A Review of a Final Thesis

submitted to the Department of English and ELT Methodology,
Faculty of Arts, Charles University

Name and titles of the reviewer: PhDr. Gabriela Brůhová, Ph.D.

Reviewed as: ☒ a supervisor   ☐ an opponent

Author of the thesis: Petr Louda
Title of the thesis: English translation counterparts of the German pronoun *man*
Year of submission: 2021
Submitted as: ☒ a bachelor's thesis   ☐ a master's thesis

Level of expertise:
☒ excellent ☐ very good ☐ average ☐ below average ☐ inadequate

Factual errors:
☒ almost none ☐ appropriate to the scope of the thesis ☐ frequent less serious ☐ serious

Chosen methodology:
☒ original and appropriate ☐ appropriate ☐ barely adequate ☐ inadequate

Results:
☐ original ☒ original and derivative ☐ non-trivial compilation ☐ cited from sources ☐ copied

Scope of the thesis:
☐ too large ☒ appropriate to the topic ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate

Bibliography (number and selection of titles):
☒ above average (scope or rigor) ☐ average ☐ below average ☐ inadequate

Typographical and formal level:
☐ excellent ☒ very good ☐ average ☐ below average ☐ inadequate

Language:
☒ excellent ☐ very good ☐ average ☐ below average ☐ inadequate

Typos:
☒ almost none ☐ appropriate to the scope of the thesis ☐ numerous

Brief description of the thesis (by the supervisor, ca. 100-200 words):

The study investigates the English translation counterparts of the German pronoun *man*, a pronoun used to express the general human agent*.* As English does not have one identical counterpart, the aim is to provide a description of various devices used in English to translate the German *man.* In addition, the author attempts to answer the question whether there is a connection between a translation counterpart and the specific meaning of *man.* The material used for the empirical part comprises 247 instances excerpted from the Intercorp13, from the fields of fiction and parliamentary debates. This enabled the author to compare the translation counterparts in two different registers. The analysis has revealed that *man* is most frequently translated using the English passive (almost 25%), followed by the pronouns *we* (almost 15%) and *they* (almost 12%).

In general, the thesis is of very good quality, well-written, mature. The author showed an impressive independence in his research and proved that he is extremely well oriented in the topic.

Review, comments and notes (ca. 100-200 words)

Strong points of the thesis:

- The author does not only provide translation counterparts of the German *man*, but he also attempts to find correlation between the specific meaning of *man* (general, anonymous, self-referential, exclusive…) and the way it is translated. For this purpose the author applied two different semantic classifications of *man.* This procedure must have been very demanding and time-consuming.
- The author pays attention to interesting translation equivalents and does not hesitate to comment on the correctness and appropriateness of the selected counterpart, offering his assessment.
- The presentation of the results is systematic and straightforward, using illustrative tables.
- The methodology is appropriate and the results are informative.

Weak points of the thesis:

- It would have been better if the analysis could have been conducted using a greater variety of fiction books and their (and not only four books translated by three different translators). However, this cannot be viewed as the author's mistake; it is simply the matter of Intercorp and the low number of books translated from German to English.

Questions to answer during the Defence and suggested points of discussion:

1. Ex. 39 (on p. 39) „comissioners to be found" – Wouldn't it be more appropriate to classify the translation counterpart as a personal pronoun „I" (rather than passive)? To be found is a passive infinitive in the syntactic function of postmodification, and thus this example clearly differs from the other examples of „passive" equivalents".
2. Why did you you classify the ex. 37 (*It was assumed that*…) as a counterpart using the passive and not the anticipatory *it*? There seems to be overlap between these two categories.
3. Your analysis revealed a rather low distribution of the translation counterpart *one.* I found this quite surprising, as I had expected *one* to be one of the most frequent equivalents. Why do you think *one* was so rare?

Proposed grade:

☒ excellent   ☐ very good   ☐ good   ☐ fail

Place, date and signature of the reviewer:
Prague, 1 September 2021