

**Review report for a Ph.D. thesis submitted for Ph.D. defence at Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics**

**Title: Lexicographic Treatment of the Valency Aspects of Verbal Diatheses**

**Author: Anna Vernerová**

### **I. General Comments**

The thesis is an important contribution to the widely discussed issue – differentiation of various types of verbal diatheses and their lexicographic treatment in the valency dictionary. It introduces theoretical and methodological basis for the specification of rules by means of which different types of verbal diatheses (especially those with the passive participle) are formed. Methodologically, the thesis is rooted in the valency theory of the Functional Generative Description.

The thesis, which runs to 275 pages (including some pages of extra information and explanation schemas in appendices), is very clearly structured. It comprises eight chapters, the first three of which introduce theoretical issues related to the central topic including the descent of the valency theory in the work by Aristoteles, Jan Blahoslav, the development of syntactic tree method in the work by Šmilauer and Tesnière and detailed explanation of various aspects of Functional Generative Description theory (detailed information together with Vallex statistics is also provided in the appendices).

The work shows that the authoress is familiar with a large amount of literature in the field of the valency theory and morphology of genus verbi. It also attests the high level of authoress's capability to provide empirical analysis, describe and categorize rich language material and generalize the findings into complex theoretical model of verbal diathesis. The novelty of the practical analysis lies in the fact that it introduces the rules for formation of verbal adjectives from the verbal participles. Apart from this, many other interesting findings are presented in the theses (e.g. the different behaviour of genitive complements in passivization, fluctuation between two types of behaviour in reflexive verbs forming passive/resultative diathesis with respect to the removing of component *se, si*, etc.).

### **II. Specific Comments and Questions**

The thesis bears the title *Lexicographic Treatment of the Valency Aspects of Verbal Diatheses*, however, deagentive diathesis is not analysed in it, that's why it would be appropriate to specify the title of the thesis by suitable subtitle.

The introductory part of the third chapter brings the differentiation among passive diathesis, resultative diathesis and verbonominal construction. It is mentioned that the differences existing between those types of constructions are often blurry, however, no specific criteria how to differentiate them are given (apart from basic semantic description which is sketched briefly, reference to the possibility of Actor expression and description of annotation in PDT). Concerning this issue, the inspiration could be found in the work by Sokolová (1993), Sokolová & Žigo (2014), Čaha (2017), etc.

The thesis states that verbs with the accusative and genitive as alternative morphemic forms of the same complementation form the passive and resultative diathesis in such way that the accusative changes to nominative and the other forms (including the genitive) stay unchanged in the frame, e.g. *Právě použitím částečného sypání karamelového a pšeničného sladu bylo docíleno úplně nové chuťové varianty*.X.gen. At the same time, it is shown that verbs with genitive complementation ((behaving similarly to verbs with an accusative complementation) behave in such a way that the genitive changes into nominative when filling the subject position, e.g. *Je v ní dotčen problém*.X.nom, *nakolik je člověk tvůrcem svých vlastních osudů*... How

would you explain the fact that the complementation with the same morphemic form (genitive) behaves differently within the different structures in the process of passivization?

The sentence *povinnost vrátit uhrazenou částku nebo její část v případě, že studia.Y.gen bude zanecháno* is interpreted as the case of intransitive verbs which do not allow the change of the genitive complementation into a nominative one: the forms of the complements, except for Actor, are therefore the same as in the unmarked member of the diathesis. How would you explain the existence of the structures like *Studium bylo zanecháno písemným oznámením., Pokud není v oznámení uvedeno datum, ke kterému k zanechání studia dochází, bude studium zanecháno k datu doručení tohoto oznámení.* in this context (they can be easily found on the Internet)?

Certain statements and explanations are not always clear. For example, it is said that when speakers want to avoid mentioning the Actor of objectless verbs, they normally use the deagentive diathesis and that the material related to passive-forming intransitive verbs confirms this hypothesis (besides, the authoress elaborates it also for verbs with an object in the form of a prepositional group, as well as those with a dative object, with a complementation of Direction or Manner, verbs with a complementation expressed by the instrumental case, and even a verb with a complementation expressed by a content clause). However, the examples used for this statement do not illustrate the usage of deagentive diathesis, but the usage of passive or resultative diathesis. Are those examples common in Czech or it is the deagentive diathesis that is preferred in these cases?

It is also stated that in the case of reflexive verbs, the examples suggest that while the reflexive *se* is removed from the marked constructions, the reflexive *si* is maintained. However, example provided for this statement shows the presence of the component *se*: *Ten jim však odpověděl (rescripsit), že o ius respondendi se podle zvyklostí nelze ucházet, ale musí se o něj být zaslouženo, a že tehdy beneficium beze všeho udělí.*

When analysing subjective resultative, the examples derived from reflexive verbs are given. However, not all examples are unambiguous. For example, the sentence *Pár.ACT.nom základních obchůdků, jako je lékárna, tabák či malé elektro, bývá nalepeno i na Kaufland.* is interpreted as being derived from reflexive verb, *nalepit se pf* 'to stick/cling (to sth)'. However, in Vallex, the given lexical unit is illustrated typically with human subject, e.g. *Jak jsem vyšel z baru, hned se na mě nalepili.*, which presuppose volitional interpretation. Is it possible to form the active sentence like *Pár obchůdků, jako je lékárna, tabák či malé elektro, se nalepilo i na Kaufland.* in Czech (bearing in mind that the nature of the participant doesn't allow the volitional interpretation)? Isn't it possible to interpret it as being derived from non-reflexive verb *Pár obchůdků, jako je lékárna, tabák či malé elektro, někdo nalepil/nalepili i na Kaufland.*?

It is also mentioned that when the reflexive verb is a decausative, there may be ambiguity between the subjective resultative derived from the decausative (reflexive) verb and the resultative diathesis of the corresponding non-reflexive verb and that the deciding role is played by context. On the basis of the provided example, it seems that it is also the semantics of participants that is important. If the subject complementation is expressed by participant representing the natural element, the derivation from reflexive verb is more natural (no causer logically exists), e.g. *V okamžiku maximální fáze [...] bude měsíční disk.ACT.nom do stínu ponořen přibližně z 81 procent.* (there isn't any causer which could make the moon disc immerse), similarly *Díky tomu je severní polokoule.ACT.nom polovinu roku přikloněna ke Slunci.* On the other hand, if the participant is human, the ambiguity remains. In the example *Vešel jsem do ulice, kde bylo shromážděno hodně.ACT.nom lidí a hrála tam nějaká kapela.* the interpretation of the structure as subjective resultative is more natural, however, is the possibility to interpret the structure as resultative diathesis derived from non-reflexive verb, e.g.

*Vešel jsem do ulice, kde někdo shromáždil hodně lidí a hrála tam nějaká kapela.*, excluded? Which factors support the interpretation of the structure as subjective resultative?

Concerning the analysis of the conversive possessive resultative diatheses, several questions can be raised. The structure *Jak dále uvedla, pracovní dobu má každý zaměstnanec.* BEN.nom *přízpůsobenu svému zdravotnímu stavu.* EFF.dat. is analysed as an example of conversive type. Isn't it possible to analyse it as an example of non-conversive type, e.g. *Každý zaměstnanec (si) pracovní dobu přizpůsobil svému zdravotnímu stavu.*? It seems that ambiguity arises when the participants are animate; when the participant is characterised as non-animate, ambiguity is not the question e.g. the structure like *Vnitřní stěny mají proraženy obloukové otvory, které vile dodávají jedinečný ráz.* is always conversive one. The same holds for examples that can be interpreted as an instance of metonymy which enables non-conversive interpretation, e.g. *Kamión měl deklarováno, že převáží kovový šrot. – Kamión (= řidič kamiónu) deklaroval, že převáží kovový šrot.*

Referring to (Načeva-Marvanová, 2010), Panevová and Ševčíková (2011, p. 178) it is claimed that (both types of) the possessive resultative constructions of imperfective verbs are rare. However, in the data provided by the authoress, there are almost 200 lexical units in about 145 lexemes (accounting for about 200 non-iterative lemmas), in which the possessive resultative diathesis is annotated for an imperfective verb. Unfortunately, no examples are given in this chapter (apart from the model example *Území máme chráněno před povodněmi.*). Is it possible to speak about possessive **resultative** (highlighted by M. I.) construction if it is expressed by imperfective verb?

In the chapter analysing recipient passive diathesis it is stated that the recipient diathesis is generally impossible with verbs that have a dative complementation expressing the entity towards which the process is oriented or even someone from whom another entity is taken away. However, the authoress finds the exception to this general rule: it is possible to use the recipient passive diathesis to explicitly contrast two events, one in which the 'recipient' is receiving something and another one in which they have it taken away, e.g. *Autokrošař, který se stane mistrem Evropy, by měl dostat přidáno a ne ubráno.* Nevertheless, all such structures are illustrated by examples with the ellipsis of the verb in the second part of the constructions. Would it be possible to use the verb in such cases, e.g. *Autokrošař, který se stane mistrem Evropy, by měl dostat přidáno a neměl by dostat ubráno.*? Would these structures be grammatical in Czech?

I'm also not quite sure if structures like *V lepších špitálech, pokud tedy nemáte speciální dietu, dostanete vybráno z několika druhů jídel, přičemž jedno z nich je automaticky vegetariánské.* can be described as **derived** (highlighted by M. I.) from sentences with the verb *dát + inf* 'let/give sb inf'. Can they be described as instances of **derivation** (highlighted by M. I.)?

### III. Evaluation

To summarize, the thesis brings sufficient sources to tackle the problems concerning differentiation of various types of verbal diatheses and their lexicographic treatment. In this respect it is an important contribution to current ongoing scholarly debates about the valency issues. The thesis meets all required standards in terms of the nature and quality of work undertaken and can be accepted as the basis for Ph.D. defence. Judging by the Dissertation, the candidate Anna Vernerová merits the Ph.D. Degree.

doc. Mgr. Martina Ivanová, PhD.

Prešov 30. 8. 2019