

ker mittels des Ackerbaus erwirtschaftet hatten, lockte sie an? Indem sie Raub betrieben, handelten sie "ökologisch", d.h. örtliche Ackerbauern wurden nicht umgebracht, sondern unterdrückt bzw. versklavt. Mit den zusammen geraubten Reichtümern lernte man Handel zu treiben und entwickelte sich zu Geschäftsleuten. Der gleiche Prozeß wiederholte sich, als die Europäer in der Neuzeit auf

anderen Kontinenten der Erde Kolonien eroberten.

Ergebnisse der Genetik heranziehend nennt J.-L. Moreau die Möglichkeit, daß mitochondriale DNA oder maternale Linien die alte und bekannte Tradition, überflüssige Kinder, besonders aber Mädchen zu töten, beeinflussen konnte.

L I T E R A T U R

- Heapost, L. 1998, Eestlaste antropoloogias, keelest ja geenidest. — Akadeemia, Tartu, 2147—2165.
- Kallio, P. 1995, Suomen kielen kivikautisista lainoista. — *Vir.*, 380—389.
- Künnap, A. 1998, Breakthrough in Present-Day Uralistics, Tartu.
- Lanng, V. 1997a, On the Roots of Northern Europeans. Some Thoughts from the International Symposium Dedicated to the Ethnogenesis of Northern European Peoples in Turku 29 May to 1 June 1997. — *Western and Eastern Contact Areas of Uralic Languages*, Tartu (FU 21), 72—79.
- 1997b, Põhja-Euroopa rahvaste etnogeneesi rahvusvaheliselt sümposiumilt. — *KK*, 622—627.
- Vilkuna, J. 1996, Siperiasta vai? Uusia tulkintoja suomalaisten alkuperästä. — *Siperiasta siirtoväkeen: murrosaikoja ja käännekohtia Suomen historiassa*, Jyväskylä, 7—30.
- Wiik, K. 1996, Põhja-Euroopa rahvaste ja keelte päritolu küsimusi. — *KK*, 581—589.
- 1997, How Far to the South in Eastern Europe Did the Finno-Ugrians Live? — *Fennoscandia Archaeologica XIV*, Helsinki, 23—30.

AGO KÜNNAP (Tartu)

<https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.1999.2.08>

Ago Künnap, Breakthrough in Present-Day Uralistics, Tartu 1998. 122 p.

The title of the book refers to a number of new ideas concerning both the shape, timing and geographical placing of the Uralic proto-language, which have been proposed in recent years by researchers in the fields of archaeology, linguistics, as well as anthropology and human genetics, and which have led to a lively discussion in a number of professional journals. Among the linguists, the main proponents of the "Uralic Breakthrough" are Kalevi Wiik, János Pusztyai and Ago Künnap himself, whose ideas have been criticized from the "traditionalist" angle by, for example, Johanna Laakso, Esa Itkonen and Petri Kallio.

In the preface, A. Künnap expresses his agreement with J. Pusztyai on the shape of the Uralic proto-language, which is no longer to be seen as a unitary and reconstructable language, but rather as a number of languages, each with its own genetic origin, which at

some point in time converged, having possibly a *lingua franca* between them as an intermediary, and later diverged again. J. Pusztyai has laid the theoretical groundwork for this hypothesis (Pusztyai 1995), which has received a critical review by J. Laakso (1997). Also, a number of essays tackling the problem from the "new" point of view has appeared in "Itämerensuomi — eurooppalainen maa" (1997). Now another book concerning the discussion up until now has appeared, which could have the advantage of having been written by a single author. The book consists of eleven chapters, apart from the introduction. The first seven chapters deal with the background of the current discussion, whereas in chapters eight, nine and ten the question of linguistic evidence for the new hypothesis is being dealt with. The eleventh chapter, at last, contains the author's own conclusions.

First of all, a general remark has to be made about the book. In my opinion, it consists of too many quotes, and too few attempts to put these quotes into a readable and coherent text. For example, chapter 10.1 ("Thoughts About Substratum", pp. 95–103), consists, first, of a N. Strade quote which extends two and a half pages, then the author immediately goes on to quote K. Wiik on a page and a half, after that three maps are quoted from the articles by K. Wiik, then again a page and a half is filled with a K. Wiik quote, then A. Künnap quotes an earlier article by himself on half a page, which is followed by a quote from an article by A.-M. Uesson. Here the paragraph ends and the following chapter of quotes can begin. The book is filled with such examples. Also, sometimes the author seems to quote from earlier articles by himself. For example, the first two paragraphs of chapter 4.2 (pp. 29–30) are the same as the two last paragraphs of Künnap 1995, and the last paragraph on p. 32, as well as the first on p. 33 also occur in Künnap 1995 : 125–126. It sometimes gives the reader an uncomfortable sensation of *déjà-vu*.

Having said that, let us deal with the contents of A. Künnap's book. Chapter two (pp. 11–17) and three (pp. 18–26) deal with the current state of the Uralic languages, their geographical distribution and the rate of decline and ultimately the extinction of some of the smaller Uralic languages, as well as with the traditional views on the proto-Uralic and its break-up into daughter languages. Chapter three also treats some rather untraditional variants of the language tree, the comb model and a model proposed by Rein Taagepera, with roots from different genetic origin and a non-unitary stem, which is commented on approvingly by the author. The fourth chapter deals with new views on the origin of the Uralic languages, divided into chapter 4.1, which deals with the discussion from 1970 to 1994 (pp. 27–29), and 4.2 (pp. 29–39), dealing with the timespan 1995–1998. A. Künnap first approvingly cites from a book by A.-M. Uesson (1970), where the latter proposes a diachronic language diagram in which each of the contemporary languages has multiple roots in a number of different proto-languages. A very similar scheme has been proposed by J. Raukko and J.-O. Östman (1995 : 58). A. Künnap goes

on quoting P. Dolukhanov, who hypothesizes that during the later Paleolithic age, the northern periglacial zone would have been occupied by speakers of proto-Uralic, whereas a more southern mediterranean zone could have been occupied by speakers of a common ancestor of the current Basque and Caucasian languages, and perhaps a number of other ancient non-Indo-European languages. A. Künnap quotes P. Dolukhanov saying that the Basque-Caucasian language affinity cannot be due to migration, so the mediterranean language zone would have to be very large. However, the Basque-Caucasian language affinity is highly controversial, so it would seem premature to base any conclusions on it.

An alternative to the "traditional" language tree model was proposed by J. Raukko and J.-O. Östman (1995), and is quoted, again approvingly, by A. Künnap. However, their model which has been heavily criticized by "traditional" historical linguists (Laakso 1995; Itkonen 1998), and which proposed, like A.-M. Uesson's model, a number of different genetic origins for every contemporary language, does stem from a far wider understanding of the meaning of genetic affiliation, rather than from new insights on the genetic developments of languages. Whereas J. Raukko and J.-O. Östman would reckon also language contact influence from Swedish to Finnish as proof of a genetic affiliation of Swedish and Finnish (1995 : 46–49), there is a very real difference between language c o n t a c t i n f l u e n c e, from the borrowing of a few words to a large-scale influence on grammar and syntax due to substratum influence, and l a n g u a g e t r a n s m i s s i o n, (for example) from one generation to the other. A. Künnap also, further on in the book, asserts that every language is a mixed language (p. 90). However, it should be made more clear if this assertion is to mean that proto-Uralic is a mixed language i n a g e n e t i c s e n s e, for example some kind of creole language, or a "mixed language" in the sense of a language "genetically" consisting of a number of influences from other languages, and the odd genetic ancestor. If the latter is the case, then the conflict is mainly a matter of differing ways of denotation, if the former is the case, quoting upward language trees like the ones proposed by J. Raukko and J.-O. Östman

makes the matter, in my opinion, only more complicated.

In that case, remarks to the extent that "every language is a mixed language" should not be easily passed by. The theoretical framework in which languages of genetic mixed origin (in the traditional meaning of the word *genetic*) are a rule and not an exception still has to be created: although S. G. Thomason and T. Kaufman in their (especially by the "renewers") often-quoted work "Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics" have laid the theoretical groundwork for the existence of mixed languages (or rather languages that have not developed along the usual genetic line of transmission from generation to generation) whose genetic origin cannot be determined, they remain adamant that most languages are not mixed (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 3).

A. Künnap goes on to treat J. Pusztaý's elaborate 1995 treatment of the Uralic proto-language, and K. Wiik's ideas about the linguistic map of Europe some 40 000 years ago. Then he tries to make an argument against the hypothesis of an ancient language home a few millenia ago out of the much older origin of Modern Man, which probably coincided with the origin of language: "But that was 120 000 years ago in Africa — we are concerned with the genesis of Man and the emergence of human language. It is difficult to imagine that the humankind, migrating from Africa and spreading all over the world would later have formed a number of ancient homes and proto-languages, most recently only 4000—8000 years ago" (p. 36). I fail to see his point: few Uralists would deny that there have been many millenia of language history before the proto-Uralic. However, since languages change over time, there will probably be too little remnants of that earlier history in contemporary languages to base any conclusions on. The "most recent" ancient homes and proto-languages certainly occurred later than 4000 years ago, if one abandons the ultimate, earliest, reconstructable proto-language as the "most recent" one.

The kernel of the matter lies in the limits of the methods of reconstruction, nothing else.

The next two chapters deal respectively with the genetic and archaeological background of Uralic peoples (Chapter 5, pp.

40—48), and with a theory of a paleolithic mass migration caused by volcanic activity in the Eifel region (Chapter 6, pp. 49—55). The chapter on human genetics (pp. 40—45) is unfortunately rather unclear. A. Künnap first explains an obsolete, polygenetic theory about the origin of Modern Man, each stemming from different, geographically dispersed groups of *Homo Erectus*, and the modern "Black Eve" theory, and tries, again, to make a connection between the former theory and the traditional view on historical linguistics: "I find it hard to generalize to which extent and how consciously the old theory about the genesis of Modern Man had influenced linguists, however, I don't think it unnecessary to indicate that it reminds one of the theory of ancient homes of peoples, of a proto-language spoken at each ancient home and of the following dispersal from ancient homes which brought about the development of daughter languages" (p. 40). As indicated above, I think A. Künnap is fighting a straw man here.

The purpose of the following three-and-a-half pages of quotes, which indicate respectively that genetic research on European populations would point more to a spread of agriculture by cultural diffusion than by demic diffusion, that there are still some genetic peculiarities among northern Finno-Ugric peoples, that there might have been a population expansion from the north of the Iberian peninsula during the paleolithic and that the light skin of the current Estonian population may be due to a process of natural selection following a livelihood shift and a radical change in nutrition habits, remain opaque, not in the least due to lack of comment from the author. The following chapter on archaeology suffers from the same ailment.

The relevance of the results of genetic research has been strongly doubted. In a reply to an earlier article by A. Künnap, C. Hasselblatt argues that in the case of German-speaking descendants of Turkish immigrants, or Belgians, who speak three different languages, there is hardly a connection between one's genes and one's language (Hasselblatt 1998 : 237—238). Also, P. Sammallahhti has indicated that the genetic distance between Lapps and Finns, and the genetic closeness of the latter to Germanic-speaking peoples might be due to exogamic

relations between early Finnish and early Germanic populations, and J. Laakso has made a similar argument (Sammallahti 1995 : 151; Laakso 1995 : 71–72). In a reply to C. Hasselblatt's critique, A. Künnap has remarked that the importance of genetic population research lies in its proof that Baltic-Finns are common Europeans, and that there seems to be no proof of a mass migration from the east (Künnap 1998 : 420).

However, if such a mass migration would have taken place more than three millennia ago, it might not even show anymore in the genetic makeup of the current Finnic population. A comparison with the Hungarian population, whose migration from the east is hardly controversial and whose arrival in Europe took place relatively recently might be interesting.

Chapter 6, "Continental Ice and Volcanic Activity" is hardly more coherent. Following a series of maps depicting Europe during the Würm III glacial maximum and the slow retreat of the ice cap in Fennoscandia is a three-page quote of H.-P. Schulz, hypothesizing that a large migration from the Eifel region in current Germany into the Baltic might have been due to a period of volcanic activity in the Eifel mountain range about 13 000 BC, and that these migrants might be identified with a proto-Lappoid population. The following chapter deals with three recent happenings from the perspective of the "revolutionaries", i.e. the symposium "Roots of Northern Europeans", in Turku in 1997, which A. Künnap has retold by a long quote from Valter Lang, the symposium "The Roots of the Finnish population" at Lammi in autumn 1997, on which, for a change, A. Künnap comments on himself, and the appearance of the above-mentioned book "Itämerensuomi — eurooppalainen maa". The latter is treated by a quote from J. Pusztaý's article on his chain model for the Uralic protolanguage, from M. Nuñez' essay about his theory of the colonization of Finland by linguistic ancestors of the modern Finns during the retreat of the ice cap, some 10 000 years ago, and an excerpt from M. Niskanen's essay on the origin of the Baltic-Finns in the light of physical anthropology.

The problem of finding linguistic evidence for the hypothesis that the proto-Uralic should be regarded as a *Sprachbund*

of languages of different genetic origin, perhaps with a *lingua franca* as intermediary, rather than a more or less unitary protolanguage, has been approached from basically two different ways. First, the analysis of the proto-Uralic lexicon, as well as the problems of Uralic historical morphosyntax are to point at flaws in the traditional "tree-model", and a Uralic substratum has been searched for, mainly in Germanic and Balto-Slavic languages. The proof of the existence of such a substratum would indeed place the linguistic ancestors of contemporary Uralic people in a wide zone throughout northern Europe, and would make the theory posed by K. Wiik that a livelihood shift of hunting and gathering to agriculture has preceded a language shift from proto-Uralic to proto-Indo-European very credible. A. Künnap deals with both these approaches in the eight, ninth and tenth chapters. In the eighth chapter, "Some Morphosyntactic Problems of Uralic Languages" (pp. 66–80), A. Künnap first deals with the question of the Uralic **m*-accusative, the presence of which in the Finnic and Lapp languages A. Künnap regards as unproven by contemporary linguistic evidence. Considering that in Balto-Slavic languages a partial object can be expressed by a genitive case, which may be due to Finno-Ugric influence, A. Künnap poses the hypothesis that, actually, the original case ending for total objects within the Finnic languages was the genitive case.

Concerning the order of case and possessive suffixes, Künnap poses that the CxPx order is one of the similarities between Finnic-Lapp and Samoyedic languages, and stands extremely sceptical towards the attempts to reconstruct a proto-Uralic case order. A similar line of argument has been followed by J. Pusztaý with regard to the objective conjugation, which some researchers have regarded as possibly of proto-Uralic origin. J. Pusztaý, however, regards it as a similarity between Mordvin, Ob-Ugric and Samoyedic languages (Pusztaý 1995 : 89–91). As to the proto-Uralic **š*-preterite, A. Künnap concludes that it is typical of the Siberian language area, being confined to Samoyed, Ob-Ugric, Mordvin and having possible cognates in Paleo-Siberian languages. The East Estonian (Kodavere) dialectal preterite of the negative auxiliary verb, *esin*, *esid*, and its Livonian coun-

terparts are regarded by A. Künnap as analogous forms to the usual *si*-preterite. Regarding the question of a Uralic **k*-presens, A. Künnap notes that in the Permic languages it seems only to occur with velar-vocalic negative auxiliary verbs, which may be not reconstructible to the proto-language. In my opinion, A. Künnap discards the Finnish reconstruction **tule-k-mek* a bit too easily as "dreamt-of material", compare the Southern Pohjanmaa dialectal forms presens *olemma* vs. preterite *olima*.

A. Künnap goes on to compare the supposed Uralic **k*-dual, the occurrence of which should, according to A. Künnap, be restricted to the most eastern Uralic languages, with similar Paleo-Siberian forms, and compares the South Samoyedic **ŋ* aorist/imperative marker with similar forms in Altaic and Paleo-Siberian languages. The same is done with the South Samoyedic **l*-lative and **l*-gerund. Chapter 8 is followed by a series of maps depicting ethnic groups and language areas in Siberia. This is certainly useful, however, the maps are sometimes unfortunately printed a bit unclearly and are sometimes hard to read.

In the following chapter, A. Künnap poses the possibility of an ancient contact zone in northeastern Europe between the linguistic ancestors of the current Finnic, Lapp and Samoyed languages. A. Künnap lists twelve morphosyntactical and phonological similarities between these languages, and also presents the results of an analysis of the Uralic wordstock, which, according to A. Künnap, signifies that the Samoyed languages have significantly more words in common with Finnic-Lapp and with Ob-Ugric languages. Unfortunately, the latter has been presented in too concise a manner to base any conclusions on.

The importance of finding a Uralic substratum in the northernmost Indo-European language groups (Germanic and Balto-Slavic) as evidence of the presence of early Uralic hunter-gatherers in a large area in northern Europe has been indicated above. Earlier, K. Wiik (1997) has presented an elaborate list of possibly Uralic substratum features in the Germanic languages. However, the supposition of a Uralic substratum in Germanic has been severely criticized by P. Kallio, who undermines the relative chronology of some important supposed Uralic sub-

strate features mentioned by K. Wiik and argues that there certainly is a substratum in Germanic, but that it is not Uralic (Kallio 1997). The tenth chapter in A. Künnap's book (pp. 95–111) deals with the problems of a Uralic substratum in Germanic and Balto-Slavic and opens with a two-and-a-half page quote from N. Strade, which is followed almost unnoticably by an even longer quote from K. Wiik, where he presents his scheme in which, in different areas and different periods, a livelihood shift always precedes a language shift (which follows a period of linguistic borrowing) and thus the language border between Uralic and Indo-European ever shifts northward, in the wake of the border between hunters and gatherers and farmers. A number of quotes follow, all indicating that the spread of agriculture must be rather due to diffusion of cultural traits than to migration of agriculturists.

Then A. Künnap proceeds to list the possible substratum features in northern Indo-European languages. Unfortunately, these are presented in the same, all too concise manner as in the earlier articles on the subject by A. Künnap (1997). Besides, the stress shift to the first syllable in Proto-Germanic, Baltic and Northern Russian is mentioned. The stress shift in the proto-Germanic has been shown to be a rather recent areal feature by P. Kallio (1997 : 124, which is mentioned on the literature list of A. Künnap's book, however, he does not mention P. Kallio's critique), whereas the stress shift in Baltic (actually: Latvian and some Lithuanian dialects, as has been pointed out before (Hasselblatt 1998 : 235)) and Northern Russian are relatively recent (Wiik 1995 : 81). Other supposed substratum features which have been criticized by P. Kallio in a way which should be hard to ignore are listed without comment. A. Künnap repeats twice that further research and more ardent collaboration by Uralists would significantly contribute to the lengthening of his list (pp. 106, 110). Maybe. But before lengthening it, he might deal with the criticism he has received on this list so far.

A. Künnap's conclusions, at last (pp. 111–114), are, plainly said, atrocious. Listed in, in my opinion, far too concise a manner, they do not shed light on the sometimes chaotic presentation of information earlier in the book, but are sometimes quite unintelligible themselves (the first four con-

clusions under chapter 11.2, especially p. 111). A. Künnap stresses the role of Indo-Europeist archaeologists and linguists in uncovering the ancient history of Uralic peoples (p. 111–112), warns against the dangers of back-reconstruction (p. 113), supports the theory of an early Uralic substratum in the northernmost Indo-European languages and its consequences for the placing and timing of the ancient Uralic language area (p. 113), and points to the possibility of Siberian areal phenomena, mistakenly taken to be features reconstructible to the proto-language (pp. 113–114).

Scientific disciplines renew from time to time. However, A. Künnap's statement that "The change of scientific paradigm turns old scientific theories to myths" (p. 111), is, in my opinion, not only dubious, but also points to an attitude of the current "renewers" of Uralistics, which is, perhaps, too iconoclastic: as pointed out before, the bulk of M. Nuñez' and P. Dolukhanov's insights into Finland's first human settlement could be incorporated into the old paradigm of Uralistics, as well as the current information on human genetics, whereas the theoretical critique of traditional historical linguistics as forwarded by J. Raukko and J.-O. Östman and supported by A. Künnap is, I think, not of great consequence to genetic linguistics.

The "renewers" of Uralistics have consistently tried to synthesize archaeology and genetics with Uralic linguistics, which is in

itself praiseworthy. However, linguistic theories (one of which the Uralic language tree essentially is) can only be disproved by using linguistic arguments: H.-P. Schulz' identification of a paleolithic group some 13 000 years ago with "proto-Lapps", quoted by A. Künnap on p. 54, has no linguistic significance: it can neither be disproved nor proved by linguistic means. Thus, I think most hope for the renewal of Uralistics lies in further research of possible Uralic substrata in the northern Indo-European languages, and in a critical review of Uralic morphosyntactic features.

The chapters dealing with the latter (chapters 8 and 9) are the best and most orderly parts of A. Künnap's book by far, the chapter dealing with the former has some very significant shortcomings (too many quotes, too little new). This said, I remain extremely ambivalent about the "Breakthrough in Present-Day Uralistics" — the earlier-mentioned quoting-madness spoils a lot and is often accompanied by too little comment from the author. Reading someone else's scrapbook may be useful, certainly, but spend a day in a library and you might make one of your own! In other words, the book adds too little new to the discussion on "renewing Uralistics" up to date, and its overview of the discussion so far is too chaotic and incoherent. In this, it does not do the purpose of its title much good: the road of renewing Uralistics remains long and hard.

LITERATURE

- H a s s e l b l a t t, C. 1998, Avunhuuto lounaasta. — *Vir.*, 232–239.
- I t k o n e n, E. 1998, Sukupuu ja kontakti, *Vir.*, 90–103.
- K a l l i o, P. 1997, Uralic Substrate Features in Germanic? — *JSFOu* 87, 123–130.
- K ü n n a p, A. 1995, The Uralic Language tree Model and the Myth of the Migration from the East at the Jyväskylä Congress. — *Minor Uralic Languages: Grammar and Lexis*, Tartu–Groningen, 123–127.
- 1997, Uralilaisten kielten jäljistä indo-euroopalaisissa kielissä. — *Vir.*, 79–83.
- 1998, Ensiapu koillisesta. — *Vir.*, 232–239.
- L a a k s o, J. 1995, A Spade is Always a Spade about the Comment on "The 'Pragmareaal' Challenge to Genetic Language Tree Models." — *Itämerensuomalainen kulttuurialue*, Helsinki, 70–75.
- 1997, Neue Perspektiven für die Grundsprachenforschung? [Rev.] J. Puszta y, *Diskussionsbeiträge zur Grundsprachenforschung*, Wiesbaden 1995. — *FUF*, Band 1–2, 205–213.
- P u s z t a y, J. 1995, *Diskussionsbeiträge zur Grundsprachenforschung* (Beispiel: das Protouralische), Wiesbaden.
- R a u k k o, J., Ö s t m a n, J., The 'Pragmareaal' Challenge to Genetic Language Tree Models. — *Itämerensuomalainen kulttuurialue*, Helsinki, 31–67.
- S a m m a l l a h t i, P. 1995, Language and roots. — *CIFU VIII*, Pars I, 143–155.

Thomason, S. G., Kaufman, T. 1988, *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*, Berkeley—Los Angeles—Oxford.

Uesson, A.-M. 1970, *On Linguistic Affinity. The Indo-Uralic Problem*, Malmö.

Wiiik, K. 1995, *The Baltic Prosodic Area Revisited*. — *Itämerensuomalainen kulttuurialue*, Helsinki, 75—90.

— 1997, *The Uralic and Finno-Ugric Phonetic Substratum in Proto-Germanic*. — *LU*, 258—279.

MERLIJN DE SMIT (Groningen)

* * *

If somebody breaks the dominating styles and canons, for example, in painting and creates a new style, he or she must be at home in academic techniques and styles of painting. Only in such cases the audience will recognise the breakthrough of this new artistic style. A Master who rebels against antiquated styles and techniques will soon be acknowledged as Master of his or her new style. Then most artists abandon the old styles and techniques and take over their Master's style and technique.

There is no need to prove that Ago Künnap is a Master in his special field in Uralistics — in the study of the Samoyed languages. For example, in his discussion paper "Facts and Myths about Uralic Studies", Tapani Salminen concludes that "largely a collection of standard pieces of knowledge, "Уральские языки" contains a few extremely valuable contributions, in particular the chapters on Livonian, Kamas, and Mator" (Salminen 1997: 92). The chapter on Kamas is written by A. Künnap (Kюннап 1993).

In his monograph, "Breakthrough in Present-Day Uralistics", A. Künnap shows that the old paradigm of Uralistics is disintegrated and a new paradigm has been created. While reading this book we learn that he is not alone — there are a number of colleagues in the field of Uralistics who think in the same way. We do not want to simplify the matter but, in short, it is characteristic of the old paradigm in Uralistics that one assumes the common ancestral population and language (dialect) for all Uralic (Finno-Ugric, Samoyedic, and sometimes also Yukaghir) languages. Some researchers also speak of Uralo-Altai languages.

Using the language family tree model, the holders of the old paradigm reconstruct proto-languages, e.g. the Proto-Permian, the Proto-Finno-Ugric, the Proto-Uralic, etc. For reconstructing the Proto-Uralic the data from

the living and some recently extinct languages are used at first. After that the development of the so-called Uralic languages is re-constructed from this highly hypothetical constructed proto-language. As a result, some features are ascribed to many Uralic languages that they never possessed. From these "refined" results a more precise proto-language is then re-reconstructed, and a more precise development of the re-reconstructed daughter languages is again re-reconstructed. Above all, the breakthrough in present-day Uralistics destroys the vicious circle of such back-reconstruction.

The book we are looking at consists of eleven chapters. In the preface A. Künnap shows that it is the science of man in general, not only linguistics that is responsible for the new movement from the old paradigm in Uralistics. He emphasises five major changes in our knowledge (p. 3):

- 1) data collected by human genetics;
- 2) artefacts and patterns of activity can spread without a considerable population migration;
- 3) linguistic majority can take over the more prestigious language of the linguistic minority;
- 4) there is no unmixed language (language contacts, affinity, and *lingua franca*);
- 5) dendrologically calibrated radiocarbon C₁₄ data.

After the introduction, the Uralic language family is considered in general. The reader can find the newest statistical data about the Uralic languages and their geographical distribution. Such information in this book is justified because one aspect of the breakthrough is that it helps to overcome the reclusion of the club of Uralists. The linguists working in other fields (typology, phonology, morphology, Indo-European, German, English, etc.) need more preliminary information about the Uralic lan-