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

Comments and/or topics and questions for the thesis defence: The thesis presents a metaphor analysis of food idioms in English and Italian, which to me was a pleasant read in the examination period. The comparison of food metaphor in the two general corpora is good. That shows which metaphor is more culturally significant in which language, thus allowing us to see the status the food being a cultural keyword and its representativeness in that particular culture. The analysis also shows some constructions belong more to a certain genre than others (e.g. “icing on the cake” to newspaper texts), which is potentially interesting to the study of genre analysis. The use of language and style is satisfactory. However, despite the above merits, I have some comments on the content of the thesis. A methodological issue that I have is the different data composition of the two corpora. The English part is based on the BNC (a balanced corpus) but the Italian part is a web corpus. But if no balanced Italian corpus exists and is free to use, there is probably nothing one could do about that. It seems to me that the author is using L&J’s framework only in a superficial way. In the body of the analysis, no source domain and target domain are clearly listed. Of course I understand that the source domain must be FOOD, but it seems to me that there are various target domains (POLITICS, ECONOMY, EMOTION, etc.) but they are not discussed. When the author discusses the superstitious use of bread and butter (p.38), it would be nice to provide an example. Also, when discussing examples in a language other than English, the usual practice is to put the original language first, followed by the English translation. The following are questions that I wondered whether the author could clarify at the defense. First, the author lumps the findings from both corpora in 5.3. What is the purpose of such doing? Second (a more difficult one), pizza as a signature food of Italy, but its frequency is among the lowest. Could you try to interpret that paradoxical piece of finding?