

Volatile borders, violated identities A process of cultural transition¹

Gregoria Manzin²

University of Melbourne, Australia

This brief paper will focus on a specific dilemma originated after World War II on the North-Eastern border of Italy. With the 1947 Paris Peace Treaty, the former Italian areas of Istria and Dalmatia were handed over to Tito's Yugoslavia.

Some 350.000 Italian citizens left their hometowns to move within Italy's new borders in order to maintain their national identity. They left their homes and entered Italy as "refugees": strangers in their own country, treated as strangers by fellow Italians. However, a small part of the Italian community in Istria and Dalmatia decided not to leave the area, becoming part of Tito's Socialist Yugoslavia.

The Istro-Dalmatian community as a whole became homeless: a new socio-political scenario for the ones who stayed; the same country but a new local reality and a different social status for the one who left; and a new deep borderline to divide in two opposite sides the members of a formerly united local society.

Giuliana Zelco and Nelida Milani – representatives of these two parties – raised their voices to call attention on an extremely contemporary issue: how deep can a geographical border cut into our concept of identity?

The short stories *Una terra nella pelle* and *L'osteria della Parenzana* will be object of this paper: with the means of textual analysis and the support of Jacques Derrida's theories and observations, I will underline the effects that such a political decision triggered on the sense of identity of the individuals involved in the process.

This paper is an extract from a chapter of my PhD thesis. The dissertation focuses on a specific dilemma originating on the North-Eastern border of Italy as a consequence of World War II. After the 1947 Paris Peace Treaty, which signed the end of the conflict between Italy and Yugoslavia, the former Italian areas of Istria and Dalmatia were handed over to Yugoslavia. Approximately 350,000 ethnic Italian citizens left their hometowns to move within Italy's new borders in order to maintain their national identity. They entered Italy as "refugees". A small part of the ethnic Italian community however decided not to leave the area, becoming part of Tito's Socialist Yugoslavia.

In this paper, I will focus on the work of two Istrian writers, Giuliana Zelco and Nelida Milani, who wrote mainly about the exodus of the ethnic Italian community from the

¹ This paper was presented to the Second Annual Rhizomes: Re-visioning Boundaries Conference of The School of Languages and Comparative Cultural Studies, The University of Queensland, in Brisbane, 24-25 February 2006.

² To contact the author of this article, write to her at g.manzin@pgrad.unimelb.edu.au.

Istrian peninsula. Both Istrian born, both children at the time of the events, Zelco's family is part of those 350.000 who left Istria (also known as andati, "gone"), whereas Milani's family stayed behind, in their hometown Pola (and is therefore part of the community of rimasti, "stayed")³. Giuliana Zelco and Nelida Milani raised their voices to call attention to an extremely contemporary issue: how deep can a geographical border cut into our concept of identity?

The intention of this paper is to examine a specific aspect of the process of identity construction undertaken by these two women through the means of autobiographical writing. The focus will be specifically set on one of the crucial elements unavoidably implied in the definition of one's identity, namely language. In this case, however, instead of considering their relationship with the Italian language, the attention will be concentrated on the authors' deep connection and emotive bond to the native Istrian dialect. In that area and at that specific time, dialect was in fact, definitely before standard Italian, the language of the community, the common code used by people in their daily life. Such analysis will be carried out through the textual analysis of two short stories: Zelco's "Una terra nella pelle" and Milani's "L'osteria della Parenzana"⁴. For the purpose of this study, it is essential here to spend some time identifying the key features that characterize the collections that these two short stories are part of.

First of all, it must be underlined that, although both stories deal with post-war events, the two collections they are part of have been published in a post-Yugoslavian context⁵. Precisely, Zelco's work was published in 2003 but includes stories written during an extended period of time, therefore the year of publication does not indicate the year of the original drafts. From a linguistic point of view, most of these stories are marked by a fragmented presence of Istrian dialect. There are various reasons behind this stylistic choice: in certain cases, words or sentences in dialect are justified by the lack of an appropriate translation in standard Italian; on other occasions dialect appears in dialogues, therefore this choice is motivated by an attempt to recount faithfully the conversations; other times dialect seems to be used to emphasize the writer's sense of displacement, precisely underlined by the impossibility, in her adulthood, to communicate in her native language. Zelco consistently signals the linguistic switch: dialect words or sentences are highlighted through the use of italics and the author always provides a translation in the form of a footnote.

Milani's story, on the other hand, is part of a collection published in 1994 in the form of a bilingual edition: all stories appear first in Italian and are subsequently followed by a

³ This terminology has been widely in use in the last decades within the area of studies on the post-World War II partition of the Julian March. A good example for the acceptance and use of this terminology even among English speaking scholars is Pamela Ballinger, History in Exile. Memory and Identity at the Borders of the Balkans, 1st ed. (Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2003). Ballinger identifies the andati or esuli as "those ethnic Italians who left" and the rimasti as "those who remained" (p. 1).

⁴ These short stories are part of the following collections: Giuliana Zelco, Lontani Segreti. Racconti, 1st ed. (Cornuda, TV: Grafiche Antiga, 2003), Nelida Milani, L'ovo Slossò/ Trulo Jaje, 1st ed. (Rijeka, Fiume: EDIT/ Durieux, 1994).

⁵ The Yugoslavian civil wars took place between 1991 and 1999, signing the end of the Social Republic of Yugoslavia.

translation in Serbo-Croatian. The original version is the one in Italian. Dialect dominates these stories. Contrary to Zelco, Milani does not anticipate graphically the linguistic switch, nor does she provide translations. Moreover, next to the massive presence of dialect, it is important to mention that the stories are characterized by a modest but consistent use of words or sentences in Serbo-Croatian and in this case too the code switch is never signaled formally, nor accompanied by a translation.

Within this specific ground (the textual analysis of the above mentioned stories), the method followed to conduct this study will refer to Jacques Derrida's work Monolingualism of the Other⁶. In this volume, pondering over some observations from Abdelkebir Khatibi's Du Bilinguisme, Derrida questions the univocal character generally attributed to language, as well as the nature of the language that we define "native", in relation to a second one. Even if the speaking subject might become proficient in this last one, this will always be "foreign", never comfortable as much as the mother tongue. Hence, in this specific case, the Istrian dialect will be considered as the mother tongue, whereas the role of the foreign language will be performed by Veneto dialect, the region where Zelco settled down, and by Serbo-Croatian, one of the official languages of former Yugoslavia.

This paper argues that the itinerary undertaken by the two authors starts in the first place with the process of re-thinking the past. Such a process leads to the delineation of a new locus, created and dedicated to the self in response to the initial questions. In this perspective, the investigation intends to underline the personal approaches that these writers adopt in order to face and manage the identity dilemma. As anticipated, the focus will be set on a single aspect involved in the process of identity construction: the writers' relationship with their native dialect. Zelco and Milani's use of the dialect in these two stories is a practical example of two different attempts to cope with such an issue. It will be illustrated how Zelco tends to relegate the dialect into the sphere of the past: a distinctive trait of a world she considers lost forever, still alive just in her memory. Standard Italian becomes the new register: although in the author's perspective it suffers from an emotive and evocative poorness, its neutrality grants her a possibility of detachment (a more constructive alternative to a first attempted annihilation), a necessary requirement for the construction of the new locus of identity mentioned before. Milani, on the other hand, although also conceiving dialect as a distinguishing element of the pre-war Istrian community, does not declare its death due to the deep changes in the socio-linguistic scenario. Dialect still maintains its formative character. Despite being forced to learn and subsequently officially adopt a new language, dialect is still a daily practice. In her story, it is the language of memory, but also one (next to Serbo-Croatian) of everyday communication. Milani does not erase dialect from her present (the socio-linguistic milieu allows her not to) but dialect definitely loses its univocal character: reality becomes shaped through multiple linguistic codes. Communication, and writing, will be performed through various linguistic channels.

⁶ Jacques Derrida, Monolingualism of the Other; or, the Prothesis of Origin, trans. Patrick Mensah, Cultural Memory in the Present, ed. Mieke Bal and Hent de Vries, 1st ed. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).

After this general overview, it is now useful to delineate more specifically the methodological parameters, in order to place correctly the primary material object of investigation within the critical frame previously suggested. Let us therefore move towards the core of this analysis by firstly considering a specific passage from Derrida's work, in which the French philosopher measures and comments on some crucial elements of Khatibi's observations on the native language:

If [...] there is no such thing as *the* language, if there is no such thing as absolute monolingualism, one still has to define what a mother tongue is in its active division, and what is transplanted between this language and the one called foreign. What is transplanted and lost there, belonging neither to the one nor the other: the incommunicable.

Of bi-language, in its effects of speech and writing.

[...] "Active division." That, perhaps, is why one writes and how one dreams of writing. And that is why there are two motivations instead of one, a single reason but a reason wrought by the said 'division,' that is why in always doing that one recollects, one troubles oneself, one goes in search of history and filiation. In this place of jealousy, in this place that is divided between vengeance and resentment [*ressentiment*], in this body fascinated by its own "division," before any other memory, writing destines itself, as if acting on its own, to anamnesia.

Even if it forgets it, writing still summons this memory, it summons itself in this way, it summons itself from memory⁷.

The "active division" mentioned by Khatibi becomes, in the perspective of this study, the one between the native Istrian dialect and the language the two writers were exposed to within their new social milieus. Derrida observes that this very "division" is the link between writing and the process of recollection and, for this reason, writing and memory are strictly connected to one another.

This tight relation is clearly present in both short stories under examination. Within the specificity of the narrative space, Milani and Zelco deal with the world of the past. A world that is implicitly connoted as "lost": since the historical events changed drastically the socio-political asset of the area, that world of the past, the Istrian society of the years before World War II, does not exist anymore.

In Zelco's short story "Una terra nella pelle", an innocuous hike in the mountains in the company of some friends becomes the triggering factor for a comparison between the magnificence of the mountains of Veneto, imposingly dominated by the colour grey, and the radiance of the Istrian scenery of the author's childhood, clearly marked by the fierce blue of the Mediterranean sea and by the red colour of the Istrian soil. The contrast between the two settings induces the writer to ponder over her condition of "stranger", stirred up even more remarkably by her companions' use of their native dialect. Precisely referring to the linguistic displacement, Zelco informs the reader of her earlier prolonged attempt at annihilation with the intent to generate an empty space destined for the

⁷ Derrida, Monolingualism of the Other. Pp. 7-8.

creation of a new identity. This destructive strategy aimed to finally find an appropriate collocation within the hosting society, overcoming the sensation of extraneousness that characterized her relationship with her new surrounding social environment. In order to achieve this, Zelco imposed on herself the use of the local dialect, the dialect of Veneto:

Ho tentato faticosamente di annullarmi [...] e di ricrearmi nuova per il luogo che mi accoglieva, ma mi sono sempre sentita spostata, inventata. Mi ero imposta di adeguare parole atteggiamenti e mentalità al paese di adozione per non essere *foresta*. Non ci sono riuscita. E non per colpa loro che fanno parte della mia nuova vita [...]. Ci legano, in verita', simpatia, stima e affetto profondo, ma non posso domandar loro: "*Ti te ricordi?*"⁸

("With great effort, I have tried to annihilate myself [...] and then create a new self, appropriate to the place that embraced me. However, I have always felt displaced, invented. I had forced myself to adapt to the words, the mentality and the attitudes of the region that adopted me, in order to not be a *foreigner* [in Istrian dialect]. I did not succeed. And it is not the responsibility of the ones who are part of my new life [...]. In truth, we are linked by sympathy, respect and deep affection. Nevertheless, I cannot ask them: "*Do you remember?*" [in Istrian dialect])

She admits her failure: "Non ci sono riuscita" ("I did not succeed"). This whole story revolves around the contrast between two different questions, which is actually a *single* question expressed in two different dialects: "do you remember?".

The significance of the link between writing and memory signaled by Jacques Derrida has already been noted above: "Writing still summons this memory" he wrote, namely the memory of the "active division" mentioned by Khatibi. That division is the one between mother tongue and foreign language that irrefutably calls for a loss in the difficult process of transition from one code to the other. It is precisely this loss that is re-qualified as the "incommunicable" in Khatibi's text: it is something that finds no form of expression, because there is no linguistic code - other than the mother tongue - capable of translating accurately all the semantic layers implicated within the original. This paper argues that it is exactly this "incommunicable" that leads Zelco to fluctuate between these two edges, namely the dialect spoken in the region where she now lives, and the one she learnt when she was a child. Her attempts to transplant herself into the "foreign" language fail, but at the same time cultivating her primordial idiom generates a deep sense of isolation. Neither of these two options seems to grant her that yearned for harmony. She is alone in her condition: expatriated from her land, this very experience separates her also from the people who still speak the Istrian dialect in the native village. Hence the fragmented nature of her use of the dialect in the short story, as well as her choice to provide a translation into the common standard code, Italian, the national language: neutral because it eliminates such regional contrasts, but also perceived by Zelco as poorer for its lack of evocative nature, when compared to her native dialect.

⁸ Zelco, Lontani Segreti. Pp. 37-38.

Dialect is therefore recognized as an element that signals both a sense of belonging to a certain community as well as, on a wider extent, to a specific culture. Zelco explicitly comments on this matter in the story. After climbing up a mountain track during a trip with her husband and some friends, the group finally reaches the top of the slope where solitary stands the *casera*⁹ (term in Veneto dialect that designates a typical alpine building used for summer housing or for stabling), the destination of the walk. Relaxing and recovering from the effort of the ascent, Zelco listens to the conversation amongst her friends. The reader does not actually witness the dialogues among the members of the party, but the attention is called on a recurrent line that holds together the conversations during the trip: “*Te ricorditu?*”¹⁰ (Veneto dialect for “do you remember”). These words echo in the writer’s mind the same question in her own dialect. The decision to report this line in its original form, namely Veneto dialect, strongly underlines the sense of estrangement raised by the question itself. Zelco reveals her attempts to learn and speak this language in order to feel part of the community. It is her personal choice, not one imposed on her by the surrounding social milieu. However, if she has acquired the skills to master this register, some phonetic difficulties still resuscitate in her a sense of “not belonging”. The peculiarity of this linguistic form resides in fact in its naturalness: its sounds have accompanied the child from the very moment of its birth, “*certe consonanti aspirate o altre che sembrano uscire dalle viscere, bisogna succhiarle con il latte materno*”¹¹ (“certain fricative consonants or others, which seem to come out from your guts, have to be sucked together with the maternal milk”). Those few words pronounced in the local dialect hold an implicit set of references to shared habits, some of which are alluded to through the traditional recipes mentioned in the story and that mark particular moments of the year or special occasions, assuming therefore the form of a ceremony. In this story, Zelco’s companions share a dish of “*polenta e formai sul tec*”¹² (Veneto dialect for “polenta and cheese melted in a pot”).

Both the use of Veneto dialect and the rite of consuming this traditional recipe, remind the writer of episodes of her own past. Zelco reflects on the ritual meaning of the gesture: the present is connected to the past through an imaginary bridge represented by the food consumed. The food, the grey colour of Veneto’s soil (opposed to the typical red colour of the Istrian one), and the dialect, trigger a reaction that leads her to withdraw into her own thoughts to find herself in the sphere of the past: in Istria again. As the landscape constitutes a first bridge from the present to the past, the question that scans her companions’ conversations - *te ricorditu?* - stresses the sense of isolation of the author, whose attempts to express herself in the “foreign dialect”, even if linguistically correct, emphasize even more deeply the absence of a shared physical and emotional territory behind the words. Hence the linguistic switch into her own maternal code - *ti te ricordi?*: filtered through the native dialect, also traditional culinary habits find their “translation”. The ceremonial act is not performed through the tasting of “*polenta e formai sul tec*”, like in Veneto. In the world of her memory, the ritual is emblemized in the figure of her grandfather, the mighty patriarch, who discloses the secrets of the odours and flavours of

⁹ Zelco, *Lontani Segreti*. P. 31.

¹⁰ Zelco, *Lontani Segreti*. P. 32, 34 and 37.

¹¹ Zelco, *Lontani Segreti*. P. 33.

¹² Zelco, *Lontani Segreti*. P. 34.

the Istrian seasons by declaring “*El xe bon*”¹³ (Istrian dialect for “It is good”). It is the ham from Visignano, Zelco’s hometown, whose memory has been recalled by the observation of the writer’s friends, intensely dedicated to consuming their traditional dish. The author moves then to recall the moment she retrieved that lost flavour for the first time after decades, and compares it to a hallucinogenic drug that is able to conduct her into the realm of the lost past¹⁴.

However – and here is Derrida’s reference to Khatibi’s observations – all these correspondences are not able to translate completely the nature of the sensations evoked by the elements spread through this story. Essentially, this would require a community that is able to refer back to the same source, in order to feel simultaneously the connection that binds together odours, flavours, sounds, colours and the landscape. The writer can appreciate those elements in their individuality but does not succeed in penetrating the allusive tones of their choral manifestation. They were not part of her “*prime essenze della vita*”¹⁵ (“first essences of life”). This expression incorporates therefore a whole world that the writer is not able to bring back to life, given the isolation in which she is immersed. This last factor stands as an impediment to the allusive and evocative tones symbolically synthesized in the dialect. Hence Zelco’s decision to signal words and sentences in dialect through the use of italics, which are then accompanied by footnotes with the respective linguistic translations: this choice underlines both her personal perception of the dialect as a lost mode of communication - the language of a lost community - as well as a form of acknowledgment towards her public, who is not necessarily familiar with the dialect of Veneto and the Istrian area.

Quite different is the situation experienced by Milani. The narrative voice does not find itself isolated nor pulled out of the native context. However, this same context is changing and the number of linguistic stimuli the people are exposed to is now increasing. This situation generates a form of confusion, caused by the foreign element that suddenly affects the previous stability. Milani advises the reader at the beginning of the story that life has been quite heavily influenced by the changes introduced by the *dobrodošli*¹⁶ (Serbo-Croatian for “welcome”). The penetration of an extraneous element has therefore been perceived and so have its effects. Nevertheless, the reader witnesses the first attempts at co-existence, which mark a contrast to the isolation experienced by Zelco caused not only by a necessary switch of the linguistic code, but also by a full and sudden immersion into a completely foreign scenario. Specifically this last situation is addressed by Zelco when she refers to the *prime essenze della vita*, whose lack she perceives in the new “humus” of the soil of the hosting region.

The importance of these earliest stimuli is recognized and signaled in Milani’s story as well, although these reflections are not the result of an extensive narrative meditation. In fact, in contrast to the slow tempo of Zelco’s prose, Milani’s narration proceeds hectically with sudden changes to the point of view that disorient the reader because, as

¹³ Zelco, *Lontani Segreti*. P. 36.

¹⁴ Zelco, *Lontani Segreti*. P. 35.

¹⁵ Zelco, *Lontani Segreti*. P. 37.

¹⁶ Milani, *L'ovo Slosso/ Trulo Jaje*. P. 65.

anticipated, the linguistic switches are not explicitly introduced nor formally indicated. The author shifts perspective, following the stream of thoughts of the narrative voice. As a consequence, the reflections of the writing subject become merged with the ones of the other characters. Despite this difference in the stylistic approach, Milani does not elude to value the determining power of this environment in shaping the narrative voice's identity:

Io stessa sono fatta di quei misteri, di quelle parole, di quegli insegnamenti così poco ortodossi simili a doni avuti un po' qua un po' là in osteria tra decimi di bianco da elargizioni gratuite e dallo spirito di osservazione e se esiste una sostanza che i fioi ricevono nei primi anni, alla quale poi ci si richiama tutta la vita e non ci si libera più, per me quella sostanza è là, nell'osteria della Parenzana, ed è quella sostanza a decidere ciò che mi attira o mi respinge nella gente che mi capita d'incontrare¹⁷.

("I am myself made of those mysteries, those words, those so little orthodox lessons, similar to gifts gained here and there in the tavern between quarters of white wine as selfless donations and a spirit of observation. And if a substance exists that children [in Istrian dialect] receive in their first years, a substance to which one calls back for the rest of his life, which one cannot get rid of, for me that substance is to be found there, in Parenzana's tavern, and it is that substance that decides what I am attracted to or what I reject in the people I happen to meet.")

The sostanza evoked here by Milani includes therefore also the sense of disorientation resulting from the dramatic loss of the original community. Even if integrated by the new arrivals, some essential ingredients have gone missing and their replacement has been paid through a sense of confusion that has mutated the essence of existence, marking it with a constant sensation of absence.

In summary, it seems that Zelco's sense of isolation generates an attempt to restore a form of communication that has to be linguistically expressed through the mode of standard Italian. This language is in fact perceived as neutral: even if less evocative when compared to dialect, it represents a valid alternative to the idiom that characterizes a world still existent only in her memory. Zelco's use of language seems to underline therefore a choice that systematically separates the present from the past. The native dialect is isolated within the realm of memory, and standard Italian becomes its natural substitute – poorer in evocative tone but free from any sense of loss and isolation. Paradoxically, the failure of her native dialect allows the writer to establish a less limited communicative channel for her writing. Through the use of standard Italian, her prose surmounts the confined perimeter of a specific audience, granting an extended validity to her message that can be accessed by a wider readership.

On the other hand, the multi-ethnic character of Milani's prose - which mixes standard Italian, dialect and Serbo-Croatian - seems to suggest the desire not just to open a generic

¹⁷ Milani, *L'ovo Slosso/ Trulo Jaje*. P. 71.

channel of communication, but rather to renew a quite specific one. This choice might indeed signal the wish to renovate the contact with that part of community whose absence has never stopped to overbear the existence of the ones who decided to stay on the other side of the borderline. In other words, these stories seem to express also an attempt to create a bridge between the communities of the andati and rimasti, in order to restore a relationship lost at the moment of the exodus. However, in her attempt, Milani does not elude to underline the difficulties experienced by the ethnic Italians who stayed behind.

The relevance of Khatibi's "active division" mentioned by Derrida is to be found, in this case, in what Milani defines as the sostanza. It is a mix of mysteries and words that need to be expressed in their original form, whichever this one is. Yet here, instead of concentrating on the negative aspect of such a situation - the quid that can get lost in the process of transition between two codes, Milani seems able to reverse the point of view, starting to consider the vividness resulting from the co-existence of multiple codes. Even if generating initial confusion and disorientation, that very linguistic mayhem slowly becomes familiar and introduces itself within the new locus of identity. Dialect loses its original univocality but Milani does not find herself isolated, since the *whole* ethnic Italian community comes to face the diffused presence and intensification of the variety of linguistic stimuli in the area.

It is crucial here to be reminded of the fact that "L'osteria della Parenzana" is part of a collection published in a bilingual edition and that the lack of translation for the words and sentences in Istrian dialect is a mark of Milani's style. Such a choice represents adequately the journey covered by the writer: one in which the "new essences of life" - in contrast to Zelco's "first essences of life" - starts to take position next to the original ones. It is true that these new elements have proved their inability to erase the memory of their originals, but they do seem to succeed in constructing a new scenario whose key word becomes co-existence, shaping the ground for a re-negotiation of identity.

In summary, the reader witnesses here two different approaches to the language matter in the writers' attempts to forge a new locus of identity. Let us now move back for an instant to Derrida, in order to draw the conclusions of this analysis. The French philosopher questions his readers on the nature of identity:

What is identity, this concept of which the transparent identity to itself is always dogmatically presupposed by so many debates on monoculturalism or multiculturalism, nationality, citizenship, and, in general, belonging? And before the identity of the subject, what is *ipseity*? The latter is not reducible to an abstract capacity to say "I", which it will always have preceded. Perhaps it signifies, in the first place, the power of an "I can", which is more originary than the "I" [...] ¹⁸.

Obviously, the short stories examined in this paper do not reflect the process of identity construction in its whole entirety; rather they represent instances of the first step of such a process. In the light of Derrida's reflections, this paper suggests that the reader has

¹⁸ Derrida, Monolingualism of the Other. P. 14.

observed here an attempt towards defining the writers' ipseity, which has to be considered a pre-requisite in order to move forward along the identity journey.

In conclusion, Milani and Zelco's linguistic choices exemplify two different approaches to this issue: on one hand, Milani's writing is shaped through an assertive claim for the power of that "I can" mentioned by Derrida. As illustrated, her prose embodies the linguistic hybridism of post-war Istria. Milani's language seems to perform a lunge into the multicultural and multiethnic reality of the area. Dialect becomes therefore just one plug of the linguistic mosaic displayed through her prose. On the other hand, Zelco's narrative world seems to be frozen in the past. Past images are vivid in her mind, but the narrative space, arising from the realm of memory, is contained within a static sphere: the past is congealed by historic determination and so are all the main elements enclosed in this lost world. Dialect becomes, in this perspective, the language of memory, dramatically anchored to a past that still torments the writer. It is drenched with an evocative power that fails to grant the writer that essential detachment necessary in order to mould a new locus of identity. Memory will not be silenced - the attempt at annihilation has been discarded - but as the language of memory, dialect acquires a fragmented character that cannot absolve the task of everyday communication. Hence the choice to resort to standard Italian: neutral, therefore also considered more arid, but certainly less invested in reminiscent power. In light of this, the power of an "I can" is to be recognized, in Zelco's case, in her decision to opt for a linguistic register that is evidently less aligned to her past: a step towards that detachment that is the premise for the construction of a new locus of identity.

Works cited

Ballinger, Pamela. History in Exile. Memory and Identity at the Borders of the Balkans.

1st ed. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Derrida, Jacques. Monolingualism of the Other; or, the Prothesis of Origin.

Monoligualisme de l'autre, ou, La Prothèse d'origine (1996). Trans. Patrick Mensah. Cultural Memory in the Present. Ed. Mieke Bal and Hent de Vries. 1st ed. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Milani, Nelida. L'ovo Slossso/ Trulo Jaje. 1st ed. Rijeka, Fiume: EDIT/ Durieux, 1994.

Zelco, Giuliana. Lontani Segreti. Racconti. 1st ed. Cornuda, TV: Grafiche Antiga, 2003.