



FACULTY OF ARTS
Charles University

Department of English and ELT Methodology

A Review of a Final Thesis

submitted to the Department of English and ELT Methodology,
Faculty of Arts, Charles University

Name and titles of the reviewer: Pavlína Šaldová, PhDr., Ph.D.

Reviewed as: a supervisor an opponent

Author of the thesis: Klára Horáková

Title of the thesis: Semantic roles of English genitive and its Czech translation counterparts / Sémantické role anglického genitivu a jeho české překladové protějšky

Year of submission: 2024

Submitted as: a bachelor's thesis a master's thesis

Level of expertise:

excellent very good average below average inadequate

Factual errors:

almost none appropriate to the scope of the thesis frequent less serious serious

Chosen methodology:

original and appropriate appropriate barely adequate inadequate

Results:

original original and derivative non-trivial compilation cited from sources copied

Scope of the thesis:

too large appropriate to the topic adequate inadequate

Bibliography (number and selection of titles):

above average (scope or rigor) average below average inadequate

Typographical and formal level:

excellent very good average below average inadequate

Language:

excellent very good average below average inadequate

Typos:

almost none appropriate to the scope of the thesis numerous



Review, comments and notes (ca. 100-200 words)

The thesis presents a detailed inventory of translation correspondences of the -'s genitive NPs with an assumption that the semantic relation between the nouns may be reflected in the Czech equivalent. Classifying the English examples purely on the basis of semantic/pragmatic interpretation and disregarding other factors may, however, have hindered the author from interpreting the results at a more general level (5. Conclusion).

Strong points of the thesis:

The introductory theoretical chapter is comprehensive and clearly written. The identification of translation counterparts and their formal aspects is very good and detailed. Observations concerning the difference between the two subsections of the corpus (fiction vs administration) are interesting and relevant.

Weak points of the thesis:

The methodology of handling the translation counterparts:

- not limiting the search to English original texts means the sample does not correspond with the task, as it contains Czech originals, not translations, e.g. Fuks, Pekárková, Balabán, Hrabal, Sedláček, Jirotko, Hůlová, Páral, etc.)
- not distinguishing between congruent/noncongruent/zero counterparts (úplné, částečné, nulové) makes systematization of the correspondences difficult (the results appear fragmented and difficult to summarize)
- structural and other constraints on the potential translation counterparts are not considered (e.g. length of the 's NP).

The wording and presentation of the results:

- not using % (only absolute numbers, except p. 34); not being specific as to proportions (p. 35 "*The overwhelming number ... comes from the Collections*"), which makes the text vague and difficult to follow at times; Table 5 lacks a grand total and %!
- referencing major grammars repeatedly by full title; p. 18-21 references to "Huddleston and Pullum (2002) 16.5.2" - How are the mentions to be found? (the chapter number is missing).

Questions to answer during the Defence and suggested points of discussion:

1. What correlation of the genitive meaning and the way of rendering it in Czech had been anticipated /hypothesized (excepting the distinction between determinative and descriptive uses)? Can your results be explained?
2. Since semantic analysis is inherently difficult (cf. pp. 32-33, or Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 474), can you think of other possibilities in categorizing your English examples?
3. What factors did you identify as correlating with the translation equivalent? Can the complexity of the 's NPs determine possible Czech counterparts (*Miller's dictionary*, *Hitler's hatred* x *Dr. Witherspoon's theory*, *Miss Woodhouse's character*, *a member country's treasury*, *EU's security*)?
4. p. 37 "*The Core sections offers a larger scale of the means of translation than ... the Collections segment.*" Can you explain and specify?
5. How did you classify the Czech equivalents of UN3, UN9, UN10, POS2?
6. Why is UN3 classified as UN? How can the pattern *China's/Sudan's president* be interpreted semantically? Classification of POS24, POS27, POS28, SUB25, DES2, DES13? P. 43 *next week's* with the translation counterpart in the postmodification *příští týden* (DES1)

Proposed grade:

- excellent very good good fail

Place, date and signature of the reviewer: *Prague, 27 August 2024*