



## POSUDEK VEDOUcíHO BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

---

Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk a literatura (dvouoborové studium)**

Název práce: **The semantics of the genitive case in English**

Autor/ka práce: **Monika Pieglová**

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Petr Kos, Ph.D.**

Oponent/ka bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Helena Lohrová, Ph.D.**

---

### **Stručná charakteristika práce / Short characteristics of the thesis**

The main aim of the thesis is to analyze the semantic relations between the genitive and head nouns in genitive constructions in English in a language corpus. The variety of such relations is described in grammar books, but we lack the knowledge of the overall frequency of such relations in real-life language. Also, the thesis aimed to check whether the typology of the semantic relations described in grammar books is comprehensive.

### **Celkové zhodnocení / Overall assessment**

The thesis is generally well structured. It starts with the description of the case in general, then focuses on issues connected to the genitive case, leading to the description of the semantic relations as described in grammar books. However, not all the information provided seems to be directly relevant to the main theme of the thesis. Most importantly, the author does not provide justification why she described certain aspects of the genitive case, even though they eventually may prove to be relevant, e.g. the X-bar theory, the phonetic aspect, and the history of the genitive. The purpose of these sub-chapters should thus be better clarified.

The division of the actual analysis into three separate parts proves to be fortunate due to different frequencies of the semantic relations in each group. The resulting data can thus better illustrate the tendencies in language.

In some cases, however, I am not sure about the correctness of the analysis. For example, *mother's response* (p. 38) is analyzed as an instance of the genitive of origin. However, as the head noun is deverbal (*response* ← *respond*), the more correct analysis appears to be "subjective genitive". Nevertheless, such cases are rare and most of the material analyzed seems to be correct.

The chapter on "problematic cases" rather brings a comparison of seemingly analogical cases than actual issues of analysis that would prove to be problematic to the author. The examples provided are not thus "problematic", as differing semantic relations of the same genitive noun can be expected.

Overall, the thesis meets the goals that were set at the beginning. The author has shown good understanding of the issues described and she brings results that may prove to be useful for other students of English morphology. However, in some places the description of the theoretical issues as well as the way the results are provided could be more coherent, which would make the work more comprehensible to the readers.

The thesis is written in good English with occasional mistakes only.



Filozofická  
fakulta  
Faculty  
of Arts

Jihočeská univerzita  
v Českých Budějovicích  
University of South Bohemia  
in České Budějovice

Práci doporučuji k obhajobě.

Navrhovaná klasifikace: velmi dobře

24.8.2020

Datum

Podpis