



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: PhDr. Gabriela Brůhová, Ph.D.

Reviewed as: a supervisor an opponent

Author of the thesis: Bc. Vlastislav Ryšavý

Title of the thesis: Variant alternation of expressing the predicate in dependent imperative clauses: a corpus study

Year of submission:

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



Brief description of the thesis (by the supervisor, ca. 100-200 words):

The thesis explores the alternation of variants used in dependent imperative clauses, namely indicative, subjunctive and putative *should* in legal texts. The first part of the research is concerned with the distribution of the alternative forms in the *that*-clauses following three selected verbs and three selected adjectives. Here the author proved that there is a correlation between the verb in the *that*-clause and the form of the main verb. The results suggest that the speakers tend to use the mandative subjunctive if the verb in the dependent clause is the verb *be*. In the second part of the analysis the author compares similarly sounding constructions in French and English, verifying the hypothesis that subjunctive is preferred over the other variants, when translated into English from French (due to the obligatory use of subjunctive in French). Although this hypothesis was not confirmed, the analysis brought some interesting results.

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

Strong points of the thesis:

- The author proved that he is extremely well oriented in the topic. Not only does he provide quantitative analysis of the three variants, but he also attempts to find correlations between the variant and other factors (such as the verb in the dependent clause, the form of the verb in the main clause) when explaining the use of each variant.
- The methodology is appropriate and the results are informative. I appreciate the author's courage to formulate his own hypothesis (which is connected with his second subject of study) for the second part of the research.

Weak points of the thesis:

- The methodology should be described in more detail (the Material and Method section is one page long). Instead of stating that 240 examples will be analyzed, the could have mentioned that 40 examples of the six selected verbs / constructions were analyzed.
- It would have been more convenient if the examples mentioned in the analytical part would be numbered in the order as the author mentions them (e.g. (1), (2)...). This would have made the reference to the examples easier when discussing the examples.
- When discussing the verb in the dependent clause (chapter 4.2.4) it would be more appropriate if the author specified the functions of the verb *be*.

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

1. On p. 47 it is stated: "We have ultimately decided to treat each of these occurrences individually in accordance with the notion and meaning of each collective noun (a group/unit mentioned in general vs highlighted individuals)." Could you explain why this is relevant in your analysis? Is the distinction a group vs. individuals relevant when assessing whether the verb form is subjunctive or indicative? Collective nouns are mentioned only in the chapter dealing with *insist*. Did you find collective nouns also in the other verbs / adjective constructions that you investigated?
2. Ad distribution of the variants with respect to the form of the verb (chapter 4.2.5): the distinction of the four morphological forms seems irrelevant to me. It would be more relevant to investigate the tense form and temporal reference of the verb in the main clause (present vs past vs future). Could you explain why you paid attention to the four morphological forms?



FACULTY OF ARTS
Charles University

Department of English and ELT Methodology

3. The analysis has shown that the subjunctive tends to be used if the verb in the *that*-clause is the verb *be*. Could you specify the functions of the verb *be*? What other functions – apart from the auxiliary *be* in passive constructions – were there in your sample and how frequent were they?

Other comments:

- *data* – should be used with plural verb: *the data shows* (instead of *show*), *our data were* (instead of *was*)
- p. 61 – the hypothesis should not be in quotation marks

Proposed grade:

excellent very good good fail

Place, date and signature of the reviewer:

Prague, 2 September 2021