Thesis title: A Multi-Parallel-Text Approach to Chinese-Czech Dish Names

Author of thesis: Lucie Habichová

Author of comment: Karolína Krištofová

Abstract

For the aim of the research, I advise, to add the word *meaning* in the sentence of *"find the differences* <u>in meaning</u> between Chinese dish names and their Czech translations". Otherwise, the author's aim of work is clear.

The sentence "The understanding and translation of Chinese dish names is a discipline that requires special attention because their history is long" seems vague. The author should rather mention the complexity and long evolution of Chinese language to prove her point that the discipline requires special attention.

In the sentence "The results of all studies afterward provided data in English or other translations, so this research focuses mainly on the Czech environment" the author should emphasis her aim to focus on Czech environment by changing so to but, and omit the word mainly if the only one researched environment in the work is Czech. The reformulation of the sentence: The results of all studies afterward provided data in English or other translations, but this research focuses mainly on the Czech environment.

In the sentence "The majority of Chinese restaurants in the bigger cities in the Czech Republic have the menu at least in Chinese and Czech, therefore it allows to build a set of parallel texts" the author should mention that in her case, she is actually going to use the menus that have these parallel texts of Chinese and Czech names.

Even though, the multi-parallel-text method is mentioned in the name of the thesis, I would welcome if the whole name of the method was used also in abstract and only later would be abbreviate into MultiParT.

"Even though there already were some attempts in different languages to accurately interpret Chinese dish names, every language is unique and requires a different approach from the researcher." I don't think this sentence is appropriate for an abstract, it does not give us any information about your project.

The term *Czech approach* should be clarified and explained that it's an approach from Czech person/native who speaks Czech language.

For the innovation of the project, I feel like during her research, the author will have to take into account the cultural (and maybe linguistic) background of the evolution of the Chinese names of the dishes, if that's the case, the project also brings a look into forming and evolution of the names of Chinese dishes.

Key words

I advice to use *Chinese dish name* and *Czech dish name* as first key words as it is the main topic of thesis.

Progress beyond the current state of research

The citation in the first sentence should be the name of the author and right behind it the year of the mentioned work cited: Dan Jurafsky (2014). Also, it's not clear if the cited work talks about Chinese dish names or how is it important to the author.

In the presentation, the author mentions that she's going to follow certain works. In her research proposal, she's only giving us the main ideas of the works. As in her presentation, the author should add that she intends to follow the work of mentioned researchers, and how it will be useful for her project.

The author also mentions the translation theory by three different authors. She should clarify if she's going to use certain theory regarding her project. The theory of cognitive linguistic is mention only in the presentation and should be mention also in research proposal.

The author says that "In the Czech Republic, there has not been too much attention directed towards this issue and that is what the thesis will focus on". If she was not able to find any literature regarding this issue in Czech language, I believe, that is because it does not exist. If there is, the author should mention them. Therefore, she should reformulate the sentence: In the Czech Republic, there has not been <u>any</u> attention directed towards this issue and that is what the thesis will focus on.

How the project aims will be achieved

Personally, the main question is not completely clear to me. For what I understood, the author wants to find the meaning differences between Chinese and Czech names of dishes. Therefore, the question could be formulated as: What are the meaning differences between the Czech and Chinese dish names in Chinese restaurants in the Czech Republic?

Other two questions are clear and will help to reach the aims of the project.

In the presentation, the author mentions that she's going to use quantitative research. In her research proposal she does not mention it but should. Nevertheless, she does describes detailly the process and steps of how she's going to proceed in obtaining data.

In the sentence "The choice is sufficient because the occurrence of Chinese restaurants that would offer the Chinese and Czech menu in smaller cities is rather scarce" when proving that the choice is sufficient, the author should say that it's because of abundant occurrence of Chinese restaurants in those two cities rather than saying that other choices are not appropriate. The sentence should be reformulated as: The choice is sufficient because the occurrence of Chinese restaurants that would offer the Chinese and Czech menu in Prague and Brno are abundant and offer great examples.

In author's research proposal, the hypothesis is that "the Czech dish names are literally translated and do not offer any further explanation of the Chinese dish names which could lead to some misunderstandings from the direction of Czech customers." In the presentation, the author's hypothesis about literally translation is the same, but she proposes that the misunerstanding can be detected by Chinese and not Czechs. Here, I would not include the view of Chinese person if the name of the dish would be translated back to Chinese from Czech as the author mention in presentation. This part is confusing and author should decide on specific hypothesis.

Cited literature

The work by Chau is included but not actually cited in the work.