Lucie Chlumská, *Překladová čeština a její charakteristiky*
Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of PhD
at Charles University, Prague

External examiner's report

This dissertation takes as its starting points several hypotheses about the nature of translated language that have been posited by leading scholars in the field. In the literature review, it is shown that a further, fuller investigation based on a specially constructed corpus is needed to arrive at a more definitive view of whether these hypotheses are supported or not. Chlumská then shows how her corpus is constructed and how it and its various subcorpora are interrogated to arrive at a view on these hypotheses.

Chlumská finds that evidence for these universals is present, if not exactly overwhelming and visible to the average reader: differences in genre and text type tend to overshadow the differences between translated and non-translated works. She posits that her comparable corpus, albeit many times larger than those used in the other studies referenced, may not be quite large or diverse enough to rule out genre and text type as confounding factors. Nevertheless, the dissertation represents a significant step forward in the debate over translation universals and constitutes an original contribution to the field.

I read this dissertation with interest. Its strong points are numerous, and are as follows:

- The research questions are "big questions": important, interesting questions for the field, and the way they are formulated and framed gives the reader confidence that Chlumská's contribution will move the field forward.
- The dissertation has been carefully structured; the exposition is logical and shows the thinking behind the evolution of the research questions, the hypotheses and the operationalization of them at each juncture. The reader is never in any doubt as to why the author has taken each step.
- The conclusions drawn at each stage are judicious. Chlumská never overstates her case and considers possible alternative explanations. She is careful not to fall into the trap of equating significance and effect size, and some of the neatest work in this dissertation is done balancing the consideration of significant effects with the measurement of the differences they indicate.
- The mixture of statistical measures used shows a commendable familiarity with common techniques and more innovative ones. The treatment of statistical data and methods is clear and accurate without sacrificing detail.
- The literature review and other relevant parts of the dissertation show a good general knowledge of the field with some admirably deep reading and analysis in a number of particular areas, especially those surrounding the so-called "translation universals" that are being subjected to examination.
- The project has resulted in the creation of a significant resource for the field, the Jerome monolingual corpus of comparable translated and non-translated texts. The work leading to the corpus's creation is a direct result of the background research and framing of the PhD study.

It has far fewer weak points, and I would point to only two of them:

- In places the background reading on the history of translation studies seems to lean somewhat heavily on one textbook (Munday 2008), to the extent that at least one key discussion (of Even-Zohár) seems to come entirely from there with no reference to the original source material.

- As mentioned above, Chlumská is rigorous in considering alternative explanations for significant findings. In the discussion of her findings on simplification, Chlumská presents the possibility that the differences she has found could be the results of the different text subtypes (i.e. specific themes/genres within the general *beletrie/odborná literatura* categories, pp. 110–113). I thought this could have been followed up in a large referential corpus to see whether those text subtypes generally display differences along the relevant axes. If I've understood it correctly, her text types are not identical to those listed for the SYN corpora, so there might not be an exact match, but it would have been worth following up that angle to see whether the principle held.

The dissertation offers numerous interesting lines for questioning at an anticipated defence; I will refrain from outlining those here.

In summary,

1. The work presented reaches the standard of a doctoral dissertation, both in depth of research and maturity of thought.
2. I recommend the dissertation for a public defence.
3. I would propose a grade of "pass", subject to a satisfactory defence.

Sincerely yours,

Neil Bermel
Professor of Russian and Slavonic Studies
School of Languages and Cultures
1 Upper Hanover Street
University of Sheffield
S3 7RA
United Kingdom

10/10/2015