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1. **Evaluation of central idea, thesis, focus and purpose:** D  
2. **Evaluation of organization, logic and arrangement:** C  
3. **Evaluation of topic development, support and evidence:** D  
4. **Evaluation of language, style, standard usage, citation and bibliographic standards:** B

**Comments and/or topics and questions for the thesis defence:**

The thesis takes up as its goal a corpus comparison of English and Italian metaphorical expressions containing images of food. Although this is a relevant goal and it is to be appreciated that the candidate sought to apply her knowledge of both languages and insights gained from cognitive linguistics, the rendering in the thesis is unfortunately at a Bachelor’s rather than Master’s level.

The theoretical chapters are with surface rather than in-depth coherence. Occasionally, the text reveals that the author does not sufficiently distinguish between content-level (non-figurative) references and figurative expressions containing food expressions, e.g. “The use of vocabulary can reveal something about the eating and drinking habits of people from different cultural environments” (p. 12). Sometimes, the author is jumping at conclusions prematurely erroneously “An obvious example of this theory can be food” (p. 14); this is by no means obvious. It is also unclear whether the cultural differences in food-based metaphors are an assumption the thesis is based on, or a conclusion it arrives at.

As far as the material is concerned, basic information of the corpora used is missing. The missing is perhaps forgivable in the case of BNC, on which information can be easily found but the Italian corpus is not a standard publically available one. The structure of the corpora was bound to influence the results, therefore lack of a discussion of the results in the light of this possible influence is a shortcoming of the thesis as well. The author’s limited experience with how corpus research is conducted is also evident from the fact that rather than frequencies per million words she gives absolute numbers of occurrences, remarking on the differing sizes of the two corpora, leaving it up to the reader to figure out how significant the differences are. Also material-wise, it is a pity that no CD with relevant corpus extracts is attached to make the data analysed more accessible for the readers, as is relatively common in similar works.

The methodology of the study detailed in Chapters 3 and 4, described partly on a few lines on p. 16-17 and then in hinted at in the lines introducing Chapters 3 and 4 is very sketchy – hardly existent in fact. Based on what criteria was the selection of metaphorical phrases made? What problems had to be dealt with in the process? Are the references in the phrase *in a nutshell* or *a hard nut to crack* really to food? Is a *couch potato* really a reference to food at the literal level, or something else? Can a firm line between food expressions and other (related) expressions be drawn at all? I would welcome the candidate addressing these issues as a part of her defense.

Chapters 3 and 4 (the analyses) are poorly introduced (no research questions have been asked here or in the preceding chapters) and contain no conclusions either. This is not remedied in the fifth, summary chapter. The information conveyed through the graphs is hard to assess, given that the proportions of the individual text pools (fiction, newspapers, magazines etc.) have not been discussed. On some occasions, such as in the last paragraph on p. 68, register has not and should have been considered.
“Bordieu” is quoted on p. 12 instead of Bourdieu and the item is missing from the bibliography. The mention of Pinker on p. 21 is rather incongruous and the reference to Aslan (2016) on the same page is so incomplete that it is not clear what purpose it serves.

Language-wise, although lexically the language is at a good level, many definite articles are missing throughout the thesis; punctuation is often deficient and some parts of the text show features of Czenglish (e.g. “Italians have smoke connected with fire”, p. 61).

Another suggestion for the defence apart from the hint above: Could the candidate summarize what she believes is the most valuable outcome of her thesis (in two or three sentences)?
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