

outlining the importance of metadata and discussing the various factors that affect our understanding of these resources: technical imperfections and carrier playback speed (which is often not stated, so various methods to determine it may be applied). Similarly, Susanne Ziegler also deals with the issue of (missing) metadata: she discusses the problems concerning old wax cylinders (original cylinders, galvano-matrices, and copies) at the Berlin Phonogramm-Archiv, which demand a twofold responsibility: on the one hand they are objects that should be preserved and handled properly like other ethnographic artifacts, and on the other hand the content of these cylinders should be made available—but this objective, as she states, is sometimes unachievable and it raises questions about preserving severely damaged items in the first place.

With some exceptions, the authors seem to answer the question “Trapped in Folklore?” in favor of non-entrapment, which is also evident from the aim of the publication, as the editors Urša Šivic and Drago Kunej state in the introduction, “to present the modernity, openness and diversity of views on folklore and to create a connection between (past and present) folklore phenomenon, between researchers and between their fields of expertise.”

Teja Klobčar, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts, Musicology

Lundberg, Grant H. 2013. *Dialect leveling in Haloze, Slovenia.* (Mednarodna knjižna zbirka Zora, 91). V Mariboru: Mednarodna založba Oddelka za slovanske jezike in književnost, Filozofska fakulteta. 114 pp.

Lundberg’s monograph is a unique and significant work, which is broader in scope than the title suggests. It analyzes the dialects of the Haloze region from both a diachronic and synchronic perspective, combining data from traditional descriptive field research with surveys on language usage and attitudes.

Chapter 1 provides a brief discussion of the different varieties of Slovene and the ways they have been characterized in the literature. Lundberg rightly points out that the different varieties that are usually mentioned—the standardized literary language (primarily written), the colloquial standard (which exhibits some regional variation), regional and urban vernaculars, and local dialects—are not discrete, clearly differentiated entities. They form a continuum, and the interactions between different varieties are complex. Individual speakers command different ranges of this continuum, and when adapting their usage in different situations, they do not shift clearly from one of the traditionally defined varieties to another.

Rather, they employ some subset of the features that are seen as characteristic of any given variety (all of which, it must be understood, are only abstractions, and speakers may have different conceptions of the boundaries of these varieties than linguists do). It has been claimed that there is a trend towards the leveling of distinctions, particularly from local dialects towards varieties that are more widely used and/or more prestigious (12), and this issue is investigated in detail in chapter 4. Chapter 1 concludes with a brief outline of the contents of the rest of the monograph.

Chapter 2 introduces the Haloze dialect group and describes the vocalic systems of the eastern, central, and western dialects as part of this general overview. This section is followed by a more detailed description of the phonology of the local dialect of Meje (the first such description to appear in print, see p. 13) and its differences from other eastern Haloze dialects (in the distribution of certain vowel phonemes, in vowel reduction, and in circumflex advancement, which took place in most environments in Meje but is much more limited in the easternmost Haloze dialects). Lundberg then describes the phonology of the central Haloze dialect of Belavšek and gives a brief sketch of its morphology. Although this description is very restricted in scope, it is still of value given the very limited amount of published information on the morphology of this dialect group. For nouns, the dual endings have been almost completely replaced by those of the plural, but the dual is preserved for pronouns and verbs. There is also a significant degree of syncretism among the endings of the masculine, neuter, and feminine declensions (see p. 46). I do not know to what extent this is attested in other Slovene dialects, if at all, but Lundberg's observation that "women refer to themselves and are referred to using the masculine" past tense verbal forms (45) is interesting from a sociolinguistic perspective. This chapter concludes with a brief discussion of the historical development of the vocalic systems of the Haloze dialects. The central Haloze system as seen in Belavšek can be derived from the Common Pannonian system posited by Rigler, but eastern Haloze has a merger of long **ě* and long **ǣ*, which cannot plausibly be derived from the same source. Lundberg suggests that the latter dialects may have a Kajkavian base or were otherwise subject to strong Kajkavian influence at an early stage of their development (48).

This idea is examined in more detail in chapter 3, which synthesizes the historical phonological developments with the available information about the history of this region. Traditional accounts of the history of Slovenian and Croatian language varieties assume a family-tree model of language change and are influenced by the ideology of national languages, so that it is assumed that dialects on different sides of the historical border between the Slovenian and Croatian territories neatly split at some point in the past and afterwards underwent separate Slovenian and Croatian developments (see p. 51). The Haloze dialects have been classified

differently, as part of the Pannonian or Styrian dialect groups (52), but as Lundberg's research shows, the Haloze dialects themselves do not exhibit uniform phonological developments and do not conform to the traditional family-tree model, which represents Slovene and Kajkavian dialects as belonging to distinct branches. Linguistic change is more accurately described as involving overlapping waves of innovation originating in different areas, which are not limited by modern national boundaries (although, of course, political boundaries at the times of these changes could play a role in their propagation). To explain the merger of long **ě* and long **ə* that eastern Haloze has in common with Kajkavian, Lundberg adopts the view that the raising of **ě* was an early development, which spread from the northwest to the southeast (Vermeer 1982, Greenberg 2000: 123). Lundberg states: "In the Slovene dialects north of the Sava, *jat* raised before **ə* lowered, so **ə* merged with **e*. In eastern Haloze and in Kajkavian dialects, *jat* raised later, so that by the time **ə* lowered, *jat* was still low, and they merged" (60). This corresponds with what is known about the history of the region. It appears that eastern Haloze was under Hungarian control during the time when these phonological developments are thought to have taken place; for a significant period its closest economic, political, and religious ties were to Varaždin and Zagreb, both in the Kajkavian dialect zone (64). Another feature separating Eastern Haloze from both neighboring Kajkavian and Slovenian dialects is the presence of the long monophthongs *e:*, *o:* in forms where eastern Slovene has *e:i*, *o:u* and parts of Kajkavian have *ie:*, *uo:*. If one assumes that eastern Haloze originally had rising diphthongs here, as in Kajkavian (cf. the general Kajkavian vowel system posited by Vermeer 1983: 456), then Lundberg suggests that the monophthongal reflexes seen today could be the result of a process of accommodation when these Haloze speakers came into closer contact with speakers of Styrian and Pannonian dialects. The monophthongs *e:*, *o:* would represent a compromise between the conflicting diphthongs (60–61).

The dialect descriptions in chapter 2 represent the most archaic system, as used by the oldest generation of speakers. Chapter 4 examines the current state of the Haloze dialects and the attitudes of speakers of these dialects. Lundberg gives a brief ethnographic description of different generations of Haloze residents and their linguistic behavior, based on interviews and observations made during more than a decade of fieldwork. He then discusses the results of two different surveys of Haloze residents, conducted in 2009 (239 respondents) and 2010 (300 respondents). In both surveys, a very high proportion of the respondents claimed to have a good command of their local dialect (92% and 87%, respectively). In the second survey, 63% asserted that the young people in the region speak the local dialect most of the time, but 50% still think that the local dialect is dying (with higher percentages of those over 50 and those with some post-

secondary education expressing this opinion). A large majority of respondents (71%) indicated that beside the local dialect, they have the greatest amount of contact with the variety used in Ptuj, the closest urban center, and most of those who expressed a belief that their local dialect was dying indicated that it was being replaced by the Ptuj dialect (62%). The 2010 survey also solicited aesthetic and intelligibility judgments about the Haloze dialects and other varieties of Slovene. For a number of questions in this survey, there were significant differences in the answers based on the respondents' place of origin (Haloze or elsewhere), place of residence, or age. The 2009 survey asked respondents to rank their language use in different contexts on a scale of 1–7, where 1 indicated most like the local dialect and 7 most like the literary language. The means of these responses indicate that speakers do adapt their language to different situations, with the local dialect being used primarily at home and with friends. Most other contexts show a marked shift towards the standard variety (95). When respondents were asked why they changed the way they speak in different contexts, the most common answer given was in order to be understood (69%), although other reasons were also mentioned; e.g., because the dialect is unsuitable in certain contexts, because of embarrassment or a feeling that the dialect is uncultured. It is important to note here that in the 2009 survey 81% of the respondents said that their dialect was very important to their identity.

Lundberg's own field research shows that there is a significant amount of variation in language use in Haloze and a tendency to level salient features that are specific to Haloze dialects (95–96), but the leveling goes mainly in the direction of the regional dialect of Ptuj rather than the standard language. These observations are supported by his survey data. The survey results also belie the widespread view (not just in Slovenia) that local dialects are dying out and are being replaced by standard languages. Rather, the local dialects are changing: they no longer represent the idealized "pure," archaic variety that is the object of most traditional dialect descriptions, but they are still important markers of local and regional identity. As Lundberg points out, speakers' own opinion of what constitutes their local dialect may not be the same as that of a historically oriented dialectologist, and an adequate description of the dialect today must take variation into account. At the end of his brief final chapter, he concludes that the contemporary Haloze dialect still has distinctive features that mark it as "haloško," even though it may be influenced to varying degrees by other varieties.

The book has some minor flaws. Typographical errors are rare, although "post-hoc Turkey tests" (84, instead of Tukey) is particularly unfortunate, since this error is repeated in several of the figures. The organization of the text lacks focus at times and there is a certain amount of repetition, which could have been improved with some additional editing.

The results of statistical tests are not cited in the typical way; e.g., “chi-square .000” (80), instead of reporting this as a p-value (presumably, $p < .001$). Not all forms are glossed, and the combinations of characters and diacritic marks used in the transcription of dialect forms are also not always clearly explained; it would have been helpful to supply a complete table or list somewhere with IPA equivalents. I mention these things here because this is a work that should be of interest to a broader audience, beyond the narrow circle of scholars specializing in Slovene dialects, and minor changes such as these would make it more accessible and appealing to non-specialists, particularly sociolinguists. However, none of these quibbles seriously detracts from the merits of the work as a whole.

Dialect Leveling in Haloze, Slovenia is an interesting and valuable contribution to the study of South Slavic language varieties. It provides important information about an understudied group of dialects and their historical development, but goes beyond the traditional goals of dialect description by investigating variation in contemporary dialect usage and attitudes about different language varieties from the perspective of perceptual dialectology. The application of sociolinguistic research methods for the study of language variation is still relatively rare within the field of South Slavic linguistics, and it is to be hoped that more researchers will follow in Lundberg’s footsteps.

Keith Langston, University of Georgia

List of Works Cited

- Greenberg, Marc L. 2000. *A historical phonology of the Slovene language*. (Historical phonology of the Slavic languages, 13). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Vermeer, Willem. 1982. “Raising of *ě and loss of the nasal feature in Slovene.” *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku Matice srpske* 25, 97–120.
- Vermeer, Willem. 1983. “The rise and fall of the Kajkavian vowel system.” *Studies in Slavic and general linguistics* 3, 439–77.

Amedeo Osti Guerrazzi. *The Italian Army in Slovenia: Strategies of Antipartisan Repression, 1941-1943*. Translated by Elizabeth Burke and Anthony Majanlahti. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. XIV + 196 pp., \$95 (hardcover). ISBN: 9781137281197.

Amedeo Osti Guerrazzi’s monograph, fluidly translated from Italian by Elizabeth Burke and Anthony Majanlahti, is a welcome addition to the rather sparse English-language scholarship on the behavior of the Italian military in occupied Slovenia. Guerrazzi’s work was preceded by a few