e.g., bob 'broad bean,' brnica, čompe, jabuka 'apple,' kartofelj, kostanj 'chestnut,' korun, krompir (the standard form), papeščak, podzemljica, turkinja and 46 are complex (binomial) terms, e.g., laška repa 'Italian turnip,' podzemeljska hruška 'underground pear,' podzemeljska jabolka, podzemeljski kostanj, turška repa. As for the grammatical gender and number, 72 forms are feminine, 55 masculine, and 8 neuter while 102 forms are in the singular and 33 in the plural.

We learn, for example, that krompir comes from the German Grundbirn and that turkinja or turška repa are not to be thought of as coming from Turkey, but rather from outside of Slovenia, because turški 'Turkish' generally meant 'foreign' or 'overseas' in the sixteenth century. Most interesting and entertaining is the chapter on the 'linguistic quarrel' around 1845 as to whether korun could or should be used instead of krompir. There is also a chapter on 'the potato in Slovene literature,' including sayings like Brez krompirja ni kosila 'There is no dinner (lunch) without potatoes.' Finally, it is also amusing that just as Slovenes were somewhat reluctant to cultivate potatoes at first, so also it took Stabéj over 20 years to convince at least one publisher (in Slovenia) to publish this entertaining scholarly jewel of a potato.

Joseph Paternost, Pennsylvania State University

Jože Toporišič. "A Language of A Small Nationality in a Multilingual State," *Sociolinguistic Problems in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and Yugoslavia.* Edited by William R. Schmalstieg and Thomas F. Magner. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, Inc., 1978 (=*Folia Slavica*, Volume 1, Number 3), pp. 480-86.

Toporišič's paper--one of the contributions to the conference on Sociolinguistics in Eastern Europe, which was held at the Pennsylvania State University, October 24-26, 1976--speaks clearly of the author's deep concern about the sociolinguistic status of Slovene in Slovenia today, and the potential long-range consequences of an incipient Slovene-Serbo-Croatian bilingualism in the historically Slovene speech territory. Toporišič's statement is crystal-clear and unequivocal; it corroborates the logic of sociolinguistic evolution in multilingual states and concurs with J. Skerlič's

old and well-known prediction of a Serbo-Croatian 'lingua communis' for the Yugoslavia of tomorrow.

Toporišič points to three main factors advancing bilingualism in Slovenia:

1) an unprecedented influx of Serbo-Croatian speakers;

2) the operation of Serbo-Croatian media of communication and education in the Slovene speech territory;

3) the linguistic adaptability of Slovenes themselves.

Toporišič considers three possible outcomes of this evolution:

1) either Slovenes will continue to assimilate linguistically the non-Slovenes from other regions of Yugoslavia; or

2) the Slovenes themselves will abandon the acquiescent adaptability of their character; or

3) the Socialist Republic of Slovenia will eventually become a Yugoslav republic with a Slovene minority.

These possibilities are, of course, entirely theoretical. We do not know what the tolerance of Slovenes as a nation to endure further linguistic assimilation is today, or whether a revolutionary metamorphosis of the Slovene character is at all possible. What we do know is that linguistic situations, contingent on such primordial social bonds as ethnicity, do as a rule involve unpredictable factors leading to surprising evolutions, which would tend to preclude any sociolinguistic prognostications.

The primary value of Toporišič's paper is that it openly recognizes the problem and that it poses it in scholarly terms.

Rado L. Lencek, Columbia University