



**Department of English and American Studies  
Faculty of Arts, Palacký University**

Křížkovského 10, 771 80 Olomouc, Czech Republic  
telephone: +420 68-5633103, fax: +420 68-5633101,  
<http://www.upol.cz/resources/English>

## **REVIEW of MA diploma thesis**

Author of the work: **Otto Kurtiš**  
Name of the work: **Distribution of bare infinitives in English**  
Supervisor: **doc. Ludmila Veselovská**  
Opponent: **prof. Joseph Emonds**  
Author of this review: **doc. Ludmila Veselovská**

<b>Points</b>		<b>Final evaluation</b>	
excellent	5	35-30	A
very good	4	29-25	B
good	3	24-20	C
acceptable	2	19-16	D
weak/sufficient	1	15-10	E
insufficient	0	< 10	F

	<b>Points</b>
1. Originality and new contribution to the field, up-to-date presentation of the problem:	4
2. Awareness of treatments in the field (literature):	3
3. Clarity of the topic, research question(s), hypotheses:	4
4. Methodology:	4
5. Argumentation, discussion, interpretation of the results, summary:	4
6. Formal aspects of the work: format, graphics, bibliography formatting:	1
<i>Bibliography !!!</i>	
7. English (language correctness, style):	5

**Summary: Overall evaluation, other comments:**

*(5-15 lines for BA, 10-30 lines for MA thesis)*

*The author undertakes to describe and comment on the distribution of bare infinitives in English. He lists all the contexts found in the normative literature, paying special attention to the structures when both bare and to-infinitives are used.*

*He uses descriptive grammar manuals and his own corpora research to explicitly state the proportion of specific infinitival forms with all the structures allowing a variation - this part of his study is especially valuable because it provides statistics and observations which are a necessary starting point of any more theoretical analysis. In some parts the work is unnecessarily long, e.g. when arguing for (non-)lexical characteristics of the verbs, the candidate uses NICE criteria plus some others and repeats all the patterns in detail - some shortened version would be enough, e.g. on tag questions, instead of the repetition.*

*As for the theoretical part of his study, citing relevant literature and his own data, the candidate demonstrates and explicitly formulates several generalisations:*

- the distribution of bare infinitives in English is not restricted to only non-lexical verbs,*
- the positions of bare infinitives in the clausal structure, i.e. not in NP positions, is plausibly comparable with the position of the to-infinitives*
- the complementarity of bare and to-infinitives cannot be predicted by semantic distinctions and all formal criteria seem to fail as well. The conclusion could be more structured; the final table is not organized so that the significant results are salient and transparent.*

*The candidate shows the ability to consult and fruitfully use linguistic literature. He can search for relevant corpus data and work with the statistics. He does not, however, get far beyond a descriptive level of treating the phenomena, does not provide any theoretical explanation to his observations, and does not frame his data within a specific theoretical framework.*

**Topics / Questions for the defence:**

*(2-4 specific questions which should be answered at the defence)*

- During your presentation explain the final table - perhaps improved - and situate the most important data, mentioning the relevance of each of the facts with respect to the aim of the thesis.*
- In your work you show the (non-)validity of several generalisations which have been used to explain the bare infinitive distribution. Can you rate them with respect to their reliability? Are there some which are more reliable than others?*

---

<b>Final evaluation in points (see above) :</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>I recommend the work for the defence</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Proposed classification (see above):</b>	<b>B-C</b>

Date: 25. 5. 2015

Name (and signature):