

La Sapienza

Valutazione esterna tesi di dottorato Studi germanici e slavi 36° ciclo

PORCARO CIRO

Evaluation form for PhD dissertation

Evaluation form

Title of the thesis

Metonymie zwischen Theorie und Empirie: Eine kognitiv-linguistische Untersuchung des deutschen Migrationsdiskurses

Affiliation of the reviewer

Università di Genova

Report

The thesis presented by Mr. **Ciro Porcaro** stands as a compelling scientific work, providing a complete overview about the state of the art of international and germanistic research on metonymy theory. Not content with merely offering a surface-level exploration, it delves into the intricacies of theoretical frameworks surrounding metonymy and metaphor, particularly within the realm of German press language and the contentious topic of immigration. Mr. Porcaro not only provides a comprehensive overview of metonymic categories in German expressions but also furnishes a potent theoretical apparatus for the ensuing corpus analysis. Through a judicious blend of discourse analysis and an examination of metonymic emergence within online press texts from disparate news outlets, Porcaro illuminates the pivotal role of metonymic conceptualization in shaping mental maps, often precipitating discriminatory and xenophobic attitudes. The evaluation of Porcaro's thesis unequivocally affirms its merit, lauding its rigorous theoretical and methodological underpinnings alongside its innovative field analysis, yielding insights of profound relevance.

Confidential report (it will not be shown to the candidate)

Mr. **Ciro Porcaro's** thesis presents an outstanding analysis of general metonymy theory and its application to the German language, elucidating a series of intricacies that distinguish it from considerations regarding the English language. Moreover, Porcaro conducts a meticulous and rigorous corpus analysis, effectively delineating various aspects of metonymic phenomena in press discourses surrounding migration to Germany. Methodologically impeccable and innovative, this thesis yields convincing results while also paving the way for new avenues of research in the field of metonymy. In my estimation, Mr. Porcaro's work merits the highest praise. However, it should be noted

that the thesis contains a certain number of orthographic, morphosyntactic, and typographic errors that warrant thorough revision.

Evaluation file (optional)

Presentation and clarity

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The reviewer should be able to read the text without difficulty. This implies that the dissertation is clear and 'user friendly', without duplications or repetitions.

Integration and coherence

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The manuscript should present logical and rational links between different parts of the thesis.

Introduction to scientific background

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The text should contain a satisfactory introduction to the scientific background which is relevant to the research, preparing the reader to the exposition of the problem.

Review of relevant literature

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The candidate must have a detailed knowledge of original sources, have a thorough knowledge of the field, and understand the main theoretical and methodological issues.

Statement of research problem

None Poor Average Good Excellent

A clear statement of the research problem should be made, together with specific hypotheses, predictions, or questions which the research is designed to address.

Originality

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The research must be the candidate's own work. The degree of independence may vary according to the research topic.

Contribution to knowledge and scientific relevance

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The dissertation should be substantial enough to be able to form the basis of two articles on refereed journal, a book or research monograph.

Mastery of the English language

None Poor Average Good Excellent

The candidate must be proficient in written English and show mastery of appropriate scientific/technical language.

A major goal of the review process is to evaluate if the present version of the thesis is:

- 1) adequate as is
- 2) require minor revision
- 3) require major revision

for admission of the candidate to the defense of the work in front of a national evaluation board.

Accept as is Minor revision Major revision

Date: 3/9/2024

Reviewer: Gerdes Joachim