

# Review of Lucie Černá's dissertation 'Cross-linguistic Participial

## Modification of Nominals'

September 28, 2016

Lucie Taraldsen Medová

[lucie.medova@gmail.com](mailto:lucie.medova@gmail.com)

The dissertation is well written, with impeccable structure and it is overall clear.

In general, I found the style rather descriptive, without much attempts to explain why things should be so – and that's a little disappointing given the potential. I suggest at a few places to elaborate more on the ideas presented there.

Needless to say, I know that the time is limited and I also acknowledge that a dissertation is not the ultimate work in one's life. Not all the issues I raise need to be addressed, of course.

### I. Content related comments

1. p. 37, discussing (179) Czech Adjectival Word Order, regarding the examples of feminine-only postnominal form of an adjective

The examples in (178)-(179) are fine, but the claim is generalized way beyond its scope. Such feminine-form adjectives are used exclusively in NOM – and even more in VOC, but not in indirect cases (or ACC), as far as I know (and as far as Grepl 1995, 491 states).

(i) Mluvili jsme o tý holce ušatý.LOC.F.SG

we talked about this girl big-eared

(ii) Mluvili jsme o tom klukovi \*ušatý.LOC.F.SG / ušatým.LOC.M.SG

So, the non-agreeing F form is available only in NOM and VOC forms – and indeed, in these cases they are used expressively. Notice also that the claim is repeated in fn. 89 on p. 153.

2. section 2.2.3.

It is just plainly stated that the result nominals in Czech have the endings *-(e)ní/-tí* and *-ba*. Again, some references should be helpful.

And: there is a master thesis dedicated to the *-(e)ní/-tí* nominals in Czech, Prochazkova 2006, available here: <http://rci.rutgers.edu/~dvorakov/docs/M.Phil.thesis.pdf>, or a shorter version here: <http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~dvorakov/docs/FDSL6.5-article.pdf>

3. p. 78-79 (This is perhaps the most substantial comment I have; as you will see, it kind of unveiled with time and progress through the dissertation. So I leave it as I kept writing the notes hoping that it might be useful for the organization of the discussion.)

a. The post-nominal position of the verb-derived adjective is discussed.

'In Czech it is possible to use the adjective derived from the verb post-nominally only if it is further complemented by a PP (349). This condition of Czech Complex Adjective Modification (196) was already formulated when we discussed the placement of complex adjectives in section 1.5.3.'

This is true, but as far as I recall, there is nothing in (196) that makes the further modification of the derived adjective necessary. It seems to me to be a rather bizarre state of affairs and I wonder whether you have any thoughts on why should that be so. Might it be connected to a valence requirement of the original verb? Perhaps, as with unergative verbs it seems better even without further complementation (iii), while originally transitive verbs require further modification (iv).

(iii) Učitel přistihl studenta dupajícího / spícího

teacher caught student stamping / sleeping

(iv) Učitel přistihl studenta chytajícího \*(pokémony)

teacher caught student catching Pokemons

Your example with *podvádět* 'cheat' is then mysterious: it is a secondary imperfective, so one would really expect it to be ok without any further modification, but the '*při písemné zkoušce*' in (349) makes it better. Notice, however, that the same PP is absolutely redundant in the full sentence in (351). Mystery.

It reminds me of the requirement of benefactive DATs in Czech with unergative verbs: (v) is ungrammatical (unless *Karel* is my baby), but adding a kind of PP modification (not valence-required, since we deal with unergatives) makes the sentence perfect. These facts have been discussed, I have a weak recollection that it might have been mentioned in Richardson, Kylie (2007): Case and Aspect in Slavic, OUP. And perhaps elsewhere.

(v) \*Karel mi spí.

Karel on-me sleeps

(vi) Karel mi spí na zahradě.

Karel sleeps on me in (my) garden

b. Re examples (419)-(420).

At least to me, when the adjective is further modified, the sentences are perfect. This brings us back to the point a. above. Yet another instance, yet another time: why?

Moreover, a similar constraint is presented for English at p. 143:

'The post-nominal use of an unaccusative past participle is possible only if the participle has a complement (632).

(632) *The train arrived from Berlin was quickly moved to the railway yard.*

Hence, the precedence is here and some discussion on the Czech data is required

And now I see that the idea is presented in section 5.2, but at least a reference to it should appear already here. And in any event, I still wonder about the (hypothesis about the) reason for such a state of affairs.

419' Učitelé stěžující si na studenty nejsou vítáni.

teachers complaining REFL.DAT about students are not welcome

420' Studenty bavící se o Pokémonech poslal učitel za dveře.

students talking REFL.ACC about Pokemons sent teacher behind door

c. p. 98-100: The generalization for Adj derived by *-cí*.

The claims go for transitives, but I think it works for intransitives as well: so long as they are modified:

421' Ten týpek váhající úplně se vším je můj bratr

this dude hesitating absolutely with everything is my brother



421" Úplně se vším váhajcí týpek – to je můj bratr.

(Notice that I had to play with the rest of the sentence a little, to make it sound ok.)

421'" \*[Váhajcí úplně se vším] týpek je můj bratr

421'''' Ten týpek úplně se vším váhajcí je můj bratr.

Schematically, the following picture emerges:

postnominally:                      prenominally:

N [Adj mod] '                      \*[Adj mod] N ''

N [mod Adj] ''''                      [mod Adj] N ''

All in all (cf. the formulation on the Czech Adjectival modification in (436), and its extended version here), it recalls Biberauer, Theresa, Anders Holmberg, and Ian Roberts. "A syntactic universal and its consequences." *Linguistic Inquiry* 45.2 (2014): 169-225.

This is not in the list of references, but I suggest that some link to this paper is made. Of course: BHR are concerned with a general constraint, but here, Lucie Černá seems to come with a similar picture, when she looks at the modification of an Adjective that then modifies a Noun.

d. The postnominal position of deverbal adjectives in Czech is – again – perfect when the adjective is modified; this is true also for -*n/-t* based adjectives shown in (661)-(664), cf.

(vii) Hrad zbořený za husitských válek stál na kopci.

castle destroyed during Husite wars stood on hill

(viii) Jana rychle utřela mlíko rozlité po celém stole.

Jana quickly swept milk spilt over whole table

#### 4. Re examples (407)-(411) & (419)-(420):

a. The position of the reflexive clitic – does it follow the expected rules for the clitic placement in a sentence? And if it doesn't, doesn't that fact constitute another argument for your claim that we deal with an adjective derived from a verb, and the clitic is inside an NP?

b. There are indications that the nature of the verb from which the adjective is derived is crucial – unacc vs. unerg. It is generally assumed that the -*l*-based adjectives are derived from unaccusative verbs only. I wish there was a good paper on this, but as far as I know, for Czech there is only Kosta & Frasek 2008?. But in this connection, some work of Petr Biskup might be useful, perhaps this:

<https://digilib.phil.muni.cz/handle/11222.digilib/135447>

I would love to see an elaboration on these hunches.

#### 5. section 3.3., especially the *participial verb phrases*:

The French allows only a finite relative clause – and not an adjectivized active participle (for example (462)-(463)). English and Czech, on the other hand, do have adjectives based on the active participles. For such cases, a reduced relative clause analysis of such adjectives is proposed by Kayne and others. I would appreciate a more generous discussion of the disadvantages of reduced relative analysis and the advantages of the late insertion of -*ing* analysis.

6. p. 144, fn. 80: 'This kind of passive [= reflexive passive, LTM] will not be discussed here, because unlike the '-*n/-t* participles', it does not give rise to an attributive verbal adjective.'

I forgot whether it was mentioned or not at the relevant place: in principle (and also according to Dokulil 1986, p.324 (=AMČ1), there are cases where a reflexive form (hard to say whether a reflexive PASSIVE) might give rise to a *l*-based participle (which then might be used attributively), such as *smáčekklý* 'smashed, crashed' is derived either from an active form (*někdo to smáčeknul* – or rather *zmáčeknul*) or from a reflexive form (*ono se to smáčeklo / zmáčeklo*).

Though what seems to be important in this context: even if the form is derived from a SE form, this SE can never be retained in the attributively-used adjective – as strongly opposed to adjectives derived from the transgressive-forms by *-(v)š-* or *-cí* suffix, cf. ok *utopivší se soused / bavící se studenti* vs. *speklé (\*se) rohlíky* (cf. *rohlíky se spekly* 'the rolls melted into a mess while baking'). What is the status of such adjectival modification, do the native speakers accept/produce phrases such as (ix)? It doesn't sound all that bad to me.

(ix) *speklé se rohlíky*

Why is SE impossible with *l*- or *-n/-t*-based adjectives – and ok with the transgressive-based ones? This is just something to think about.

7. p. 167, table 10: I am puzzled by the lack of agreement in Czech post-position: I am very positive that there is agreement in the Czech post-position, as shown in (x).

(x) *Rybáři našli Karla.ACC.M.SG už utopeného.ACC.M.SG / volajícího.ACC.M.SG o pomoc / zoufalého.ACC.M.SG*

What do I miss?

## II. Summary


Based on my careful reading of this dissertation, I confidently recommend that this dissertation successfully passes, and be defended.

## III. Questions for the defense

1. Are there passive adjectives that are ambiguous between being lexical and syntactic? And if so, how does that fit into the proposed analysis? (I suppose it fits well, given the proposed different levels of insertion of the passive-like morpheme, but I just want to make sure.)

Is there a way to predict which passive adjectives will become lexical? (Since that's the way things proceed, right? From being syntactic to being lexical. Or is something else involved?)

2. If you were to propose – given the knowledge you have now, after having completed this great work – a direction for further research that your dissertation has opened up, which direction would it be? What is the natural / exciting / intriguing extension of your work? What's next?

  
Mgr. Lucie Taraldsen Medová, MPhil., PhD.

In Tromsø, September 28, 2016