

## REVIEWS

**Drago Kunej, Urša Šivic.** *Trapped in Folklore? Studies in Music and Dance Tradition and Their Contemporary Transformations* (= *Musikethnologie* 7). Zurich: LIT. 222 pp., \$44.95 (cloth). ISBN 978-3-643-90232-0.

Questions dealing with folk traditions once they have been “preserved” and described are as old as folklore itself. The publication *Trapped in Folklore?* consists of ten articles presented at the international interdisciplinary symposium *What to Do with Folklore?* (Ljubljana 2009). The authors represent (non)entrapment in folklore in various ways; the topics discussed are diverse, ranging from instrumental and vocal music to dance to recordings.

The first article describes the bagpipe tradition within the well-known concept of the Hungarian folkdance event known as the *táncház*. The actors in this musical culture are classified as musicians, researchers, and manufacturers (“doers,” “knowers,” and “makers”), and the authors Zoltán Szabó and Katalin Juhász show how the marginalized bagpipe tradition establishes its place within Hungarian folk music, known for its combination of tradition and creativity. Based on his research among villagers from Primož pri Ljubnem in northern Slovenia, David Verbuč explores types of performance events with an emphasis on everyday and celebratory activities in contrast to staged performances. The author argues that the first two types of activities (which are often mistaken for “inauthentic” because of their openness to modernization) include both individually therapeutic and socially connective functions, and at the same time emphasizes the difference between textual and contextual research approaches. After briefly discussing the popularity of Balkan music in Slovenia, Urša Šivic focuses on the phenomenon of Serbian Balkan brass bands in Slovenia. Comparing the repertoires and performances of such bands with the “original” Serbian ones, mostly those at the Guča festival,

the author outlines the differences between the “original” Balkan and Slovenian Balkan bands, while tracing the understanding of “ours” and “theirs” in the context of Slovenian brass bands.

Liz Mellish and Nick Green present two different folk dance traditions: the Romanian *căluș* and English Morris. The revival of each practice depends on the specific historical background of the country in question. The differences between the two dance practices are discussed through the history of research, today’s state of performance, and the possible courses of future development of these traditions, and the authors argue that the images of these traditions depend on two specific factors: “ideas of ‘respect’ from the wider community and the role of ‘creativity.’” A comparison of musical practices, this time women’s practices of Kosovo and Slovenia, is also discussed by Alma Bejtullahu. She focuses on some common turning points in the histories of these two countries, and shows how they “appeared to have similar effect on both societies, [even though] they occurred at different points in time” and how practices such as singing and instrumental music, the tamboura in Slovenia, or the *çifteli* (a stringed instrument) in Kosovo, followed different paths of modernization and urbanization. Similarly, the folk event known as *revena* in Vojvodina (Serbia) is discussed through the past and present. The author Selena Rakočević first describes the history, and then her participant observation at one of the events. In a strict patriarchal society, the exclusively female practice of *revena* was one of the few opportunities for women to act outside the limits imposed on their behavior. Based on her observation of such an event in the village of Taraš, the author describes the celebration in detail, citing the musical repertoire and specific customs, and finally argues that the theatrical manifestations of the *revena* should be understood as a sort of “inverted reproduction of repressive everyday reality.”

The focus of the article by Zlata Marjanović is the tune “Još Hrvatska ni propala” (Croatia Has Not Yet Fallen; lyrics: Ljudevit Gaj; music: Ferdo Livadić) and its many versions (sometimes with a completely different meaning and function) in Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia, and Montenegro. Ljudevit Gaj took his inspiration from folk music (supposedly Polish), and therefore the tune “arrived as folklorism but it became a part of folklore.”

Rebeka Kunej investigates old gramophone records as a (comparative) resource for folkdance research. In case of the recordings by the Hoyer Trio in the first half of the twentieth century in the U.S., their role was not only musical; they were also a “tool of bringing back the memories of the hearth at home.” At the time, they were also played in Slovenia and they even predate the first Slovenian field recordings of instrumental folkdance music. Old recordings are also the topic of the last two articles. Drago Kunej discusses early sound recordings as scholarly resources,

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 \**ǝ* 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 \**ǝ* lowered, so \**ǝ* merged with \**e*. In eastern Haloze and in Kajkavian dialects, *jat* raised later, so that by the time \**ǝ* 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

recent strong surveys, such as James H. Burgwyn's 2005 study *Empire on the Adriatic* and Davide Rodogno's 2006 translated work *Fascism's European Empire*, yet none of them focused specifically on occupied Slovenia. The distinction is critical, for in comparison to occupied Croatia, for example, where "the Italian soldiers were able to recall their defense of the ethnic minorities with pride" (121), they remained largely mum on the atrocious war crimes that were committed in Slovenia. Indeed, this is a central theme in Guerrazzi's work—how to explain the massive chasm separating the reputation (and myth) of the "*bono taliano*" (good Italian) during the Second World War from the cold-blooded killings perpetrated against civilians as an official antipartisan strategy in Slovenia. That this subject is not merely the preserve of isolated scholarly exchange is evident in Guerrazzi's final chapter ("Memory and Oblivion"), where he traces the reluctance of both Italian officials and the public to come to terms with the shameful conduct of their army and especially its commanders in Slovenia, clinging instead to the outdated "good Italian" caricature, or even worse, seeing themselves solely as the war's victims.

It wasn't meant to be this way, as Guerrazzi reveals in his opening chapter "The Annexion." "Italian conduct, in this early phase," Guerrazzi reminds us, "was marked by a certain moderation" (22). Under the guidance of civilian administrators, the Italians offered their newly annexed so-called Province of Ljubljana "cultural and linguistic autonomy" (22), which although intended to Italianize the population in the long-run was still far less harsh than the brutal behavior of the occupying Germans, who were attempting in the summer of 1941 to deport a third of their Slovene population. Yet Guerrazzi devotes only a few pages to this "honeymoon stage" in Italy's illegal occupation and annexation of Slovene territory, as it had already been largely derailed by the autumn of 1941 with the emergence of armed Slovene resistance in the form of the Liberation Front (OF – Osvobodilna fronta). In fact, Mario Robotti, the commander of the Italian Eleventh Army Corps, which was assigned occupation duties in Slovenia, insisted that the hostile Slovene population *was taking advantage* of the "slackness and tolerance that has produced the phrase *bono taliano*" (27). By September 1941 the death penalty had been declared for "those responsible for attacks and those who had taken part in subversive meetings or assemblies or were in possession of anti-Italian propaganda material" (28) and the military had taken over from civilian authorities exclusive control of all antipartisan operations.

With this passing of the torch (or rifle), Guerrazzi's work enters the meaty and most rewarding phase—the attempt (and failure) by the Italian Second Army and its Eleventh Army Corps to stamp out Partisan activity by relying almost exclusively on draconian military measures. Through the close examination of Italian archival sources, Guerrazzi chronicles the spiraling violence in the three following chapters beginning in the autumn

of 1941 and ending with the orgy of violence that was the Italian summer offensive (June–September 1942). Somewhat confusingly, Guerrazzi decided to entitle some of his chapters after the leaders of the Italian Second Army; Chapters 2 and 3 are named after Vittorio Ambrosio and Mario Roatta respectively, while chapter 5 is entitled Gambara, after Gastone Gambara, who takes over the command of the Eleventh Army Corps in December 1942. The tenure of these commanders, with the possible exception of Gambara's return to a relatively passive antipartisan strategy, were not that distinctive and the book could have been better subdivided using actual events and chronologies specific to the antipartisan struggle in Slovenia, such as chapter 4's ("Summer 1942") coverage of the Italian summer offensive. Moreover, awarding Ambrosio, Roatta, and Gambara with chapters begs the question of why Robotti, who had his fingers more deeply imbedded (and for longer) in the antipartisan fight than any other Italian military official, did not deserve his own chapter.

However, these reservations are mostly optical and do not detract from Guerrazzi's well-researched explanation for what he sardonically refers to as the "exceptional case" (xii) of Italian brutality in Slovenia. To debunk this presumed exceptionalness, Guerrazzi takes the long view of Italian experiences in counter-insurgency tactics. In his introduction, Guerrazzi surveys the horrific reprisals against civilians in Libya and Ethiopia prior to World War II, where the aim was to terrorize the population into rejecting resistance, resulting in some 100,000 and 500,000 victims respectively (3). Not only did some of the key military figures in occupied Slovenia cut their teeth in these African campaigns, but the Italian' overall antipartisan policy against "racially inferior" and hostile Slavs—favored themes in Fascist propaganda—was copied from Libya and Ethiopia, including "devastating villages, burning houses, and shooting and deporting civilians" (17). Guerrazzi also highlights the poor caliber of the Italian military and especially its higher officers. The latter were rigidly stratified and denied lower-ranking officers the operational flexibility to suppress insurgency that was adopted by the Wehrmacht. Poorly schooled in antiguerrilla campaigns, the Italian military command assumed until 1939 that the next war would be a "trench war" like the last (9). As for weaponry, the Italian army was also largely unprepared to fight a guerilla-style war, lacking vehicles for rapid deployment and armed primarily with rifles and hand grenades. When faced with an enemy that did not dig into trenches, but rather moved lightly across a land they knew well, struck Italian patrols and garrisons with deadly effect with the few submachine guns they possessed, and then blended into the civilian population, the Italians could only respond with clumsy brutality. Guerrazzi offers numerous documented cases of Partisans slipping out of poorly planned Italian dragnets. Often unable to catch, let alone neutralize, the OF insurgency, Italian soldiers took their frustrations out on civilians who frequently had only the faintest

connection to the resistance. In the numerous orders he provides as evidence, including Roatta's infamous March 1942 Circular 3C, which mandated a scorched earth policy, the taking of hostages, and the widespread arrest and internment of civilians (especially those capable of supporting the resistance) in concentration camps, Guerrazzi reveals that such behavior was in most cases officially sanctioned by Italian commanders. While Guerrazzi notes that such policies were also practiced by the Nazis, Russians, and other armies (49–50), he contends that the Italian military's particular inability to strike surgically against resisters helped contribute to their viciousness against those they could apprehend—that is, civilians. Guerrazzi's larger point, which he repeats several times throughout his work (for example on pages 54 and 87), is that the shooting and arrest of civilians and the burning of homes was not “hot” violence committed in the thick of battle against guerillas with civilians as unfortunate collateral damage. This was “cold” violence, often committed well after engagements with the guerillas or failed raids. As Guerrazzi notes, “This was simply planned violence, against all the rules of war, and ordered from above” (54).

While Guerrazzi provides a thorough and well-documented exploration of the brutality of the Italian military in occupied Slovenia, he telescopes his analysis largely to the most violent one-year span from September 1941 to September 1942. His study largely ignores the less violent “shoulder” periods from April to September 1941 and especially the last year of the Italian occupation from September 1942 to September 1943. Chapter 5 (“Gambara”), which covers Gambara's tenure as commander of the Eleventh Army Corps from December 1942 to the capitulation, is only five pages long, essentially a quick summary of the return to the tried-and-failed policy of fragmenting Italian forces among numerous garrisons and the abandonment of the more aggressive search-and-destroy missions that had characterized much of 1942. Just because there were “no large-scale actions to be remembered, no great victories or heavy defeats” in the final year of the occupation does not mean that the period does not deserve more attention (119). Indeed, Guerrazzi briefly notes that the Italian occupation was increasingly “Slovenicized” in this later period (115), as the Italians came to rely more heavily on the *Milizia volontaria anti comunista* (MVAC)—a Slovene antipartisan collaborating formation which had been established during the Italian summer offensive. Yet the MVAC, despite the important role they played in antipartisan repression and the overall development of what was already by 1943 a civil war between resisters and collaborators, is first mentioned only in the final twenty pages of the book (112). In addition to the MVAC, the Slovene Chetniks—which are not mentioned at all in the book—also established relations with the Italians which allowed them to pursue the Partisans unmolested by the Italians. The resistance is also treated too much as a monolithic organization. There is

little attempt to distinguish between the OF and the non-communist led, albeit weaker and unarmed, resistance groups in Slovenia, especially in the first-year of the occupation. The *varnostna obveščevalna služba* (VOS) is obscurely referred to as “a partisan organization” (66), rather than as the armed security and intelligence wing of the Communist party of Slovenia. The OF also suffered far more dramatically from Italian antipartisan policies than Guerrazzi is willing to admit, and the organization was largely incapacitated (temporarily) by the Italian summer offensive. Guerrazzi’s reluctance to better explain the complexity of the Slovene response to the Italian occupation by resisters, collaborators, and accommodators, leaves the Slovenes as somewhat faceless actors in the dynamic relationship that often develops between the occupied and the occupier. On a final editing note, while the book reads wonderfully in English, the two maps of the Province of Ljubljana on page 137 contains a confusing array of Slovene, Italian and a few undecipherable place names that would have been better represented had only one of the languages (preferably Slovene) been consistently applied.

These concerns, however, are largely sins of omission, and resistance and collaboration in Slovenia have admittedly been covered in many studies by Slovene and non-Slovene historians. As for his stated goal that is encapsulated in his title—explaining the Italian Army’s strategies of antipartisan repression in occupied Slovenia—Guerrazzi’s work succeeds admirably and should become its authoritative text. On a wider level, Guerrazzi’s study of Italian-occupied Slovenia is a must-read for anyone interested in memory studies and a critical addition to the growing literature that is reassessing the decades-old image of the “good Italian.” Confronted with Robotti’s 3 August 1942 statement that “we must begin to create a greater terror than that provoked by the rebels” (98), this antiquated one-sided perception must surely crumble.

*Gregor Kranjc, Brock University*