traditional and New” peculiarly expressed in the Irish language).

Among the ten samples of menus, two menus use the first system of labelling courses, one menu is organised according to the second system and seven menus employ the third system. Naturally, the offer of meals in different restaurants varies according to the particular cuisine of each restaurant. Since the third system enables the authors of the menu to accurately cover the specificity of individual sections (e.g. Yapas, Boxy Pancake Dishes), it is used most frequently.

It has been observed that a number of synonyms can be identified in menus. The first pair of synonyms to be discussed is *appetisers* (or *appetizers*) and *starters*. The first course is

called *appetisers* in two menus and *starters* in six menus. In one menu, a section named *Apéritifs & Appetisers* is followed by a section entitled *Starters*. The word *Apéritifs* obviously refers to “a small alcoholic drink drunk before a meal” (Longman, 1990: 37). The word *appetiser* is spelled twice with *s* and once with *z*. Interestingly, the terms *Hors d’oeuvre* or *entrée* do not appear in any of the analysed menus.

Another pair of synonyms is *beverages* and *drinks*. These can be also either *hot* or *warm*. In the two menus that include this section, both words, *beverages* and *drinks*, are used once. Similarly, the words *hot* and *warm* appear both once. In one case, the term *beverages* or *drinks* is substituted by specific words such as *Pudding wines* or *Brandy*.

Words that are specific for a particular restaurant are often included in English and Irish menus. These words reveal only little about the contents of the dishes, as they are closely related to the restaurant, such as “Chicken Boxy” (BH) or “Browns House Salad” (B). As a result, a further description of the ingredients is always provided.

Some words may be related to the area where the restaurant is located. An Irish menu uses Irish words in one of the headings, *Tradisiúnta agus Nua* (Traditional and New), as well as in the names of traditional Irish meals, for example *Coddle*. A Yorkshire restaurant lists *Yapas*, meaning *Yorkshire tapas*, before starters. Tapas are “small dishes of food eaten as part of the first course of a Spanish meal” (LOD).

5.1.4. Grammatical Features

This section describes the most typical grammatical features of English menus. As it is typical of most “Cinderella” texts, the text of the menu is not composed of complete sentences, which is also signalled by the absence of full stops. It has been observed that premodification is the predominant syntactic construction used in menus. A noun is often premodified by a number of words, such as in “thyme roasted croutons” (B), “Pan Fried Guinea Fowl Breast” (SMI) or “Chargrilled Hereford Sirloin Steak” (E).

Three basic types of premodification in menus can be distinguished: a noun is premodified by another noun, by an adjective, or by a participle. Other types of premodification (i.e. by genitive, adverb or phrase/sentence structures) do not occur in the sample, with the rare exception of the occasional genitive, such as in “Brafford goat’s cheese” (SMI). Firstly, the noun head is often premodified by one or two nouns, such as in “Lobster Tagliatelle” (B) or “baby Caesar salad” (E). In the latter example, the noun phrase *Caesar salad* is premodified by the noun *baby*. In fact we often find multiple noun premodification, where the noun premodifier is itself premodified by another, such as in “Kingsvalley Chicken

Caesar Salad” (KV). Nouns in premodification are also used in titles, for example “Bar Brasserie Autumn Menu” (A) or “The Harbour Light Restaurant” (HL), and in subtitles, for example “fish dishes” (HL) and “Boxy Pancake Dishes” (BH). Secondly, adjectival premodification is used extensively in dishes, for example “A Traditional Irish Recipe” (BH) or “Grilled Peaches” (C), and in section headings, for example “Vegetarian Menu” (SMI) and “Hot Beverages” (CWP). Thirdly, a noun may be premodified by a past participle, such as in “corn-fed supreme of chicken” (CWP) or “Seared Fillet” (BH). It is common to combine nouns, adjectives and participles in a single noun phrase, such as in “Oven Dried Tomato Ravioli” (SMI), “Freshly made Autumn truffle linguini” (A).

In some of these cases postmodification instead of premodification may be used. For instance, both variants “Marinated breast of pigeon” (CWP) and “Pan-fried duck breast” (CWP) are possible. Postmodification with the *of*-construction is often used in dishes containing a particular part of meat, such as “Rack of Lamb” (E) or “Belly of Pork” (B).

Postmodification is often realised by a postponed participle. “Tropical fresh fruit salad served with or without pouring cream” (CWP) and “Lemon Sole Fillet fried in golden breadcrumbs” (HL) may serve as examples of this postmodification. The construction is actually a reduced relative clause with an adverbial (mostly an adverbial of manner), where the relative pronouns *that* or *which* and the verb *to be* are omitted. If a dish is divided into two parts, as discussed in the Contents section above (see 5.1.2), the participle introduces the second part of the dish, connecting it semantically to the first and main part, so that they form one logical unit: “Belly of Pork & Dublin Bay Prawns / Served with Pea Puree & Lemon Bur Blanc” (C).

Alternatively, even the verb *served* may be omitted. Thus, the additional part of the dish is connected to the preceding one only by the preposition *with*, such as in “Marinated Olives / with garlic, chilli and mixed herbs” (B). The preposition *with* also serves a cohesive function, connecting the first and the second part of the dish.

Table 1 below illustrates the use of premodification and postmodification. One sample of a menu that represents a typical example of this text type was selected and data were collected from all listed dishes in this menu. The figures show the number and percentage of each type of pre- and postmodification discussed above. It is clear from the table that in about half of the cases premodification is realised by a noun and postmodification by a postponed participle.

Table 1 Premodification and postmodification in English menus

Premodification			Postmodification		
Noun	108	54 %	Postponed participle	36	55 %
Adjective	56	28 %	<i>With</i> -construction	14	22 %
<i>-ed</i> participle	35	18 %	<i>Of</i> -construction	15	23 %
Total	199	100 %	Total	65	100 %

The function of the postmodifying *with*-construction is close to coordination. Coordination is another typical feature of a menu. It is predominantly realised by the coordinating conjunction *and*, by the sign & and by commas. Coordination appears in dishes, as well as in subtitles.

In the case of dishes, coordination is mostly used between the enumerated ingredients in the second part of a dish. The general practice is that if several additional ingredients are listed, commas are used between the initial ones, whereas & or *and* is used before the last one, such as in "... Brafford goat's cheese, beetroot, rocket & pesto" (SMI) or "... broccoli, cauliflower, sunblaze tomatoes, chestnut and oyster mushrooms" (B). Nevertheless, this practice is not universal; three menus, two from Yorkshire and one from Ireland, connect all additional ingredients only by commas, or combine commas, the conjunction *and* and the sign &. In addition, one menu occasionally lists all the components of a dish asyndetically, for example "Sweet potato gnocchi, chargrilled courgettes, sage brown butter sauce" (A).

In the names of courses, it appears that the conjunction *and* and the sign & may be used interchangeably: "Fish, Pasta, Salad & Vegetarian" (B) or "Pasta and Salads" (CWP), and "Apéritifs & Appetisers" (B) or "Appetizers and Small Dishes" (E). Similarly in dishes, *and* or & is used: "Pumpkin & Almond Soup" (SMI) and "Rocket Parma ham and feta cheese salad" (CWP).

By contrast, if the name of the restaurant is provided with a subtitle characterising the type of the restaurant, & is used in all three instances: "Bar & Brasserie" (B), "Bar & Bistro" (K) and "Restaurant & Bar" (BH). Thus, the ampersand seems to be preferable in this particular usage. By contrast, it appears that it is a matter of individual preference whether a conjunction or the ampersand is used in dishes and courses.

The use of determiners in menus is an interesting area, since articles are mostly omitted, such as in "artichoke dip" (B) or "whole grain mustard sauce" (HL). In contrast, in some menus the indefinite article occurs in the detailed description of a dish, such as in

“Served with a grilled Portobello Mushroom” (KV). Nevertheless, even in menus where the indefinite article occurs, it is omitted in the first part, the name of the dish, such as in “Omellette of your choice” (KV).

A syntactic device, which is only rarely used in English menus, is parenthesis. It serves to explicate or qualify the contents of a meal, such as in “Breaded Scampi (whole Langoustine tails) deep-fried” (HL). Also, parentheses are occasionally used to explain an unclear expression. For example, below the name “Kingsvalley Chicken Caesar Salad” is an explanation given in parentheses: “(Mixed leaves, bacon lardons, Pine nuts, Croutons, Parmesan ...)” (KV).

5.2. Czech Restaurant Menus

In this part of the thesis, the organisation of Czech restaurant menus is examined. The method of analysis is analogous to the method employed in the analysis of British and Irish restaurant menus.

5.2.1. Formal Features

The name of the restaurant usually appears at the top of the page or, if the menu consists of a number of pages, on the first page. In one menu, the name of the restaurant does not dominate the first page, as it is postponed to the second page. In three menus the restaurant’s name or emblem appears either on the bottom or along the edges of all pages. Only in one case the name of the restaurant is entirely omitted. In three menus the name is decorated with a photograph or an illustration of the restaurant.

The body of a menu is in all cases arranged in a number of sections that are marked by headings conveying the type of the course. In the great majority of cases the menu is clearly divided in two columns, the left one presenting the dish and the right one providing its price. In one menu the whole text is centre-aligned, thus the price immediately follows the name of the dish. In four menus, the two columns of meals and prices are arranged in two to four adjacent columns, so that a greater number of dishes are placed on a page. The organisation and content of the key part of a menu will be discussed in the following section devoted to the content of a menu.

A Czech menu is usually, i.e. in six out of ten menus in our sample, concluded by contact details of the restaurant, such as its name, address, telephone and web page. Four

menus offer additional information about the history, location and services of the restaurant, or about its chef, and even a recommendation to another restaurant is once added. On the last page, bon appetite is wished in three menus.

If any final notes regarding the details about individual dishes are included at the end of a menu, their content varies considerably among menus. These notes inform, for instance, about the price of half portions and take aways. They may also inform that the restaurant accepts Euro and about the times when meals which are in a few portions prepared in advance (*hotová jídla*) are served. Only four menus include one or two of these notes, six menus do not include any final notes. Three menus simply end with the last dish on the list, without any additional notes or comments. Apparently, it is not customary to include notes referring to particular dishes or clarifying any abbreviations, as no abbreviations are used in the body of a menu.

The symbol of currency is omitted in six menus, whereas in four menus the sign of the Czech Crown, *Kč*, appears. If the currency is omitted, the numeral designating the price is always provided with an established sign consisting of a comma and a dash (,-). If the currency is provided, two menus retain the comma and dash before the sign of the currency (e.g. 30,- *Kč*) and two menus omit the punctuation marks (e.g. 69 *Kč*).

A universal feature of all Czech menus is the inclusion of the weight of a meal or amount of a drink served denoted by the abbreviation for a unit of mass (*kg* or *g*) or a unit of volume (*l* or *ml*). All menus give quantity with main dishes, especially when the meal consists of meat. The prevailing tendency is to provide the information about the amount or number of pieces where it is possible, whether it is a main course, a salad or a desserts section. Four menus provide the information virtually for each item, with a few exceptions, such as ketchup or nuts, where it is impossible. It is more common for the information to be placed at the beginning of each item, as is the case with seven menus. Alternatively, it may follow the name of the meal, with or without brackets.

The individual items on four menus are numbered. Numerical ordering functions as a connecting element. Furthermore, it presumably serves a more practical purpose, as customers can easily order a particular dish by referring to the number of the dish instead of its name.

As for the design of Czech menus, it is mostly rich, sometimes perhaps excessive. Photographs and illustrations of meals and restaurants decorate the central part or the edges of the menus. Only one of the menus has a plain design and does not make use of pictures or any other graphic elements.

5.2.2. Contents

As has been mentioned above, the body of a menu is subdivided into a number of sections, which are provided with an appropriate name of a particular course according to the type of encompassed dishes. The order of courses relatively follows the natural sequence of courses in the process of dining. Although the order of courses slightly varies in different menus, a certain pattern in the sequence of courses listed in a menu can be established. Regardless of the specific names of the individual courses, the order is generally as follows: starters; soups; various main courses subdivided into a number of sections according to different kinds of meat; salads; desserts; side dishes.

One out of ten analysed menus does not follow the previously described pattern. This menu is divided into four main sections. It starts with a section on recommended main dishes and then it proceeds to a section with a heading “Vaše chuť vybírá, my vaříme”, which would be particularly hard to translate (or paraphrase). This section is subdivided into steaks to which additional ingredients and various kinds of sauces are suggested, fried meat dishes and side orders. This is followed by a vegetarian section. The heading of the last section indicates that various other meals are offered (“Další nabídka”). This section is again further subdivided into starters and small dishes, soups, desserts, ice-cream sundaes, children dishes and dog snacks. This system seems to be rather unusual and chaotic.

Nevertheless, this menu shares many features of its contents with the rest of the menus that follow the previously described pattern. Naturally, even within the conventional structure of a menu there are differences. In one menu soups precede starters, and in one case soups are inserted between cold starters and warm starters. Starters are divided into two sections, *cold* and *warm* starters, in five menus. In three menus side dishes precede desserts, in two menus side dishes and desserts are listed in two columns beside each other. Desserts may be divided into more than one section, for instance into cold desserts, warm desserts and ice-cream sundaes. One menu does not include a desserts section, presumably the restaurant has a separate desserts menu or a blackboard. Although side dishes may be added directly to the main dish in the sections of main courses, they are always listed in a separate section at the end of the menu.

Vegetarian dishes either occupy a separate section or they are included in one section together with pasta. The two versions are equally common, as both are used four times. In two menus, a vegetarian section is not included. Three menus contain a separate section dedicated to children's dishes. A common component, which five menus share, is a section with traditional Czech cuisine. At the end of one menu, cheese is offered. In two menus, a section

entitled *pochutiny* or *k pivu a vínku* contains small snacks, such as nuts and crisps. Although one menu has a section “K pivu” (UV) as well, in this case it comprises various kinds of meals from snacks to large main courses. At the end of one menu, a special section on sauces and dressings is included, as well as a section on meals that need to be ordered twenty four hours in advance.

As for the presentation of dishes, they are typically introduced as a whole in a single line. In other words, the dish is listed in its entirety, for example “Grilovaná kuřecí prsíčka plněná kozím sýrem s bylinkovou omáčkou” (T). Further explanation may be added, especially if the contents of the meal are unclear, as it has a specific or local name. It follows the preceding description in the same line and it is in brackets, for example “Krumlovský ježek, hořčice, křen (grilovaná klobáska)” (ŠD).

Only in one menu the description of each dish is provided below the name that indicates only the most important ingredients. In some cases, the description of the dish provides detailed explication of its contents. To illustrate this, the first line may read “Filet z lososa se špenátem, šťouchaný brambor” and the description below in brackets “čerstvý špenát, česnek, šťouchaný brambor s cibulkou” (O). Nevertheless, sometimes the description repeats the information of the main line, for example the starter “Pečené švestky ve slatině” is followed by “sušené švestky ve slatině” (O). In such cases it seems rather unnecessary to add the second piece of information.

Two menus combine these two strategies of presenting dishes; some of the dishes are provided with a further detailed description, while the other ones are not. In one case the description below the name of the dish is in brackets and in one case slashes are used instead of brackets.

An interesting graphic device is capitalisation. In the subtitles of individual sections (i.e. courses), mostly the initial letter is capitalised. Only three menus have the whole words printed in capital letters. In addition, the subtitles are underlined in two menus. The dishes are printed in upper case only in three menus, in the majority of menus only the initial letter is capitalised. If the menu provides additional description to a dish that is printed in capital letters, the description may be either in lower or upper case. Although the use of capitalisation varies in different menus, the particular system is always maintained consistently throughout the whole text.

In two out of three menus that use the system of presenting dishes in which the dish is frequently provided with an additional description, the two pieces of information are clearly distinguished by graphic means. In one case, bold letters and a different size of the font is

used, in one case the distinction is achieved by upper and lower case. One menu does not make use of a variety of graphic features, which worsens the legibility and lucidity.

Similarly, menus that present dishes in several languages always make a clear distinction between the Czech and foreign names of dishes. The Czech one is always more noticeable, since it is printed in bold, upper case, larger font, another colour, or several graphic devices are applied.

It is not common to include beverages in one menu together with meals. Drinks are listed only in two menus, one of which has a separate wine list as well. If the menu includes beverages, it contains all kinds – cold and warm, alcoholic and non-alcoholic drinks.

5.2.3. Lexical Features

As has been discussed in the contents section, names of courses vary considerably. Several synonyms have been observed in the names of courses. For example, the section containing dishes without meat may be named *bezmasé pokrmy*, *bezmasá jídla*, *vegetariánské pokrmy* or *nabídka pro vegetariány*. Similarly, the last course can be called either *moučníky* or *dezerty*. The word *moučníky* is used in three menus, whereas *dezerty*, a word of foreign origin, appears in five menus. In one menu both words are, rather unnecessarily, combined in the expression *dezerty – moučníky* with a dash between the two words. In addition, section headings typical of Czech menus are *hotová jídla*, *oblíbená jídla*, *speciality*, *tradiční česká kuchyně* and *staročeská kuchyně*.

In Czech menus, loanwords and foreign words appear frequently, for example “Chilli con carne, nachos” (UV), “carpaccio” (O), “Hovězí Consomé” (T) or “Pfeffersteak” (UV). One menu contains a large number of foreign words and names, which is probably due to its Croatian, or Mediterranean, specialisation: “Scampi na buzaru”, “Chobotnice pod pekom”, “Semifredo” (MD).

Certain dishes, especially in the mains section, are sometimes called by “local-colour” names. For example, “Katův šleh” (P) and “Pfeffersteak” (UV) are well known to the Czechs. Czech menus generally include peculiar names of dishes that are specific for the restaurant, since they refer to the name of the restaurant, for example “Gril Hloupého Honzy” (HH) or Tojské trio (T). The nature of the restaurant may be reflected in original or uncommon names of dishes, such as “Kovbojský steak” (K). This particular name is not provided with any explanation or further description. The name of the restaurant may also appear in the name of a course: “Vejvodovy speciality z drůbeže” (UV).

In addition, diminutives are occasionally included, especially in the children's section: "Smažené řízečky loupežníka Rumcajse" (P), and pets' section: "Paštička Caesar" (Y). The diminutive form may be used to indicate that the meal, usually a side dish, is of a smaller size, such as in "Cibulové placičky" (S), "Přílohové bramboráčky" (P), "rukolový salátek" (O). Interestingly, the expression *jídelní lístek* is used only in one menu.

5.2.4. Grammatical Features

A typical syntactic feature of Czech menus is the use of the prepositions *s*, *v*, *z* and *na*. "Biftek s jemnou bylinkovou omáčkou" (ŠD), "Husí játra v sádle" (O), "Smažený řízek z vepřové panenky" (T) and "Telecí kotlet na grilu" (MD) may serve as examples. The prepositions are used to connect the second part, containing the main additional ingredients or indicating the method of preparation, to the first part of the dish. The preposition *po* often signals the style of preparation that has usually an established meaning, for example "po provensálsku" (UV). A combination of several prepositions is common, for example "Kuřecí prsíčka na bylinkách po provensálsku se zeleninou dušenou na másle" (UV).

A noun is often postmodified by an adjective that is further modified, such as in "Biftek zabalený do slaniny" (O) and "Dušený listový špenát ochucený česnekem" (T). These constructions may be viewed as reduced relative clauses, in which case the adjective is a remnant of a verbo-nominal predication. Although postmodification and constructions with prepositions *v* or *na* seem to be interchangeable, the two alternatives slightly vary in terms of meaning. To be more specific, the amount of the given ingredient or the preparation procedure may be different. In other words, *špenát ochucený česnekem* is probably prepared in a different way than *špenát na česneku* and it may contain less garlic.

Noun phrases typically contain premodification. It is predominantly realised by adjectives, which indicate the kind of meat used (*kuřecí*, *jelení*), the method of preparation (*gratinovaná*, *smažené*) and other characteristics. A noun may be premodified by several adjectives, as in "Pečené špikované husí stehýnko" (T) or "Jemná medová kuřecí filátka se sezamem" (ŠD).

Exceptionally, a noun, usually of foreign origin, modifies another noun, for example "Mix salát" (MD), "Nizza salát" (MD) or even "Losos grill" (MD). This practice is, however, characteristic merely of one menu. A meal such as "Losos grill" is generally expressed by premodification (*grilovaný losos*) or by a preposition (*losos na grilu*). In the case of salads, the two nouns are typically in a reversed position; the word *salát* is postmodified by its name,

such as in “Salát Nicoise” (T). In addition, a noun is occasionally in apposition to another noun in dishes with a specific name, for instance “Topinka ‘Kometa’ s kuřecím masem” (K). Table 2 below shows the occurrence of adjectives and nouns in premodification, as well as the occurrence of adjectives and prepositions in postmodification. The following data were collected from a menu that uses syntactical structures typical of Czech menus.

Table 2 Premodification and postmodification in Czech menus

Premodification			Postmodification		
Adjective	106	99 %	Postponed adjective	16	27 %
Noun	1	1 %	Preposition <i>s</i>	28	48 %
			Other prepositions (<i>v, z, na</i>)	15	25 %
Total	107	100 %	Total	59	100 %

Another characteristic feature of Czech menus is coordination. In dishes, as well as in headings, coordination is realised by the coordinating conjunction *a*. In the case of subtitles, this conjunction is used three times in the expression “těstoviny a bezmasá jídla” and twice in “předkrmy a malá jídla”. Occasionally it appears in other courses, which present two different kinds of meat, such as “Zvěřina a divoká drůběž” (S) and “Ryby a zvěřina” (ŠD). In the case of dishes, the conjunction *a* generally appears between the two last components of the dish: “Hovězí carpaccio s pestem, parmazánem a toastem” (O).

Far more frequently, coordination is realised by commas. Commas may be used between all components of the dish, such as in “Klobásy na grilu, vařené brambory, kysané zelí” (K). Alternatively, the main components are connected by a preposition and a comma is used only before the side dish: “Filet z lososa se špenátem, šťouchaný brambor” (O).

Parenthesis is occasionally used to explicate a certain component, such as in “Svíčkové řezy (hovězí svíčková) marinované v červeném víně s pepřem 4 barev” (ŠD) or “Těstoviny (špagety, penne, farfalle) s úpravou” (Y). In the case of an unclear name of a dish, especially one that relates to the particular restaurant, all ingredients are predominantly provided in parentheses, for instance “Kotlík YVY (kuřecí maso, brokolice, šunka, žampiony, smetana, sýr)” (Y).

In the side orders category, the use of singular and plural form of nouns varies. Although side orders are typically in plural (*vařené brambory, houskové knedlíky*), they

occasionally appear in a singular form. For example, the singular form in “Vařený brambor s máslem” (P) implies that only one potato, in one piece, is served. By contrast, the singular form may also denote a substance made of several potatoes, such as in “Smažený telecí řízek na másle, šťouchaný brambor” (O). Interestingly, the same restaurant lists *šťouchané brambory* in plural in the side orders section, while it uses the singular form when the side order is directly added to the main dish in the section on main courses.

5.3. A Comparison of English and Czech Restaurant Menus

In this section similarities and differences between English and Czech restaurant menus are summarised. The summary is based on the previous detailed analysis of each sample. All the above features (formal, contents, lexical and grammatical) of both samples of menus are covered.

5.3.1. Similarities

The text of all English and Czech menus is clearly organised. The listed items are arranged in two columns with dishes on the left and prices on the right side. In some English and Czech menus the meals and their prices are further arranged in two to four adjacent columns. In one Czech and two English menus the text is centre-aligned.

The whole text is further divided into a number of sections. Each section is provided with a heading that characterises the meals listed in the particular section. The sections are typically arranged in a sequence that corresponds to the order of courses in dining. In other words, starters are listed first, a variety of main courses follows, and desserts come at the end. A slight deviation from this pattern occurs in Czech menus that list side orders as the very last section of the menu. Apparently, some Czech menus tend to consider the section on side dishes as a supplementary one.

Although side dishes are in all Czech menus and most English menus listed in a separate section, they may also occasionally be added right to the description of certain meals as a recommended component in both groups of menus. In addition, only a few English and Czech menus include beverages in the menu where meals are listed.

Since menus use a variety of subtitles to characterise the individual groups of meals, a number of synonyms exist in both languages. The lexicon of one language naturally offers synonyms for different courses than the lexicon of the other language. For instance, English

can use *starters* or *appetisers*, whereas Czech has only one word for this course – *předkrmy*. On the other hand, Czech can choose between *bezmasé pokrmy* and *vegetariánská jídla*, whereas English expresses this particular section by only one word – *vegetarian*. In the case of the last course, both languages offer a variety: *sweets* or *desserts* and *moučníky* or *dezerty*.

Both English and Czech menus name some of the dishes after the restaurant or the area in which the restaurant is located. These restaurant-specific words are used in the section headings, as well as in dishes. Loanwords, foreign words and words of foreign origin are often included. Whereas in Czech menus these words come from German, Spanish, English and French, English restaurants, especially brasseries, contain mostly French words and expressions.

Interestingly, the great majority of English and Czech menus omit the words *menu* and *jídelní lístek*, which in fact designate the text type. By contrast, almost all English and Czech menus include the name of the restaurant. The name of the restaurant or its emblem may be printed on the first page, on the last page or on all pages of the menu. It is usually clearly visible due to the use of graphic features such as underlining, a change of font size, colours or illustrations.

All English and Czech menus make use of various graphic devices in order to make the text intelligible and as lucid as possible. Especially the headings of individual courses are clearly distinguished from the meals listed under them. Within the text larger letters or framing is sometimes used to attract the attention of customer.

All Czech menus and the majority of English menus add symbols or abbreviations of currency (£, €, Kč or ,-) to the prices. Most English and Czech menus are concluded with their contact details, such as the address, telephone number or web page.

As for syntactic devices, coordination is employed in English, as well as in Czech menus. In both languages it is mostly realised by conjunctions (*and*, *a*) and by commas. In addition, the sign & is often used in English. Parenthesis is used to explicate the contents of a meal in both languages. Also, an explanation containing the ingredients of an unclear name of a dish is given in parentheses. Nevertheless, Czech menus make use of parentheses more frequently and also for other purposes.

5.3.2. Differences

All English menus have a heading that consists of the name or type of the restaurant, whereas four Czech menus do not have any heading. Moreover, English and Irish restaurants present

their emblems on menus more often than Czech restaurants. On the other hand, Czech menus include more illustrations than the English ones.

All English menus include notes that inform customers mostly about the value added tax and gratuity. Other notes concern diets, vegan dishes or children's portions, or they may serve as explanatory notes to the abbreviations used in the text, which in most cases denote vegetarian and gluten-free meals. Most frequently, these notes are situated at the end of the menu. By contrast, it is not common for Czech menus to provide this information and if provided, it varies considerably in different menus. The Czech notes may inform, for instance, about half portions, take-aways or currency that is accepted in the restaurant, but generally they differ greatly from the notes in English menus.

A number of differences are found in the arrangement of sections and the classification of meals under headings. Whereas soups always occupy a separate section in Czech menus, they are included among starters in the great majority of English menus. Side dishes are usually placed after or beside desserts in Czech menus, while English menus list them before desserts. In several Czech menus desserts are subdivided into several sections, while in English menus this is never the case.

Interesting components in comparative terms are vegetarian and children's meals, since English and Czech menus handle and classify them in a different way. In Czech menus the section on vegetarian dishes, as well as the section on children's dishes, are included more often than in English menus. On the other hand, it is very common for English menus to indicate meals that are suitable for vegetarians by a small letter *v*. Moreover, two English menus include a whole vegetarian menu, comprising vegetarian starters and mains and some English menus refer to a separate children's menu.

Occasionally, English menus include sections on burgers and omelettes, which never occur in Czech menus. By contrast, typical headings of Czech menus are *česká kuchyně*, *k pivu* and *speciality* (specialities of various kinds). Czech menus sometimes include a section on small snacks, such as crisps and nuts, whereas in English menus it is more common to offer cheese and biscuits.

English menus tend to be more conservative in the naming of the courses. We mostly find that conventional labels, such as *appetisers*, *fish dishes*, *main courses*, or *poultry & meats* are used to characterise the particular groups of meals. By contrast, the variety of labels used in Czech menus implies that there is a strong tendency to use creativity in Czech menus in this respect. In addition, Czech menus include dishes with "local colour" names, such as *Katův šleh* (The Executioner's Whip), more frequently than English menus.

Two methods of presenting dishes were observed and described in the contents and lexical sections of both groups of menus. Whereas in the first system the dish is briefly described in a few words, in the other system it is divided into two parts, consisting of a name or brief description followed by a detailed description below. English menus employ both systems equally often, while Czech menus apparently prefer the first one, and in case any further details need to be provided, they are added in brackets. Moreover, the dish is not divided into two parts by means of graphic devices, as is the case of some English menus.

English and Czech menus greatly differ in their use of capitalisation. Most Czech menus capitalise the initial letters of both courses and dishes. Only three menus have courses, dishes or both typed in upper case. By contrast, the most frequent practice in English menus is to capitalise all full lexical words in courses and the most important words, or even all full lexical words, in dishes. Alternatively, only initial letters capitalised in three menus. Interestingly, none of the menus has courses or dishes typed in upper case.

Whereas numerical ordering is used in four Czech menus, it is not applied in any of the English menus. Similarly, it is typical of Czech menus to add the amount (usually in grams and millilitres) to almost all dishes. In English menus the amount of meals is provided only exclusively, mostly with grilled meat and steaks.

Grammatically, the most notable distinction between English and Czech menus is in the use of pre- and postmodification. Although both samples of menus employ premodification, the types of premodification and their frequency are different in each language. Although in English adjectival and participial premodification is common, the noun is mostly premodified by another noun. By contrast, Czech menus typically employ adjectival premodification and noun in premodification occurs very rarely due to typological differences between the two languages.

Whereas in English postmodification is mostly realised by participles, in Czech prepositions are the dominant syntactic device. Generally, a noun is premodified by a greater number of words in English than in Czech. Therefore, in many instances where words are in a premodifying position in English, they are postponed in similar contexts in Czech.

5.4. The Organisation of a Restaurant Menu as a ‘Cinderella’ Text

Although it might seem from the comparison carried out above that Czech and English menus do not share many characteristics, they correspond in the features that classify them as the same text type – a restaurant menu. This section analyses which properties of a colony defined by Hoey (2001: 72-92) are applicable to a restaurant menu. Although Hoey (2001: 75) mentions the menu as an example of a colony text, he does not give any example of its particular properties in his further detailed discussion of the features of colonies. Therefore, this part of the paper summarises the features of a restaurant menu on the basis of the collected and examined samples of Czech and English restaurant menus.

Each property is at first briefly noted (their detailed description is provided in the theoretical background of this thesis) and then it is discussed whether a menu has this property. Although Czech and English menus vary in the details of their arrangement and other features, they are regarded as representing the same text type: menu. For this reason, they are considered as one group in the following analysis.

The first and defining property of a colony is that the “component parts do not derive their meaning from the sequence in which they are placed.” (Hoey, 2001: 75) Consequently, if the parts are jumbled, the utility may be affected but the meaning is not. This is true for a restaurant menu, since readers would understand the meaning of individual dishes even if they were jumbled. Nevertheless, the utility would be affected, as readers would find it difficult to choose their desired dish if it was listed in another section than it belongs to. To illustrate this, if a customer wanted to order a main dish, for example sirloin, it would be difficult for him to find it when listed under desserts or starters instead of in the mains section.

The second, and corollary, property is that the “adjacent units of a colony do not form continuous prose” (Hoey, 2001: 77). This property applies to a restaurant menu, since dishes are listed individually, without any connections between them. Moreover, there is no cross-referencing between the components, as no dish is dependent in its meaning on another one.

The third property concerns a colony’s title, which provides a framing context. Most restaurant menus have a title. Predominantly it consists of the name of the restaurant, which refers to the provenance of the text, and/or a word that characterises the type of the restaurant (e.g. *brasserie*, *restaurant*). In some cases the word *menu*, which characterises the text type, is in the title. Four menus do not have any title, only subtitles relating to individual sections. Interestingly, all four menus without a title are Czech.

A restaurant menu has typically no named author, which is the fourth property of a colony. A menu has probably one or several authors who cooperated on the compilation of dishes and structure of the whole text. The author may be the chef, perhaps cooks and the manager or the owner of the restaurant. Only one restaurant menu, a Czech one, provides the name of the chef and the name of the person responsible for prices. Interestingly, these pieces of information do not appear in the English translation of this menu. Nevertheless, it must be noted that the chef does not necessarily have to be the author of the menu.

The fifth property is that a component of a colony may be used without referring to other components. As there is no cross-referencing among dishes in a restaurant menu, this property fully applies to this text type. Moreover, it is usual to scan the whole text, or at least the relevant parts of it, while examining the contents of the menu before selecting a particular meal.

The sixth property concerns reprinting a component part of a colony in another colony. It is probable that a dish may be re-used in another menu; it may, for example, appear in a different menu (e.g. a lunch menu, a dinner menu, set lunch, a banquet menu) of the same restaurant. It is, however, not a rule for all menus that their components are reused in other menus, as the restaurant may have only one type of menu.

Consequently, the contents of a menu changes through time, as dishes are added, removed and altered according to current fashion or the taste of the chef. Moreover, the revision is a mechanical matter, since the surrounding text of the revised element does not have to be changed, as long as one component does not appear twice in a menu. This is also due to the fact that there is no cross-referencing in a menu. Apparently, the seventh property of a colony text fully applies to a menu as well.

The two last properties concern Matching and Sequence relations between components of a colony. The fact that many of the components serve the same function in a colony is considered as a weak Matching relation. It is true of a menu that the listed dishes serve the same function – to present or describe the meals that the restaurant offers. Thus, they are in a weak Matching relation with each other.

Sequence relations provide connections between components by arbitrary systems, such as alphabetic and numerical ordering, and non-arbitrary systems, such as ordering by time or date. A menu is not typically connected by any sequential relations. Nevertheless, numerical ordering is employed in four menus, all of which are Czech.

The table below indicates which of the nine properties discussed above a restaurant menu has. The table that Hoey (2001: 88) designed in order to show which properties various

colonies have is used as a model. Although he mentions that a menu is an example of a colony, Hoey does not include it in his table.

Table 3 Features of a restaurant menu

<i>Colony feature</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>Total</i>
Restaurant menu	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	?	7/9

Key to Column Labels and Indicators

- 1* The meaning is not derived from the sequence of components
- 2* Adjacent units do not form continuous prose
- 3* The colony has a framing context (a title)
- 4* The colony does not have a named writer
- 5* One component may be used without referring to the other components
- 6* Components can be reprinted or reused
- 7* Components may be added, removed or altered
- 8* Many of the components serve the same function (Matching relation)
- 9* Alphabetic, numeric or temporal sequencing is used (Sequence relation)
- +/- indicates whether the colony has this property
- ? indicates that the colony does not always have this property

As has been demonstrated, a restaurant menu fulfils at least seven out of nine properties. The two remaining ones do not apply to all menus. Consequently, since they are not universal for all menus, they cannot be regarded as typical features of this particular text type. Although the third property is characteristic of English menus, it does not always apply to Czech menus. On the other hand, whereas the ninth property applies to some Czech menus, it is not a feature of any of the English menus. Therefore, it would be incorrect to claim that any of the two groups, English or Czech menus, is a more central or marginal colony than the other. It is clear from the analysis that the menu is not a “central” type of a colony, for it does not have all of the nine properties. Nevertheless, it is obviously a very good example of a colony, since it is more widespread than some of the other colony texts.

5.5. English Translations of Czech Menus

In this section, the features of Czech menus translated into English are analysed with respect to the previous description of English menus. The analysis is carried out on six menus. Three restaurants include the English translation in the same menu with the Czech one and three restaurants have a separate English version. For this reason, to avoid confusion it is necessary to specify that the analysed menus include the following ones: Opat, Troja, Mediteran Dubrovnik, Kometa, U Vejvodů and Švaberský dům. On the basis of the preceding analysis of English menus, the contents and the most important formal, lexical and stylistic features of these six translations are examined. Thus, this section aims to describe to what extent the English translations of Czech menus comply with the conventions of English menus.

It is important to add that while the translations naturally differ in various aspects, there are cases when they do comply with a certain convention of the English menus. Nevertheless, since this thesis attempts to draw general conclusions based on several samples, the characteristics of the majority of cases are the primary factor. Consequently, if most translations do not comply with the English menu conventions in a particular feature, the feature is discussed in the second section.

5.5.1. Features that Correspond to English Menus

All Czech menus translated into English are clearly arranged in several sections, which have headings characterising the meals listed under them. Almost all menus have titles that contain the name of the restaurant, only in one menu the title is missing. All menus are arranged in two columns, with meals listed in the left column and prices in the right one. Contact details of the restaurant are in most cases included at the end of the menu. Except for one menu, the overall design and illustrations are moderate.

All translations omit articles, even in cases where the indefinite article is sometimes used in English menus, for example in the case of sauces (e.g. *a tomato sauce*). Furthermore, premodification of various kinds is used. Nevertheless, a noun is usually premodified only by one or two words. Postmodification by the *-ed* participle or *with*-construction is frequent as well.

The contents of certain dishes are explicated especially when the name of the dish is unclear. The ingredients of the dish are enumerated and given in brackets. The last point in which the English translations of Czech menus comply with the conventions of English menus is that most of them, except for one, do not apply numerical ordering.

5.5.2. Features that Do Not Correspond to English Menus

Although all Czech menus translated into English are organised in several sections, their order does not correspond to that of English menus. In all translated menus, a separate section is devoted to soups, while English menus always list them under the section on *starters*. Similarly, appetisers are subdivided in two subsections of *cold* and *hot* or *warm* starters in three translated menus, which is rather atypical of English menus. Three menus list desserts before side dishes, while a reversed order is customary for English menus.

Courses are named in a manner that resembles rather the Czech practice than the English one. For instance, instead of “Specialities of fish” (UV), premodification (*Fish Specialities*) would be applied in English menus. Alternatively, this section could be entitled simply *Fish*. In “Starters and small snacks” (ŠD) the word *dishes* instead of *snacks* is more appropriate. A more suitable variant of “Grilled meat” (MD) is *From the Grill*, since it is redundant to specify that *meat* is grilled. It is also preferable to use the word *vegetarian* instead of *meatless* in “Meatless Dishes” (O) and “Pastries and meatless dishes” (UV). Moreover, the word *pastries* is entirely incorrect, as the section obviously contains *pasta*.

The heading “Fruit and sundae” (UV) has a number of imperfections. Firstly, the word *fruit* is inappropriate, for the section does not contain *fruit*, but *fruit sundaes*. Secondly, the word *sundae* should be in a plural form. Thirdly, since desserts are typically not divided into several sections in English menus, an elegant solution would be to list only one section on desserts, entitled simply *desserts*.

In the heading “Pasta, vegetarian offer” (T) the word *offer* seems redundant. Moreover, the comma between *pasta* and *vegetarian* would be substituted by *&* or *and* in English menus. Given that only three meals in this section are vegetarian, another option is to entitle this section as *Pasta* and indicate vegetarian meals by the letter *v*. This system would allow for meals from other sections, for instance salads, to be indicated as vegetarian as well. Although this system of indicators is often employed in English menus and customers are used to it, none of the translations make use of it.

In addition, the use of capitalisation in courses does not correspond to the use in English menus. One menu is styled in accordance with the English structure, as the initial letters of words in the headings are capitalised. Nevertheless, this menu fails to employ this system consistently in all headings. Two menus have only the initial letter of the first word typed in upper case. Three menus capitalise all letters of the headings, which is never the case of English menus, and foreign customers are probably unaccustomed to it. In the case of

dishes, the most common practice of English menus is to have the initial letters of the most important words typed in upper case. This system is not applied in any translation.

Weights of dishes are provided in all translated menus, whereas English menus include them only rarely. Furthermore, only two translated menus contain final notes. One of them informs customers about the charge for bread and seasoning ingredients such as vinegar, mustard or horseradish. The word *couvert* is retained in the English translation, although the word is not used in English. Another note contains information about the price of half portions. The Czech version is, probably accidentally, retained in the translation: “Za poloviční porce účtujeme 70% z ceny” (K).

Graphic devices, such as bold or larger letters, are neglected in all three cases of menus that have a single version of a menu for two or more languages. In these menus only the Czech names of dishes and courses are prominent, whereas the English version is typed in small letters that are difficult to read. Consequently, these menus do not meet the conventions of English menus, for they are not clear and customer-oriented.

6. Conclusions

On the basis of the analysis of English and Czech menus, conclusions were made as regards their typical organisation of the contents and formal, lexical and grammatical features. The contrastive analysis of English and Czech menus has shown both common and different tendencies in the two samples.

It has been observed that English and Czech menus share several common features from each of the analysed categories. All menus are clearly organised in columns and subdivided into a number of sections, while using various graphic devices in order to make the most important components more prominent. Menus usually include the name and contact details of the restaurant. Interestingly, the words designating the text type (*menu, jídelní listek*) are mostly omitted. Linguistically, a variety of synonyms in course labels occur in both languages. Furthermore, foreign words and dishes named after the restaurant are used in both groups of menus. Common syntactic devices include coordination and parenthesis.

Nevertheless, a greater number of differences than similarities on the level of formal, lexical, grammatical and other features was observed. To provide the most important examples of differences, all English menus have a title consisting of the name or type of the restaurant, whereas the title is sometimes omitted in Czech menus. In comparison with Czech

menus, final notes in English menus conform to a set pattern, as they usually contain information of a similar nature. English and Czech menus also differ in the use of capitalisation, in the inclusion of particular sections and in the sequence of some sections. In Czech menus the dish is typically presented as a whole, while English menus either present it as a whole as well or divide it into two parts. In comparison with English menus, “local-colour” names of dishes occur more often and a greater variety of course labels is used in Czech menus. Numerical ordering is characteristic only of Czech menus. Syntactically, English and Czech menus make use of different types of pre- and postmodification, and English generally tends to prefer pre-modification.

Despite numerous differences, both samples are instantiations of one text type – restaurant menu. It has been shown that menu is a specific text type characterised by certain internal, i.e. linguistic (lexical and grammatical), criteria. This text type is also defined by formal characteristics, such as the arrangement and organisation of the contents. The findings about the features of English and Czech menus were used to establish to what extent menus exhibit the typical properties associated with Hoey’s colony texts. As the comparison of his nine properties with the characteristics of the collected samples revealed, at least seven of the properties are typical of menus. Thus, it has been proved that a restaurant menu can be classified among specific text types that Michael Hoey describes as colonies and entitles “Cinderella” texts. Although menu is not a central colony, it can be regarded as one of the most typical examples of a colony text.

In addition, both samples are equally valid instances of colony texts, since both are characterised by seven properties. The distinction lies in the third and the ninth properties, which concern titles and numerical ordering, respectively. Whereas a title is an essential component of English menus, it is sometimes omitted in Czech menus. The opposite situation is with numerical ordering, which is employed exclusively in Czech menus. These differences can be attributed to the fact that each sample comes from a different cultural background with different set of conventions.

Finally, the comparison of English translations of Czech menus with the characteristics of English menus has revealed to what extent the translations comply with the English conventions. It has been observed that the translations violate the English conventions in many aspects, for example in the sequence of courses, their labels, lexical choice, as well as in the use of capitalisation and graphic devices. The variety of creative labels of courses and “local-colour” names of dishes typical of Czech menus also cause difficulties in translation.

Although some of the instances of violation are minor, most of them may have a negative impact on the utility of the text, which is actually, according to Hoey, the purpose of this text type. If the text does not meet the customers' expectations, they can have difficulties in using it for its primary purpose (i.e. to choose and order meals). Naturally, some differences may be instances of cultural specificities that may (or even should) be preserved in the translation. Nevertheless, many translations seem to be translations of individual words and expressions rather than texts as a whole with all their other properties. The inevitable outcome is an inadequate translation; a text with a negatively affected utility.

7. References

- Atkins, S., Clear, J., & Ostler, N. (1992). Corpus Design Criteria. *Journal of Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 7(1), 1-16.
- Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D. (1989). A typology of English texts. *Linguistics*, 27(1), 3-43.
- Biber, D. (1995). *Dimensions of register variation: A cross-linguistic comparison*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D., & Davy, D. (1969). *Investigating English style*. London: Longman.
- Crystal, D. (1991). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell
- Expert Advisory Group on Language Engineering Standards. (1996). *Preliminary recommendations on text typology*. Available online from <<http://www.ilc.pi.cnr.it/EAGLES96/texttyp/texttyp.html>> (accessed: 15 December 2011).
- Faigley, L., & Meyer, P. (1983). Rhetorical theory and readers' classifications of text types. *Text*, 3, 305-325.
- Hoey, M. (2001). *Textual Interaction: an introduction to written discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Holmes, J. (2008). *The Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Kress, G. (1993). Genre as social process. In Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.), *The powers of literacy: A genre approach to teaching writing* (pp. 22-37). London: Falmer Press.
- Lee, David YW. (2001). Genres, registers, text types, domains, and styles: clarifying the concepts and navigating a path through the BNC jungle. *Language Learning & Technology*, Vol. 5, Num. 3, 3, pp. 37-72.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. (1990). Harlow: Logman.
- Longman Online Dictionary. <<http://www.ldoceonline.com>> (accessed: November 2011).
- Martin, J.R. (1993). A contextual theory of language. In Cope, Bill & Mary Kalantzis (Eds.), *The Powers of Literacy: a genre approach to teaching writing* (pp. 116-136). London: Falmer Press.
- Paltridge, B. (1996). Genre, text type, and, and the language classroom. *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 237-243.
- Sampson, J. (1997). "Genre," "style" and "register". Sources of confusion? *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 75(3), 699-708.

- Steen, G. (1999). Genres of discourse and the definition of literature. *Discourse Processes*, 28, 109-120.
- Stubbs, M. (1996). *Text and corpus analysis: Computer assisted studies of language and culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sources:

- “Britain’s Finest.” Search Server. <<http://britainsfinest.co.uk>> (accessed: October 2011).
- “Browns.” Menu. Available on-line from <<http://browns-restaurants.co.uk/static/ugc/menus/2011/10/18/1-main-menu-provincial.pdf>> (accessed: 9 November 2011).
- “Cotswold Water Park.” Menu. Available on-line from <<http://www.cotswoldwaterparkhotel.co.uk/media/1a79960c/Cotswold%20Water%20Park%20Brasserie%20Menu%20June%202011.pdf>> (accessed: 7 November 2011).
- “Elephant & Castle.” Menu. Available on-line from <<http://www.elephantandcastle.ie/Menus/LunchDinner.html>> (accessed: 5 November 2011).
- “Gallagher’s Boxy House.” Menu. Available on-line from <http://www.boxyhouse.ie/menus/a_la_carte_eng.pdf> (accessed: 5 November 2011).
- “Google.” Search Engine. <www.google.ie>; <www.google.com>; <www.google.cz>.
- “Hloupý Honza.” Menu. Available on-line from <http://www.hloupyhonza.cz/stala_nabidka.php> (accessed: 19 November 2011).
- “Hotel Opat.” Menu. Available on-line from <http://hotelopat.cz/3_restaurace.php> (accessed: 4 November 2011).
- “Hotel Opat.” Menu. Available on-line from <http://hotelopat.cz/en/3_stravovani.php> (accessed: 4 November 2011).
- “Kingsvalley.” Menu. Available on-line from <<http://www.kingsvalley.ie/wp-content/uploads/Kingsvalley-Menu-20116.pdf>> (accessed: 22 October 2011).
- “Mediteran Dubrovnik.” Menu. Available on-line from <http://www.hotelpalacky.cz/?page_id=57> (accessed: 9 November 2011).
- “Mediteran Dubrovnik.” Menu. Available on-line from <http://www.hotelpalacky.cz/?page_id=321&lang=en> (accessed: 9 November 2011).

- “Pegas.” Menu. Available on-line from <http://www.jkpegas.cz/jidelni_listek.pdf> (accessed: 30 October 2011).
- “Restaurace Sklípek.” Menu. Available on-line from <<http://www.restaurantsklipek.com/index3.htm>> (accessed: 5 November 2011).
- “Restaurace U Vejvodů.” Menu. Available on-line from <http://www.restauracevejvodu.cz/download/jidelni_listek_2011_cz_en_de.pdf> (accessed: 7 November 2011).
- “Restaurant Kometa.” Menu. Available on-line from <http://www.restaurantkometa.cz/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=60&Itemid=69> (accessed: 6 November 2011).
- “Restaurant Troja.” Menu. Available on-line from <http://www.hoteltroja.cz/files/troja_celodenni_menu_CZ.pdf> (accessed: 4 November 2011).
- “Restaurant Troja.” Menu. Available on-line from <http://www.hoteltroja.cz/files/troja_celodenn_menu_AJ-NJ.pdf> (accessed: 4 November 2011).
- “R.S.Hispaniola.” Menu. Available on-line from <<http://hispaniola.co.uk/RestaurantMenu.php>> (accessed: 3 January 2010).
- “Shibden Mill Inn.” Menu. Available on-line from <<http://www.shibdenmillinn.com/files/mainmenu.pdf>> (accessed: 9 November 2011).
- “Švamberský dům.” Menu. Available on-line from <<http://www.svamberskydum.cz/files/1.pdf>> (accessed: 6 November 2011).
- “The Angel Inn.” Menu. Available on-line from <<http://www.angelhetton.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Bar-Brasserie-Autumn-2011.pdf>> (accessed: 20 October 2011).
- “The Church.” Menu. Available on-line from <<http://www.thechurch.ie/Upload/Gallery%20ala%20Carte%20Sept%202011.pdf>> (accessed: 5 November 2011).
- “The Harbour Light Restaurant.” Menu. Available on-line from <http://www.theharbourlight.co.uk/pdf/thl_restaurant_menu.pdf> (accessed: 21 October 2011).
- “YVY.” Menu. Available on-line from <<http://vyvy.cz/listek.pdf>> (accessed: 12 November 2011).

8. Czech Summary

Tato bakalářská práce zkoumá z kontrastivního hlediska specifický textový typ – jídelní lístek. Práce přináší analýzu anglických a českých jídelních lístků se zaměřením na jejich strukturu, uspořádání a další vlastnosti. Na základě dosavadních odborných prací a rozboru nashromážděných autentických vzorků jídelních lístků je zkoumaný typ textu charakterizován a podrobně popsán. Práce přináší jak teoretické, tak praktické poznatky o tomto specifickém textovém typu.

V teoretické části je nejprve nastíněno různé vnímání často užívaných pojmů, jako jsou *žánr*, *registr*, *textový typ* a *styl*. Různí autoři je vnímají různými, často až odporujícími si způsoby. Při zkoumání této poměrně složité problematiky se práce opírá o odborný článek s příznačným názvem „Genres, registers, text types, domains, and styles: clarifying the concepts and navigating a path through the BNC jungle” autora Davida YW Leea (2001). Ze závěrů tohoto článku vyplývá, že ačkoli jsou tyto pojmy vnímány různě, mnohdy se lingvisté a teoretici na určitých aspektech ohledně těchto pojmů shodují. Práce prezentuje Leeovy návrhy ohledně způsobu, jakým by se zmíněné pojmy měly nadále používat.

V odborné literatuře jsou texty obdobného typu, jako je jídelní lístek, často opomíjeny. Přestože jsou tyto texty velice rozšířené, v porovnání s ostatními typy textů existuje jen málo odborné literatury, jež se jimi zabývá. Kniha *Textual Interaction: an introduction to written discourse analysis*, jejímž autorem je Michael Hoey (2001), obsahuje kapitolu, která se naopak zaměřuje na typy textů, k nimž lze zařadit i jídelní lístek.

Z tohoto důvodu je Hoeyho text pro tuto bakalářskou práci zásadní, a proto je popisu jeho obsahu věnován poměrně velký prostor v rámci teoretické části. Hoey se pokouší definovat tyto textové typy, jež nazývá koloniemi na základě podobnosti jejich uspořádání se včelími a mravenčími koloniemi, a stanovuje devět vlastností, které jsou pro ně charakteristické. V druhé části teoretické části jsou tyto vlastnosti podrobně popsány. Z Hoeyho poznatků tato práce vychází i ve výzkumné části a dále s nimi pracuje.

Výzkumná část si klade za cíl porovnat uspořádání, strukturu a další náležitosti jídelních lístků jak anglických, tak českých. Za tímto účelem bylo shromážděno celkem dvacet tři jídelních lístků: deset pochází z restaurací v Británii a v Irsku, deset z České republiky a šest lístků jsou překlady českých jídelních lístků do angličtiny. Nashromážděné vzorky pocházejí z různých míst, avšak zaměření kuchyně a cenová relace je obdobná. České lístky přeložené do angličtiny byly záměrně zvoleny tak, aby pocházely z turisticky oblíbených lokalit, neboť se u nich předpokládá vyšší kvalita překladu. Konkrétní vzorky byly

pověětšinou nalezeny pomocí internetového vyhledávače Google či zvoleny na základě osobní zkušenosti.

V druhé části bakalářské práce jsou nejprve rozebrány anglické jídelní lístky po stránce formální, obsahové, lexikální a gramatické. Obdobným způsobem jsou takto popsány jídelní lístky české. Po důkladném rozboru jsou shrnuty všechny zásadní rysy, ve kterých se anglické a české jídelní lístky shodují či alespoň podobají, a naopak v kterých se liší.

Mezi shodné rysy anglických a českých lístků lze zařadit celkové uspořádání textu do dvou sloupců a několika oddílů opatřených nadpisem. Typické je i využití různých grafických prostředků pro zvýraznění nejdůležitějších komponentů. Dále jídelní lístky většinou obsahují název a kontaktní informace dané restaurace. Zajímavým poznatkem je to, že samotný výraz *menu* či *jídelní lístek*, který charakterizuje tento textový typ, se obvykle nevyskytuje. V obou skupinách se vyskytuje množství synonym, zejména v označení jednotlivých chodů. V názvech jídel bylo zaznamenáno časté využití slov cizího původu a při pojmenovávání některých jídel je také patrná inspirace názvem dané restaurace. Společnými syntaktickými rysy je použití koordinace a vsuvek.

Celkově lze říci, že na rovině formální, obsahové, lexikální a gramatické bylo vyzorováno více rozdílných než shodných prvků. Rozdíly se týkají například souhrnného názvu, který se vyskytuje ve všech anglických lístcích, zatímco v českých je často vypuštěn. Na rozdíl od českých lístků obsahují anglické lístky závěrečné poznámky přinášející v různých vzorcích obdobný druh informací. Zkoumané vzorky jídelních lístků se dále liší ve způsobu užití velkých písmen, v pořadí chodů a v některých specifických chodech typických jen pro anglické, či jen pro české lístky. Způsob prezentování jednotlivých jídel je také zčásti odlišný. V českých lístcích jsou jídla obvykle popsána stručně několika slovy. Některé anglické lístky využívají taktéž tohoto způsobu, avšak jiné dělí popis pokrmů na dvě části. V českých jídelních lístcích bylo zaznamenáno větší množství všeobecně známých názvů jídel a větší rozmanitost v názvech chodů. Číselné označení se vykytuje výhradně v českých lístcích. Syntakticky se zkoumané dvě skupiny liší ve využití odlišných typů premodifikace a postmodifikace, přičemž angličtina uplatňuje premodifikaci ve větší míře než čeština.

Ačkoli se z uvedeného shrnutí podobností a rozdílů může zdát, že se anglické a české jídelní lístky z větší míry odlišují, než podobají, přesto obě skupiny patří ke stejnému textovému typu. Důkazem tohoto tvrzení jsou závěry, které přináší samostatná kapitola věnovaná rozboru nashromážděných jídelních lístků podle popisu a vlastností, které Hoey takzvaným koloniím připisuje. Daná kapitola zkoumá, které z těchto devíti vlastností jsou charakteristické právě pro jídelní lístek. Z rozboru vyplynulo, že jídelní lístek jako textový typ

splňuje přinejmenším sedm z devíti kritérií. Zajímavé je, že se anglické a české lístky neshodují ve dvou vlastnostech, konkrétně ve třetí a deváté, jež se týkají souhrnného názvu a číselného označení. Anglické a české lístky však považujeme za příklady stejného textového typu a vzhledem k tomu, že jako vlastnost textového typu lze označit pouze tu, která je pro lístek charakteristická, pouze sedm vlastností je pro jídelní lístek zcela platných. Je zřejmé, že jídelní lístek je jedním z nejtypičtějších představitelů textu typu kolonie.

Pro účely teoretického popisu jídelního lístku a jeho klasifikaci lze tedy rozdíly mezi českými a anglickými lístky na rovině čistě formální a lingvistické, které jsou popsány v předchozí části práce, považovat za druhořadé. Tyto rozdíly jsou však zásadní pro rozbor anglických překladů českých jídelních lístků, jimiž se zabývá závěrečná část práce. Ta je věnována analýze šesti překladů českých lístků na základě předchozího popisu anglických lístků. Nejprve jsou popsány prvky, ve kterých se české jídelní lístky s anglickými shodují po stránce formální, obsahové, lexikální i syntaktické. Poté následuje rozbor prvků, v kterých překlady normu anglických lístků porušují. Jako příklady odchýlení se od normy lze ve stručnosti uvést odlišné pořadí chodů a jejich názvy, nevhodné lexikální prostředky, neodpovídající užití velkých písmen a grafických prostředků. Potíže při překladu způsobují i rozmanité názvy chodů a specifické názvy jídel, jež se v českých jídelních lístkách často vyskytují.

Z rozboru překladů vyplývá, že se v mnoha aspektech od anglického úzu výrazně odlišují. Ačkoli některé odchylky nemusí být podstatné, většina má negativní dopad na snadnou orientaci v textu a jeho správné porozumění na straně zákazníka, který si s sebou přináší jistá očekávání ohledně standardní struktury jídelního lístku. Anglické překlady českých jídelních lístků působí mnohdy spíše jako převod jednotlivých slovních spojení z jednoho jazyka do druhého než plnohodnotný překlad zahrnující všechny aspekty. V důsledku takového počínání vznikají odchylky od anglické normy, jež mají negativní vliv na funkčnost textu. Vzhledem k tomu, že užitečnost textu (v případě jídelního lístku umožnění zákazníkovi, aby si snadno vybral a objednal jídlo) je v zásadě důvodem existence tohoto textového typu, adekvátní překlad se od anglické normy nesmí výrazně odlišovat. Právě výše popsané odlišnosti mezi anglickými a českými jídelními lístky se promítají v překladech tím způsobem, že vznikají odchylky od anglického úzu. V případě, že se při překladu zohlední odlišnosti popsané v této práci, vznikne překlad zdařilejší.

9. Appendix

(English menus, Czech menus and English translations of Czech menus – attached separately)