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.

Wiik, 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 (Кюннап 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-Altaic languages.

Using the language family tree model, the holders of the old paradigm reconstruct proto-languages, e.g. the Proto-Permic, 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 C_{14} 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-

guages. From the data we can see that it is not the total number of Uralic peoples but the number of speakers that is on the decline. A. Künnap concludes that "it is self-evident that all the above-said will not promise any perspectives for the retention of Uralic languages in Russia" (p. 17). It is not so hopeless, I think, because some nations may grow and some die in Russia. If we compare the Uralic languages outside Russia then we can see that Estonian, Finnish, and Hungarian are stable or growing but Livonian and many Lapp dialects (languages) are dying.

Linguistics is full of biological and geological metaphors (see Biological Metaphor and Cladistic Classification 1987; Language and Earth 1992). The most influential one is the language tree metaphor, but we also use terms like *language branch*, *mother language*, *daughter language*, *language family*, etc. At least, it is better to avoid metaphors connected with trees if we want to avoid the language family tree model. That means we should use, for example, the *Finnic group* or the *Volga group* instead of the *Finnic* or the *Volga branches* of the *Finno-Ugric sub-family* (cf. p. 11—12).

Having provided us with the general information about Uralic languages, A. Künnap presents the traditional views on the origin of the Uralic language family (Chapter 3). According to traditionalists (old paradigm) the ancient home of the Uralic peoples (i.e. Finno-Ugric and Samoyed) was situated somewhere in the East on a small area. "They spoke the Uralic proto-language, enjoyed the Uralic proto-culture and possibly, were also of a Uralic proto-race. It was a Uralic proto-period, ending no sooner than 8000 and no later than 4000 years ago. After that started the emigration mainly westward [---] until they reached the vicinity of the Baltic Sea" (p. 21).

A. Künnap also discusses some Uralic language tree models and concludes that R. Taagepera's tree (based on Viitso 1997) is the best of all existing Finno-Ugric (Uralic) language trees (p. 25; R. Taagepera's tree is here on p. 25 reproduced from an unpublished manuscript (Taagepera 1997)). As a matter of fact, R. Taagepera's "tree" is not a tree at all but a "forest" with four trees which have their own roots — Pre-Finnic, Pre-Volgaic, Pre-Hungarian, and Pre-Khanty (Samoyedic languages are not incorporated into this forest).

In the next chapter (4) A. Künnap continues the criticism of the language family tree hypothesis and presents new views on the origin of the Uralic language family (A.-M. Uesson, P. Dolukhanov, P. Sammallahti, L.-G. Larsson, J. Raukko, J.-O. Östman, J. Pusztay, K. Wiik, L. Honko). T. Crowley, an expert in South-Pacific languages, writes that there are many doubts about the comparative method but "it is probably easiest to show students how languages change by first teaching them the traditional comparative method [language family tree model], just as it is easier to teach classical phonemics than it is to launch straight into underlying phonological representations and morphophonemic rules" (Crowley 1997 : 10).

Recently the Semitic (therein Arabic) and Afro-Asiatic family tree models have been rejected (Edzard 1998). L. Edzard shows that a number of paradoxes are connected with the language family tree model. For example, "the very term *proto-language* represents an oxymoron, a contradiction in terms, as the term *proto-* suggests that there was nothing (spoken) prior to the (proto-) language in question that resembled that language. [---] The assumption of "proto-languages" does not fit chronologically in the theory, which dates the human expansion out of Africa back about 50 000 years, whereas the various "proto-languages" are typically assumed to have existed at a historical stage 5000, 10 000, or 20 000 years before present [--- But] what happened before the emergence of these "proto-languages" [?]" (Edzard 1998 : 39—40).

A very serious argument against the language family tree model is the following: "The family tree model suggests an exponentially (!) increasing number of languages in the world over the course of history (even though some branches may be lost). This does not correspond to reality: what has been increasing during (say) the last two centuries is the number of actually e x p l o r e d languages" (Edzard 1998 : 40). About the history, problems, and criticism of the language family tree hypothesis see also Sutrop 1999.

A. Künnap emphasises J. Pusztay's point of view according to which the Proto-Uralic — as any other proto-language — is not a starting point for the rise of languages but just only a single and thereby a very recent phase in the development of lan-

guages [---] Thus, originally the Proto-Uralic was not a single language but rather a language union (*Sprachbund*) (p. 33). It seems that such an approach connected with L. Edzard's theory may open several new perspectives also in historical Uralistics.

K. Wiik's hypothesis goes 40 000 years back when the population of Europe consisted of at least two genetically and linguistically different groups of inhabitants. Pre-Lapps inhabited north-west and Pre-Samoyeds north-east of Europe. It is possible that in Central Europe so-called Pre-Central-Europeans lived in that period (p. 36). It seems that K. Wiik's hypothesis tries to fill out the gap between the assumed existence of the proto-languages (arbitrary multiplies of 5000 years ago) and the human expansion out of Africa about 50 000 years ago.

In Chapter 5 A. Künnap considers the genetic and archaeological background of Uralians. Here he gives a competent picture of human evolution based on the results of modern molecular human genetics and anthropology (R. Villems, A. Torroni). The archaeological background is given shortly (D. West, K. Julku, and P. Dolukhanov).

The next chapter (6) deals with the continental ice, volcanic activity in Europe, and with the possible Upper Palaeolithic migration from the Eifel mountains into the Baltic. In the period of maximum glaciation about 20 000—18 000 years ago, there were two major population refuges in this period. One in south-west and the other in south-east Europe. After deglaciation Central Europe was recolonised from the south-west refuge 16 000 years ago. According to the Volcanic Migration Hypothesis of H.-P. Schulz and A. Künnap, there was a migration from the Eifel mountains (near Koblenz and Köln in modern West Germany) due to the volcanic activity. A. Künnap and A. Kriiska calibrated dendrochronologically the age of the eruption of Lake Laach in the Eifel Mountains to circa 13 000 calibrated years ago (p. 53). A recent independent study gives quite similar results — the Laacher See Volcano erupted 13 050 to 13 190 calibrated years ago (Baales, Bittmann, Kromer 1998).

Before the eruption, this region was settled. One settlement, a Magdalénian archaeological place of discovery — Feldkirchen-Gönnersdorf — was covered with the pumice and ashes from the eruption of Lake Laach.

After the explosion there were no known settlements in that region neither in the Upper Palaeolithic and also nor in the Mesolithic periods. It is possible that the inhabitants of this region — Proto-Lapps — migrated in the direction of the Baltic. First they moved through Poland to Lithuania and Byelorussia, and after the ice shield had moved further North, they colonised Latvia and Estonia (Sutrop 1997; cf. also Indreko 1948).

In Chapter 7 A. Künnap looks at the engagements of the ideas presented at three conferences about "roots" (biological metaphor!) in 1997 (Roots of Northern Europeans, Roots of Finnish Population, and Itämeresuomi — eurooppalainen maa). This discussion closes the first theoretical part of the breakthrough book.

In the second part of his book, A. Künnap analyses some morphosyntactical problems of Uralic languages, language contacts, and similarities between different language groups (similarities between East-Uralic and Siberian Non-Uralic languages, between Finnic-Lapp and Samoyed languages). The last chapter is devoted to the possible Uralic substratum in North-Indo-European languages. This part presents evidences against the language family tree theory. The book ends with conclusions drawn by A. Künnap about the old and a new paradigm in Uralistics.

The so-called m-accusative in Uralic is methodologically very interesting. There is no evidence of the m-accusative in several Uralic languages (e.g. in Finnic, Hungarian, Khanty) but using "the comparative method", i.e. the language family tree model, the m-accusative is reconstructed into Proto-Uralic. On the other hand, from the reconstructed Proto-Uralic, the m-accusative is back-reconstructed, e.g. into Finnic. Naturally, there is a presupposition that the m-accusative changed into the n-accusative because such phonetic change $*-m > *-n$ is very simple. A. Künnap has given an elegant explanation of why we may assume that there was never an m-accusative in Finnic.

The older Finnic sentence type was nominal and SOV. He starts his analyses from (1) and (2):

(1) *$hän$ $lehmä-n$ $tappa-va$
   he   cow (gen.) kill (participle)
   'he, killing the cow (present tense)'

(2) *hän lehmä-n tappa-ja*
    he   cow (gen.) kill (nom. actoris)
    he, the killer of the cow (past tense)'

After the change of the basic word order SOV to SVO in Finnic sentences (1) and (2) were changed into (3) and (4), resp.:

(3) *hän tappa-a lehmä-n*
    he kill (3sg.) cow (gen.)
    he kills the cow'

(4) *hän tappo-i-ø   lehmä-n*
    he kill (past 3sg.) cow (gen.)
    he killed the cow'

So the *n*-genitive was changed into the case of the total object due to the change of the basic word order (p. 68). Accordingly, it is superfluous to suppose that there was an *m*-accusative in Finnic. The genitives in (3) and (4) remain genitives and they are not the cases of a hypothetical accusative in Finnic.

A. Künnap also shows that there was not a Proto-Uralic *ś*-preterit. This is characteristic of the languages belonging to the Uralic eastward centre (Samoyed, Ob-Ugric, and Mordvin), and maybe to the Paleo-Siberian Non-Uralic languages (p. 74; cf. Audova 1996). This chapter (8) is appendixed with Siberian historical linguistic maps (pp. 81—89). Unfortunately, their print quality is unsatisfactory.

Chapter 9 is devoted to the similarities between Finnic-Lapp and Samoyed languages. A. Künnap relies on K. Wiik's theory. I, however, disagree with the opinion of K. Wiik that the Samoyed's ancient home could have been in north-eastern Europe as early as 40 000 years ago. It is important to remember that from 20 000 to 16 000 years ago the interglacial European population lived in stress conditions in refuges. It follows that initially very different dialects or languages were spoken there. It is possible that in such contact situations *Sprachbund* phenomena took place. As a result, Pre-Lapp in southwest and Pre-Samoyed in south-east refuges developed. Both were probably reduced and simplified mixed languages. The source languages lost their morphology and the resulting "pre-"languages (i.e. after-languages) were typologically in the isolating stage. After that parallel developments began. The followers of Pre-Lapp and Pre-Samoyed had typologically reached the agglutinating stage but genetically they were not connected,

although there were numerous contacts between them. Estonian (from Proto-Finnic from Pre-Lapp), for example, is no longer a typical agglutinative language. It is in a transitional stage, changing towards a flective language. Via the contacts between the languages of the westward (Finnic) and eastward (Mordvin, Ugric, and Samoyed) centres, the Uralic language family arose.

A. Künnap lists 12 similarities between Finnic-Lapp and Samoyed that may have originated from ancient language contacts. A. Künnap is here not consistent when he writes that "a source for the common features could have been a Uralic language form, extinct by now" (p. 90). On the one hand, the source was not a Uralic language form but a Finnic-Lapp (from Pre-Lapp) or a Samoyed (from Pre-Samoyed) dialect. On the other hand, there is no ground to believe that the source for all common features was the same dialect. Some features may be Finnic-Lapp, others Samoyedic. We must also keep in mind that the repertoire of the possible phonemes for morphological markers is limited. Therefore some similarities or co-occurrences of the same phoneme in the same morphological function may be only incidental.

A. Künnap also analyses the supposed Finnic-Lapp—Samoyed common vocabulary and concludes that "the number of common words traditionally supposed to be traced back to Proto-Uralic does not support the Uralic language tree model" (p. 94). It is often assumed that Mordvin possesses Samoyed morphology and Finnic lexis. My results in historical lexicology show that some older layers in the vocabulary coincide in Mordvin and in Samoyed. For example, a complex yellow-green-blue colour category with a basic name *piša* is characteristic both of Mordvin and to Samoyed. Younger lexical layers show affinities between Mordvin and Finnic again, for example, both have the same simple colour category blue with the same name *sine* (Sutrop 1998). These results do not support the language tree model either.

Last chapter (10) considers the possible Uralic substratum in North-Indo-European languages. The theoretical introduction bases mainly on the ideas of N. Strade, K. Wiik, and A.-M. Uesson. A. Künnap cites A.-M. Uesson that there are only two possibilities for considering the relations between Finno-Ugric

and Indo-European population in Europe: "Either were the Indo-Europeans autochthonous in Europe and [---] who invaded Europe were Finno-Ugrians. [---] Or the [---] original European hunting and fishing population consisted of Finno-Ugrians, who [---] were transformed into Indo-Europeans, as far as they did not retain their Finno-Ugric language in the present day Balto-Finnic area" (p. 103). Must we leave the question open, choose one, or try to combine the two alternatives?

The logic of this breakthrough book makes us believe that Finno-Ugrians were the original Europeans who were linguistically transformed into Indo-Europeans. The original Finnic Europeans (like modern Estonians and Finns too) were not able to learn some Proto-Indo-European dialect(s) correctly. It may well be that from the mistakes they made and conserved the Germanic, the Baltic, and the Slavic branches from Proto-Indo-European dialect(s) developed. A. Künnap lists the possible Uralic substratum in the Balto-Slavo-Germanic branch of Indo-European. From literature he has collected 20 phonetical and 22 morphosyntactical features in Baltic, Slavic, or Germanic languages that may reflect the possible Uralic substratum in those branches. He has discarded such Uralic features that occur only in one North-Indo-European language (pp. 104—106). On two separate lists A. Künnap presents Uralic phonetical and morphosyntactical features in Slavic languages (pp. 106—108). These lists strongly support language contact theories and voice strongly against the family tree model.

The breakthrough book ends with 44 conclusions which are divided into five sections (Chapter 11). A. Künnap concludes, for example, that every nation has its own identity; Indo-European scientists are interested in Uralistics, too; Uralists must help them. The most important conclusions (reflections) are: There was no narrow Uralic proto-home with a unitary Uralic proto-language, proto-race, proto-culture, proto-religion, etc. There was a vast area of preglacial population in northern Europe from the Atlantic to the Ural Mountains. This population could speak either relatively unitary Uralic languages or quite different languages. The so-called back-reconstruction is the worst one can do.

It makes no sense to refer to all 44 conclusions because every linguist should read this breakthrough book. The main idea of this book is to show that the old traditionalist paradigm which is based on the language family tree model does not work anymore in Uralistics. The new paradigm bases on language contact theories. My suggestion to Ago Künnap is to expand the breakthrough book and publish the edited version in a good publishing house which will guarantee the circulation of this valuable book also among the international linguistic community of Non-Uralists.

REFERENCES

A u d o v a , I. 1996, On the ś-Preterit of Uralic Languages and the Verbal s-Suffixes in the Siberian Non-Uralic Languages. — FU 20, 23—28.

B a a l e s , M., B i t t m a n n , F., K r o-m e r, B. 1998, Verkohlte Bäume im Trass der Laacher See-Tephra bei Kruft (Neuwieder Becken). Ein Beitrag zur Datierung des Laacher See-Ereignisses und zur Vegetation der Allerød-Zeit am Mittelrhein. — Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt 28 (2), 191—204.

Biological Metaphor and Cladistic Classification. An Interdisciplinary Perspective, Philadelphia, 1987.

C r o w l e y , T. 1997, An Introduction to Historical Linguistics, Auckland.

E d z a r d , L. 1998, Polygenesis, Convergence, and Entropy. An Alternative Model of Linguistic Evolution Applied to Semitic Linguistics, Wiesbaden.

I n d r e k o, R. 1948, Origin and Area of Settlement of the Fenno-Ugrian Peoples, Heidelberg.

Language and Earth. Elective Affinities between the Emerging Sciences of Linguistics and Geology, Amsterdam—Philadelphia 1992.

S a l m i n e n, T. 1997, Facts and Myths about Uralic Studies. [Rev.] Языки мира. Уральские языки, Москва 1993. — Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (STUF) 50 (1), 83—93.

S u t r o p, U. 1997, The Upper Palaeolithic Migration from the Eifel Mountains into the Baltic. — FU 21, 90—98.

—— 1998, The Vocabulary of Sense Perception in Estonian. Typology, History, and Cognition. PhD Dissertation, Konstanz.

—— 1999, Diskussionsbeiträge zur Stammbaumtheorie. — FU 22 (im Druck).

T a a g e p e r a, R. 1997, The Roots and Branches of the Finno-Ugric Language Tree (Manuscript).

V i i t s o, T.-R. 1997, Keelesugulus ja soome-ugri keelepuu. — Akadeemia, Tartu, 899—929.

К ю н н а п А. 1993, Камасинский язык. — Языки мира. Уральские языки, Москва, 380—388.

URMAS SUTROP (Konstanz)

Lembit V a b a, Uurimusi läti-eesti keelesuhetest, Tallinn— Tampere 1997 (Eesti Keele Instituut. Tampereen Yliopiston suomen kielen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitos). 547 S. + 22 Karten.

Im Mittelpunkt der Doktorarbeit von Lembit Vaba stehen die Kontakte zwischen der lettischen und estnischen Sprache. Im zu besprechenden Werk sind 370 lettische Lehnwörter, die in estnischen Mundarten auf dem Territorium Estlands vorkommen, und 775 lettische Lehnwörter, die in den estnischen Sprachinseln Leivu und Lutsi in Lettland zu finden sind, dargeboten und analysiert. Vorab werden im Überblick die Forschungsmethoden, die Quellen, die Grundprinzipien in der Vorstellung des Belegmaterials, sich früher schon mit diesen Sprachkontakten befaßte Arbeiten, die Geschichte der Herausbildung der hier behandelten Sprachbeziehungen sowie die Sprachinseln und ihre Erforschung (besonders durch F. J. Wiedemann) vorgestellt.

Hieran schließen sich die Wortartikel an, denen eine 110 Seiten umfassende phonetische, morphologische und semantische Analyse des Lehngutes folgt. Auf diesen analytischen Teil der Untersuchung wird auch in den Wortartikeln verwiesen. Mit diesem Teil steht auch die Behandlung der durch Vermittlung des Lettischen eingedrungenen deutschen Lehnwörter sowie die Analyse der Verbreitung und des Alters der im Werk behandelten Wörter in Verbindung. Viele Wortartikel basieren auf früher von L. Vaba einzeln publizierten Kurzforschungen, und die besten dieser Artikel könnten durchaus auch als eigenständige wissenschaftliche Abhandlung, so wie sie hier dargeboten sind, veröffentlicht werden; z.B. die Artikel zu den Wörtern *iiroots* 'Sense' und *kauss* 'Schüssel', die jeweils zwei Seiten umfassen.

Zu dem sehr gelungenen Aufbau der Dissertation gibt es nur einige wenige kritische Anmerkungen. Unter den Mängeln ist das Fehlen einer Zusammenfassung zu verbuchen. Im Textteil des Buches wird auf Quellen verwiesen, die im Literaturverzeichnis am Ende des Werkes nicht verzeichnet sind, so z.B. die auf S. 175 unter dem Wort *puur* angegebene Forschung von Hella Keem und die auf S. 245 unter dem Wort *vääs* erscheinende Arbeit von Arnold Kask. Leider fehlen im Literaturverzeichnis auch Veröffentlichungen, auf die im Text nicht nur einmal, sondern mehrmals verwiesen wird. Der Autor möge wohl gedacht haben, daß diese Publikationen aus der Sicht seiner Forschung keine wesentliche Bedeutung haben, aber allein die Tatsache des Fehlens im allgemeinen Quellenverzeichnis einer wissenschaftlichen Arbeit stößt auf keinerlei Verständnis und steht auch nicht im Einklang mit den, zumindest in Finnland üblichen, Gepflogenheiten.

Das in der Forschung enthaltene Belegmaterial ist seinem Umfang nach sehr repräsentativ und überzeugend (trotzdem fehlt im diesbezüglichen Wortartikel zu *paat* 'blaßgelb, verbleichtes Braun' auf S. 146 die Anmerkung, daß dieses Wort auch als eine bestimmte, ein Pferd kennzeichnende Farbe in der setukesischen Mundart vorkommt (so ist es zumindest in von Heikki Ojansuu festgehaltenen setukesischen Volksliedern vorhanden)). L. Vaba hat zu dem aus Schrift- und Archivquellen entnommenen Belegmaterial anzuerkennende Ergänzungen in Form seines auf eigenen Expeditionen gesammelten Sprachmaterials geliefert. Diese wertvolle Ma-