I believe I am not the last one to have read this book. Undoubtedly, quite a few colleagues and students must have already enjoyed J. Tárnyiková’s witty comments, and yet more of them, I am quite certain, will study the book in near future. I feel honoured that it is my privilege to be invited to write about the book’s merits, on behalf of all those who, likewise myself, would not hesitate to say, in a fairly typical English way, “It is not bad, really!”. The following remarks of mine are meant to briefly outline the contents of the book and so attract the attention of further potential readers, mainly (not only!) those concerned with issues of syntax and text linguistics in general.

There are three chapters into which the book is divided. Trained linguists will understand what the respective titles offer, novices will certainly look forward to: (1) Mapping the field; (2) Global structures of meaning and global structures of form; (3) Sentence complexes in the making. Let me only add that Chapter Three has two parts: Part One deals with selected aspects of sentence complexing in English, and Part Two provides us with a comparison of certain issues in English and Czech – May I paraphrase the author’s own words, the book wants to be functional and systemic, dynamic, text sensitive, and pragmatically rooted. I must say that it indeed has all these characteristics, which will be appreciated not only by those who are advocates of the Prague School.

What is the goal of the book? In my opinion, the author follows two aims in fact, or better, her aim is twofold: having a general reading public in mind, she presents a description of the current state of theoretical knowledge on what she calls ‘sentence complexing’; then she applies herself to an explanation of certain less predictable processes and their results as these occur in authentic language data. I find this viewpoint of hers very important, and novel, too; namely, she is well aware of the fact that the truly complex view on any language phenomenon requires considering also various structural irregularities, which usually go beyond the scope of ideal prototypes as discussed in pedagogical grammars. Last but not least, the author offers a cross-language study on sentence complexing: English data based upon written and published text samples are paralleled with their Czech translations. Although some may think that this is
a partial, perhaps supportive goal, mine is the conviction on its originality and significance. Here, on the one hand, the author pays attention to typological differences between the two languages; and on the other hand, she examines the functional hierarchies of the phenomena compared within either language system proper. Needless to say that the illustrative excerpts, quite a few as they are, come from the author’s own files, compiled during long years of her passion for the issues of text linguistics.

I must note, too, that the book offers more than one way of its being consulted. In no case is it a bedside reading! It is a genuine monograph; yet certainly readable, accessible to anybody interested, be it undergraduates, PhD candidates, translators or researchers. I myself appreciate its elaborate, well-thought-out composition which makes it possible to read each of the three chapters as separate units, or, if you wish, as a coherent text developing the ideas proposed earlier and adding more, together with thoroughly analysed illustrative records. Here are two examples, randomly chosen, to demonstrate the author’s working with respective topics. (1) One of the myths handed down for generations, says the author in Chapter One, is the belief in the usefulness of dichotomies and binary sets when classifying linguistic processes and their structures. She goes on proposing that for some data far more relevant results can be obtained if gradients, i.e. clines or scales are taken into account. This idea is then developed, expanded, discussed, analysed, and documented in Chapter Two. (2) In one of the paragraphs of Chapter One entitled ‘Cross-language perspective’ the author introduces the problem how languages tackle the realities of the external world. The discussion is comprehensive enough, to my best knowledge, and yet more information and illustration (based on English and Czech samples) is provided in Chapter Three.

I dared to mention above that the book was hardly anything like bedside reading. Many true beginners in linguistics would very likely run into difficulties when looking for their way through cross-references, or when trying to understand, at first reading, the full paragraphs sometimes composed almost entirely out of citations. Undoubtedly, a certain level of knowledge acquired during undergraduate courses is expected. Only with such minimal pieces of information will the reader relish the niceties of the author’s way of expressing, as in the Preface where she plays with the words architecture / architexture, considering their appropriateness for the title of the book; only with some feeling for linguistic precision will the reader appreciate the author’s rendering the terms clause combining and clause complexing, as well as many others, which have so far been in general use and yet implied different things to different linguists. We must admire the rigorous accuracy that the author observes in treating the issues which we very probably take for granted or too delicate to be worthy of discussion: for instance, which of us, readers, would ever doubt the synonymy of the terms main clause and independent clause, or ascribe unambiguous meanings to the fixed expressions sentence complex and complex sentence?
For reasons of space I cannot comment upon each and every topic that the author deals with. Nevertheless, I deem it necessary to expand on one or two, simply in order to show those gripping facets that the book offers.

When I was a student, I remember I found it rather difficult to read Ivan Poldauf's sophisticated thoughts on what he called 'medio-passives'. I wish Jarmila Tárnýiková had already had her own comments published then. It took me time and trouble to come to the very similar ideas and conclusions as she sets presently before the lucky current readers. Indeed, so-called medio-passive, as e.g., *The book sells well*, is a sort of intermediate member within the gradient (scale, cline) ranging from 'active' to 'passive'. Indeed, my conviction, too, is that there are at least two good reasons the author mentions to question the usefulness of dichotomies (and not only in this case, of course!). And yet, my practical question reads: If it is idiomatic to say *The dinner is cooking*, why not *The house is building*?

My problem, as a teacher, is to take a clear stand and provide inquisitive students with a satisfying answer. Having studied the pages of the book which bear on the issue, I feel happy I did get the answer. Of course, my duty, as a linguistically trained teacher, is to modify the explanation in a more comprehensible way. This will not be difficult, once I am able to understand the semantics of what the author writes down explicitly (p. 51), after a fairly long preceding discussion:

"The three groups of constructions include

1. The resistance type, e.g. *Gold does not corrode. The clothes don't wash.*

2. The easiness type (evaluative predications), e.g. *The clothes wash easily*, and

3. The becoming type (predication of becoming/result), e.g. *The shirts wash clean."

The accompanying citations and the following "An overview" (pp. 52–53) will satisfy the readers who are more deeply interested in this issue.

Another topic I chose at random to mention as an example in my modest review is 'the role of context'. Context is the term shared by many disciplines, and hence it is no wonder we meet a variety of definitions of the concept. Although laymen have used the word 'context' without any further specification, it is no single homogeneous concept. The author comments briefly on contextual types mentioning the different labels used, and she zeroes in, quite expectedly, on context as this is employed in linguistics. Ignoring extremes points (a "proper" meaning is inherent in each and every word <> the word exists only through the context and is nothing in itself), it was modern semanticists who spoke of *verbal*, or *linguistic context* (in fact, pioneers of a new trend, since there were others who still insist on semantics with exclusion of context). Nevertheless, this so-called 'verbal context', or rather 'co-text', has been understood as something that helps define the expression's meaning and function, making the text cohesive. It may be worth noting that this does not occur typically within the same utterance only, but also in surrounding ones, preceding and following. This conceptual extension leads to the other aspect of context-concept, which was called *context of situation*, or 'co-situation'. For some time the exis-
tence of co-situation was neglected because linguists did not fully accept the idea that language behaviour was an activity dependent on culture. However, it was soon recognised that also relevant features of the actual situation in which an utterance was pronounced contributed greatly to the meaning. These were held as specific participants and settings of respective discourses, and the spoken or written modes; namely, the features that we take into account when dealing with functional styles and which bear upon the question of text-coherence. The conviction that meaning is actually an observable context (or can be ultimately reduced to an observable context), as initiated and elaborated by anthropologists, philosophers, psychologists, and also linguists, must result logically in taking co-situation as the entire cultural background.

So much for the general information on context. The author, however, goes further in her comments, also adding her own, original thoughts. Readers of her present book will certainly appreciate the paragraphs dealing, besides others, with the role of context as hierarchically the highest factor in the functional sentence perspective, or the importance of so-called pragmatic context (and its dynamic character) and other correlates (rather than types) of context, such as social context and cognitive context.

As I have mentioned, it is hardly possible for me to squeeze into this brief review everything that the book offers to the potentially vast scope of readers. Let me only add one more remark. The author did not fail to present a truly vivid picture of the topic, one that elucidates issues of macro-structures; she managed to collect opinions of both older and contemporary linguists who have had a say in those issues, mainly from the functional point of view. Needless to say that the names of Czech scholars are introduced too, fairly often and with due deference. It seems to me that she was too modest to cite herself more extensively in the text; yet readers will understand well that the book could not have come into existence without the author’s patient incessant labour when for decades of her research and pedagogical work she was probing into deep structures of the text.

Originally I wished to begin this review by sharing my impression of the photo on the cover. Since I was not certain about its proper content then, I will try now – although I may not be any more certain. The photo, taken by the author herself, shows a bridge across a river. This rather trivial description of mine must contrast with very probably deep, unforgettable experience of the author or her affection for the place. However, she may have chosen the scene to be printed in her book for the same reasons as I understand them, and as readers will perhaps accept too. I understand that the bridge represents a simple metaphor, namely, it spans two "banks". The images that appear before my eyes are two: Firstly, the author’s intention was to submit a comparative study, namely, to show parallels and differences in macro-structures between English and Czech, and to explain the ways through which these are bridged. I am convinced that this goal was attained, to the satisfaction of every-
one who had read the book and consulted authentic samples recorded mainly in Chapter Three. Secondly, the bridge is hoped to span all the theories that have been uttered on the present topic; to be the spot for finding 'points of intersection' of various opinions, namely, the thoughts shared by older and modern, i.e. contemporary thinkers, specialists in respective linguistic disciplines; to let also others cross one so as to dwell on the opposite bank and prepare new and more efficient incentives. May I say that Jarmila Tárnyiková has crossed the bridge with success and is waiting on the other bank already, carrying a full bag of novel conceptions and new ideas which she is willing to share with her disciples.

Stanislav J. Kavka

CAMPBELL, LYLE – MIXCO, MAURICIO J.
A GLOSSARY OF HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS.

Lyle Campbell [abreviado LC] se ha convertido por méritos propios en uno de los especialistas más renombrados en el ámbito de la lingüística histórica y comparativa, no sólo por sus contribuciones en los campos de la filología maya, utoazteca o finougría, sino porque además sus observaciones, comentarios y valoraciones acerca de los numerosos y complejos aspectos teóricos del método comparativo, la principal herramienta de la que dispone el historiador de la lengua, han sido hasta la fecha precisos, acertados y sobre todo oportunos. Y es que LC ha sido para muchos el estandarte de la disciplina bien practicada, por cuanto sus trabajos etiológicos sobre metodología aparecieron como respuesta natural al alubión de los estudios enmarcados en la corriente de la comparación a larga distancia (traducción forzada y poco idiomática del inglés "long-range comparison", véase lemma distant genetic relationship, p. 48), cuyos simpatizantes defienden la integridad de hipótesis tan polémicas como la nostrática, por poner un ejemplo de celebridad reconocida. En sendos artículos revisionistas, LC atrajo la atención quizás un tanto relajada de la comunidad académica y redefinió muchos conceptos de la lingüística histórica y comparativa que en las últimas décadas venían tratándose por algunos de una forma superficial. De igual modo, LC ha revisado teorías/hipótesis, que sin pertenecer a aquel ámbito (maldito) de la larga distancia, parece que habían sido semiaceptadas sin mucho ánimo de discusión, véase por ejemplo las propuestas de Johanna Nichols en su famoso libro Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time (Chicago, 1992). Por tanto, sería muy difícil que alguien compusiera una lista con personas más capacitadas que LC para escribir un libro como el aquí reseñado.

De hecho, esa lista seguramente estaría encabezada por otro especialista no menos renombrado: Robert L. Trask (1944–2004), que ya contribuyó en su momento con una obra de idénticas características (Trask 2000) cuya recepción fue magnífica. Sin