Review of MA Diploma Thesis

Department of English and American Studies
Faculty of Arts, Palacký University Olomouc

Author of work: **Bc. Jakub Urban**

Name of work: **Extralinguistic Cultural References and Their Rendering in Czech Dubbing and Subtitles of The Simpsons**

Supervisor: Mgr. Jitka Zehnalová, Dr.

Opponent and author of the review: Mgr. Ondřej Molnár, Ph.D.

Evaluation for each section & proposed classification

excellent	A	acceptable	D
very good	B	weak/sufficient	E
good	C	insufficient	F

Evaluation

1. Originality and new contribution to the field, up-to-date presentation of the problem.

The present diploma thesis, entitled *Extralinguistic Cultural References (ECRs) and Their Rendering in Czech Dubbing and Subtitles of The Simpsons*, deals with audiovisual translation in general and ECRs in particular. The topic is not without any doubt original, ECRs were discussed in several authors (see the thesis for the sources), but Jakub Urban expands the discussion by analysing not only subtitles but also the dubbing, which makes the thesis innovative and interesting, providing the comparison of translation strategies between different sign systems. It is crucial to add that The Simpsons sitcom is worth such a discussion.

$\boxed{A}$

2. Awareness of treatments in the field (literature).

The author has shown awareness of the current literature on the topic under discussion.

$\boxed{A}$

3. Clarity of the topic, research question(s), hypotheses.

The thesis is structured well, offering a comprehensible discussion of ECRs. Research questions are clear. I appreciate all the examples are illustrated in the appendix of the thesis.

A

4. Methodology.

The author adopts J. Pedersen's (2011) taxonomy of methods for rendering extralinguistic cultural references, adapting it slightly to the needs of his analysis and dealing with both the subtitling and dubbing. In addition to that, the author uses both quantitative analysis as well as the qualitative interpretation of the results.

A

5. Argumentation, discussion, interpretation of the results, summary.

The author displays a mature sense of style and ability to maintain an argument, offering tentative interpretations of the results of the analyses.

The work follows a clear structure and is presented in a comprehensive way. The results are summarized in Tables.

I highly appreciate the fact that all examples are presented in the Appendix (often accompanied with necessary cotext. Note the fact thast the Appendix has more than 400 pages.

A

6. Formal aspects of the work: format, graphics, bibliography formatting.

Without any problems. The Chicago Manual Style is respected.

A

7. English (language correctness, style)

The thesis is written in English, aiming at standard academic English. The text is also well-structured at the paragraph level.

A

8. For the supervisor (if not applicable, write "Not applicable").

Not applicable.

Topics/questions for the defence:

1. On p. 23 you discuss the categorisation of ECRs, saying that the categories may overlap. As a result, you decided "to modify the list to better fit [your] case study." In what follows you explain that the main reason for doing that was to limit the scope of the analysis, quoting Katan (2009, 85): "No word is entirely denotative. Hence, even seemingly technical words can have 'cultural baggage' attached to them according to readership." I do not like the fact you state this quote at the end of the subchapter without you commenting on it. Thus, could you explain what you mean here and provide an example for illustration?

2. Discussing the category of Retention (on p. 27), you state that complete retention can be further categorised as Marked or Unmarked (related to subtitles only). Could you provide an example of marked and unmarked retention?

3. Could you illustrate an example of the combination of methods (such as retention + specification + direct translation / retention + specification + omission, etc.)?

<u>Overall evaluation:</u>

I recommend the work for the defence   YES

Proposed classification:[1] $\boxed{A}$

Date: **25 May, 2023**

Signature: **Ondřej Molnár**

Na základě kontroly vysokoškolských kvalifikačních prací systémem Theses.cz ani jiným způsobem nebyla u výše uvedené práce zjištěna taková shoda s jinými pracemi, dokumenty nebo texty, která by zakládala odůvodněné podezření z porušování autorských práv.

---

[1] The itemized number evaluations above do NOT provide automatically the final evaluation - some weaknesses are more crucial than others and some cannot be compensated at all. The proposed classification is therefore independent on these statistics. It is the complex evaluation of the presented written work and it can be still modified during the defence to become the result of the defence.