

Što, Kaj, Ča (Kajkavian Part of the System: Narration)

Emilija Kovač
Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb

Abstract

The paper investigated the relation between the modern and the traditional discourses in the area that is geographically determined as an outskirts and in which (more) affirmative aptness to tradition is taken for granted. The dynamics of generational and area/sociological (dis)continuities lead to multiple cultural gaps, which in turn generates new ways of shaping both the cultural environment and the ways of distinctive performances within it. The Kajkavian artistic expression has been shaped as (post)modern and current in terms of poetics although it frequently appears to be subdued and tacit within the works of the Croatian literature. By means of a comparative-analytical method, the paper detected the forms of correlations of the relevant part of the recent Kajkavian production with both the traditional and the modern discourse types.

Key words: *imagology; intermediality; postmodern; tradition*

Introduction: Positioning of Corpus

Dealing with Kajkavian themes usually raises the question of purely personal state of consciousness and responsibility for the local spiritual entity. The conditions of the postmodern context have – by means of the system decentralization concept – worked to a significant extent in favour of the Kajkavian discourse, as well as in favour of all other “edge” and marginal themes; however, the decentralization and especially the valorisation decomposition of the compulsory traditional hierarchy system have resulted in a state of a noticeably apathetic aesthetics of the criticism discourse.¹ The

¹ Regarding that the literary criticism has almost disappeared and that culture in the media has been boiled down to spectacle and “stage”, there is no one who could say that even in the (auto)biographic texts the text is more important than the biography. Thus it is not important any more if one has a different life (i.e. surviving Holocaust or a gulag, taking part in the Croatian War of Independence or belonging in any sense to the privileged social class), experiences some strange adventures, makes some great things for the mankind or simply has more brains than luck, but one has to produce a quality text (Pintarić, 2011).

current practices of promotion and advertising strategies, which in majority of cases overpower the competent valorisation, tune up the courses of literary production to the ideology of the market. An alternative to that are some enclaves surviving through some institutional framework and its internal regulations (i.e. contests) and very commonly through completely personal strength of belief.

This is why the existing Kajkavian production, which is considerably voluminous and exceeds the reception, features a marginal place in terms of valorisation and, in most cases, it is not properly incorporated into the national framework as a whole.

Despite the problems, one of which is the domination of scepticism and problematizing of the given categories (equally in the realms of *techne* and *virtu*, i.e. in aesthetics and ethics), due to which it is valorisationally and methodologically hard to keep the aesthetic premises relatively stable and thus the system seems to be quite incoherent, the goal is to systematize the Kajkavian production gradually by means of establishing some sort of quantifying parameters of the current state and bring them in the course of time into a position paralleling other out-of-the matrix systems.

Notes on Narrative Kajkavian Production

As it is considered that the narrative element of the literary corpus adds special weight and testifies to the maturity of the literary expression,² several narrative works respectable in terms of aesthetics and valorisation are going to be assessed in the central part of the research. There are not many voluminous narrative works and the reason for that can be found in the demanding conditions of entering and surviving in the market that is neither large nor particularly active.³

Miroslav Šicel in *Antologija hrvatske kratke priče* [Anthology of Croatian Short Story], points out the equality of the Štokavian standard and the dialects as fully rightful literary languages *in order to be understood definitely that these are literary languages whose literary and artistic scopes and abilities are fully equal to the Štokavian literary language standard* (Šicel, 2001, p. 17); he thus included a few works written in local idioms.

It was precisely because of the wide scope and the inability to frame the format of the anthology with some clearly defined coordinates and because of the wish to obtain a full scope of presenting that the basic choice criterion was, as the author put it, the literary history assessment that is yet to be followed by the aesthetic merits. This is why the anthology includes those stories first that marked the writers or the epoch in which they were published and may feature less artistic values than the stories having not entered the anthology (Šicel, 2001, p. 9).

As to the Kajkavian writers, there are Božica Brkan (*Kak su trojica pesmu nosili* [How the Three of Them Carried a Tune]), Mijo Kelečić (*Buvas, Semenjak i radio: Pripovest o*

²“At the moment when these novels appeared, the situation was about to change significantly.”(Radaković, 2013). The remark relates to the Čakavian literature which is still without a relevant prose work. The remark is quoted in the function of the narrative as a valorization parameter and a part of the system.

³“It is really discouraging to publish a novel of some 300 to 400 pages and you know in advance that the novel will not be distributed and will not be read etc.” (Radaković, 2013).

pesu, kokotu i radiju [Buvas, Semenjak and Radio: The Story of a Dog, a Rooster and a Radio]) and Denis Peričić (*Fantažija o leksikografu* [A Fantasy about a Lexicographer]). As to the Čakavian writers, there are Miljenko Smoje (*Nevirni kompanjo* [The Unfaithful Comrade], *Uncut nad uncutima* [The Rascal]), and Tomislav Milohanić (*Igraduri u kažuunu* [The Card Players in a Stone Cottage]).

The First (Genuine) Kajkavian Novel (Željko Funda, *Ljudeki* [The Mighty People])

Until Funda's novel, the first novel to have been considered Kajkavian one was *Adolf iliti kakvi su ljudi* [Adolf or What People Are] by Jakob Lovrenčić (published in 1833).⁴ Although there is a restraint towards regarding it as extraordinary,⁵ the novel is referred to (translated) as such and that suggests the problematic valorisation of *Požeški dijak Miroslav Kraljević* [The Student Miroslav Kraljević of Požega] published in 1863, 30 years after *Adolf* (Peričić, 2003). It is considered to have been the first Croatian novel and, despite occasional re-assessments, it has remained as such in the current canonical literary history references. Due to the mentioned doubts and especially due to the *translated* attribution, which are relevant in terms of valorisation, until the assessment of *Adolf* has been revised (which has not been done yet), *The Mighty People* will be referred to as the first genuine Kajkavian novel.⁶ The fact is that what Gjalski did not succeed in doing – and what was objected to by Krleža as well (namely, he did not write any novel in Kajkavian despite his Kajkavian background) – Željko Funda *did* succeed in doing (Horvat, 2005). Although it can be said that the novel did draw some attention, at least from literary scholars⁷ and the Kajkavian milieu (*Fran Galović Award* for the book relating to local themes, 2005), the reviews have concluded that this *demanding and peculiar book* (Horvat, 2005) has not been properly covered by the media.⁸

The novel consists of 530 pages of text divided into 53 mostly monologue type chapters so that 53 characters are presented, out of which 31 are real-life characters (from Ignac Kristijanović, Marko Bombelles, Vatroslav Jagić, Metel Ožegović, Slava Raškaj to Zvonko Miliković) and 22 characters are products of the author's imagination (Franc Paska, Pavla Cargač, Ignac Bogožal, Ljudevit Cargač, Ana Cargač...). The

⁴ Varaždin, 1833; the 2002 edition (Zagreb) rendered for print, text transcribed and appendix written by Alojz Jembrih.

⁵ "Jembrih did not state the typological feature of *Adolf* directly in his voluminous appendix /.../however he does think that it is a model of bildungsroman and thus he supports the thesis that it is a novel; the thesis was probably presented for the first time by Dunja Fališevac in an interview to 'Vijenac' in 1997." (Peričić, 2003).

⁶ "This is the first genuine Kajkavian novel in Croatian literature." (Horvat, 2005).

⁷ The novel was presented in Zagreb on February 17, 2004 and the literary review valorisation was given by Zvonko Kovač, PhD.

⁸ Horvat provides the information that the author had been writing the novel for 13 years and published it as his own edition (which could be indicative of the attitude of the public, i.e. the importance of the novel was not recognized).

voluminosity of the novel is justified: in terms of themes and the view of the world, it raises an abundance of questions and opens a vast area related to the Croatian society of the chosen time and area (defined by the language).

The introductory author's remark instructs the reader how to choose the approach to reading and reading flow: the conventional, linear reading is possible (reading the chapters as the author arranged them), but non-linear, *leap* reading is possible as well (linking the discontinued chapters in which the same character appears). The linear reading follows a polycentric and a polyperspective story with the language as the theme, whereas leap reading follows a series of compact stories/short stories with one character and one perspective regarding the destinies of humans as shaped by the thematic time.

As he is aware of the complexity and the peculiarity of the structure, Funda adds (useful) instructions for orientation: the list of characters (Characters: A character real, a character fictitious), remarks on grammar (*A little/Kajkavian/grammar/of mine*) and lexical solutions/personal interventions into the existing literature (Kajkavian-Štokavian Dictionary).

The text uses diverse genres: it consists of fragments stylized in the ways ranging from epistles and declarations to lyric stories and lamentations; the fragments are shaped by the literary realism method and the naturalistic method (Horvat, 2005).⁹ ("The language is God, Croats are unfaithful! Only the mother tongue has been given to us and it is the only way to reach to the beginning and to the end of the world... O, Croats, return to your word, this is where you are!", Funda, 2004, p. 98). This is the author's leading thought presented as a denotative ideologeme at some points, while at other points it is inscribed into the text by means of splendid language creativity. The ideological and revealing expression is in most cases presented as a character's attitude (and it is more or less explicit, i.e. in lines uttered by Dragošić, Kristijanović and Paska), through the epoch itself,¹⁰ and through the author's attitude as well: the introductory note in the 1st person singular (a letter to Krleža: *Instead of a preface; My beloved Krleža*) is an ultimate affirmation of the Kajkavian expression as a language and its potential that gives the whole novel a polemical tone.

What to say about our rhymers? A bunch of patchcoats and the misery of ungifted scribblers whatewermen, nousemen and clarinetists who fiddle to what they have never believed nor will ever believe in. Except jingling and rattling about little houses, vineyards, grandmas, horses, wine and the past, they are incapable – out of the shallow contemplation on the shortness of life and dreams and how sweet

⁹ Horvat's remark is documented by examples here: the sections written in the epistle manner are 8.04, 24.01, 27.0; section 16.03 is written in the tone of a declaration, Vidrić's 34.02 section is a lyric story, whereas the intonation of lamentation is given in 16.01; the literary realism method can be detected in a number of chapters: the naturalistic one can be recognized in 19.01, 19.02, and the modernist one in section 38.

¹⁰ All the characters are in some way related to the 19th century when the language matter was a current matter *per se* and the "destiny" of the Kajkavian expression was being determined.

our *kaj* is – of writing anything else in the Kajkavian language. Nothing. Neither a novel, nor a review, a feuilleton, a comedy, not even a review of the Kajkavian Poetry Book. (Funda, 2004, p. 6)

The work on language is what makes the novel intriguing. Funda creates an unusual author-variety of language: the old Kajkavian (from Ivan Belostenec to Krleža's *Ballads*) is upgraded and personalized by many newly made words (he states more than 300 neologisms in the *Dictionary*); he thus creates a system that testifies to “the enormous richness of the Kajkavian language that is capable of describing any human emotion and any situation in life: both in a Count's palace and in a poor man's cottage, in joy and sorrow, in loneliness and in company and in peace and in war” (Horvat, 2005).

There are some occasional parts of the book written in Štokavian (Vatroslav Jagić, 4.01) or in a specific Kajkavian-Štokavian mixture (Mihovil Danko 35.03, whose specific language is motivated by the situation: Jakša Čedomil reviews his Kajkavian poems negatively and he reverts to Štokavian and feels ashamed because others, who are strangers of a kind – Matoš, who came from Srijem and Valjavec, who was a Slovene – write in Kajkavian).

On reading Funda's discussions on language, art and politics, one will not sense a lack of scholar terminology or any language insufficiency. Funda shows the Kajkavian language as a language that has a complete lexical and grammatical material at its disposal for the purpose of a political discussion/polemics (section 35.06, Funda, 2004, pp. 322- 324), a discussion on art and literature as a language creation (section 34.01, Funda, 2004, pp. 295-298) as well as for a “naïve” statement given by a child (section 52.01, Funda, 2004, 498-500; section 53.01, Funda, 2004, pp. 501-505). If he does not consider the existing material sufficient, he produces a new one based on his experience and confidence in what this language is and what it could (should) be. The lexical and grammatical innovations are supported by the theoretical explications (*A little/Kajkavian/grammar/of mine*), which not only theoretically/declaratively but also actively proves the potency of the language and its polyfunctional feasibility and relevance.

What is considered extremely important is Funda's attempt to enrich and also create the Kajkavian fund of terms/terminology inventory at the scientific discourse level that is “weaker” than the one used in the artistic and everyday functions.¹¹

Funda's characters speak from the point at which the (Kajkavian) language “might be legally dead /.../ it is not used in journalism any more, it is used only in prayer books and calendars intended for common people” (Funda, 2004, p. 304). If the theme of language were discussed at the level of the explicit, the centre of the analysis would no doubt be the elements of chapter 16, assigned to Mirko Korležina (association to Miroslav Krleža is very transparent and anticipated). His *Declaration on Word* (16.01), *Declaration on the Croatian Sin* (16.02) and the apocalyptically biased *Declaration on*

¹¹ Here are some taxatively listed literary theory terms: *vitija* – *pjesma* [poem], *vmetlost* – *umjetnost* [art], *zderžina* – *sadržaj* [content], *izvustje* – *narječje* [dialect], *knjigovnost* – *književnost* [literature], *peldovno* – *primjerice* [for example], *padec* – *padež* [case], *drukanje* – *tiskanje* [printing].

Croatia (16.03) are charming manifestos of the national pride told in the old-fashioned manner of the grandiloquent pathos.

There were items acting as an ordeal for the author in terms of appropriate language performance which initiated the work on language production as a necessity, namely the items such as a wide scope of characters with respect to their interests and social position (aristocracy, servants, artists, grammar experts, priests, politicians...); the diversity of the described life entities (everyday life: private life – baroness Ožegović, Jandračko, the Drašković family; the area of ideas: the birth of the proletariat - Josip Socmek, a communist-socialist Ivan Ancel; the questions about art: literature - Jakša Čedomil, Zvonko Milković, Higin Dragošić and Vladimir Vidrić; painting - Julijana Drašković, Slava Raškaj and Bela Čikoš Sesija; photography – Karlo Drašković and linguistics - Ignac Kristijanović and Vatroslav Jagić).

At the thematic level, it is worth noting that there are emancipated women who give the narrative flow more dynamics, both through the men-women relations and at the linguistic level. Let us observe Katarina Danko's section, for example. She is an intellectual, a journalist, striving to be emancipated. The social, ideological and familial conflicts are intensified through the theme of language choice; she, as a new subject in the social life, writes for newspapers in the new language – Štokavian, Illyrian, whereas her husband lives in his illusions, in the traditionalism and historical decadency with Kajkavian dialect as his choice (Fundu, 2004, p. 40).

The text, being layered and diverse in terms of ideology and language, offers a researcher a series of themes (the story types, composition, the origin and semantics of names, terminology, neologisms, the differentiation of lexis regarding the social status of the characters, the ideas – social, political, grammar...), so a diverse methodological approach is possible (and obligatory).

Imagological Reading

Regarding the repeatedly mentioned Fundu's references to the culture realm workers related to the thematized milieu, and who left traces of their beliefs and, moreover, became the foundations for the linguistic and imaginative flows in culture, it is considered that the imagological approach will yield good results in the interpretation of the novel as the series of characters/themes can be explored by the image constructs comparison method. Since a novel is an imaginative work and images are not objective and complex but subjective and simplified instead (Dukić, 2009, p. 5), *images* (pictures), are obligatorily turned into *mirages* (Hugo Dyserinck, in Dukić, 2009, p. 28), i.e. a document is transformed into a narrative construct, while persons are transformed into characters as lexical and literary concepts.

The imagological approach is a self-imposing convenient interpretation method when it comes to the view of Slava Raškaj when paralleled with Nada Iveljić's novel (*Bijela kopriva* [The White Nettle]) and the persons related to WW I where the Krleža complex is extensively stressed, especially Krleža's view on the position of the Home Guard soldiers.

The Theme and Image of Slava Raškaj

Nada Iveljić: Slava Raškaj as a White Nettle

The novel by Nada Iveljić is the result of a thorough research of reality related to the life circumstances of Slava Raškaj (the biographical, factual discourse), the research that is imbued with the personal imaginative interpolations and the autobiographical discourse. A part of the text comprises documents, whereas a part consists of narrative sections within which there are shifts from biographical to autobiographical text models. *The First Part* of the novel presents Slava's life, partly through a monologue in the 1st person singular and partly through a narrative in the 3rd person singular from the perspective of the persons related to her life (the family, service, friends and acquaintances), persons in addition from not so intensely emotional surroundings (three sections from critics/artists: Vladimir Lunaček, Ljubo Babić, Matko Peić and, especially interesting, there is an empty space reserved for the statement by Bela Čikoš). The discourse relating to them consists of documents taken from the press.

Nada Iveljić shapes the story of Slava out of the outer focalization: her hero is to a large extent an object (it is only in the autobiographical type fragments, i.e. in *The Second Part*, mostly in the Kadenca section, that Slava gets her voice/response as an imaginative collocutor in the fictitious dialogues of the narrative 1).

The bedrock of the image, prevalently in *The First Part*, is mother Olga who speaks through evidently sentimental registries: her story testifies to herself and Slava from the psychologically (and socially) defined position – both her and Slava are misunderstood victims imprisoned in an emotive and slightly autistic personal space. The storyteller juxtaposes Slava and the world (*But, others have been proclaimed the masters of plein-air, she has been omitted*. “This is the gratitude they have shown. No one knows about her and her works”, Iveljić, 2008, p. 9), thus detecting her position in the place of loneliness and unfamiliarity.

The emotive monocentrism and engagement (an evident sympathy for Slava) - no matter how different the storytellers/focalizers are – leads to an idealized experience of a person and the space belonging to an emotionally defined group – the family (the servants consider Olga as *the good Mrs. Olga*, the area of life is “an idyllic one, a Heaven on Earth one could hardly find elsewhere”, Iveljić, 2008, p. 19). The author's concept includes the standpoint of an “objective” storyteller in the 3rd person singular (“while others talk to each other and listen to each other and have fun, she walks around the house limply as if she were a sick kitten notwithstanding the fact that the sick kitten had already been expelled from the house and she remained, Iveljić”, 2008, p. 12), but the valorisation subjectivity is more than evident, even in this storytelling dimension: the storyteller/author does not form her attitude on facts but on the pre-attitude on which the whole text structure is based, namely the formula Slava = a victim. The victim intonation bias in mother Olga's section infects the mother herself to a significant extent.

The second part of the novel is the author's voice narration and features an expressive self-thematizing, i.e. the romanced biography of Slava Raškaj comes close to Nada Iveljić's autobiography. There is as well the game of the standpoints: Slava herself is given another role – she is the recipient and the judging voice of the story (“How do you portray me? As a saint!?! /.../ I was evil”, Iveljić, 2008, p. 121).

Such image concept of Slava relies on the authentic data (the biographical factography is not a voluminous one but it is plausible) structured into a highly sentimentally shaped text.

From the very beginning, the symbol of the white/dead nettle or the Red Deadnettle (the explication is performed in pages 17 and 123) suggests a tragic denial (the nettle that cannot sting, just like Slava who cannot speak/hear) and the atmosphere of a tragic exclusion.

Funda's Image of Slava Raškaj

The compositional warp of Funda's novel includes the theme/sections with Slava Raškaj in a series of chapters but intensively in the Julijana Drašković and Vladimir Vidrić sections. Slava's chapter, which is not large by volume, is marked as 38 and it consists of one monologue (section 38.1, Funda, 2004, pp. 339-343). The second fragment related to Slava (38.2, Funda, 2004, pp. 344-350) contains a cycle of the Kajkavian translation of poetry by Slava's emotional fascination, Vladimir Vidrić, the poet. As the fragment is a continuation of Slava's section in which she thinks of (and reviews) Vidrić's linguistic expression, the translation can be observed as a compilation of the author's voice and the heroine's voice.

The five pages of the internal monologue/stream of consciousness reflect a series of misfiring on the part of a disturbed, oversensitive psyche that shifts into automatic writing occasionally. The richness of colour quality of experiences dared the author to work out a convenient transfer of finely tuned visual sensations into the language. In order to complete the task, Funda creates a number of astonishing neologisms (*irisanse, excellencial, practijokeity, waterpourlilly*,¹² *musaical, aliker...*) and uses a rich lexical scope to describe the ultrafine colour shades, which emphatically individualize Slava's consciousness and language deficiency (as she is deaf-mute).

The motivation for the linguistic creativity (both for a character and the author) stems from the dissatisfaction with the language regarded as a convention, or, rather, from a need for the language to be either unrepeatable, momentary personal expression or the reflection of the essence of the subject/object (“waterpourlillies I only understand /.../ I make it up to show the people that they speak wrongly, they use wrong words and name things falsely”, Funda 2004, p. 339). A series of impressive newly coined words were made to serve the purpose of such expression (*drobnotakvost*

¹² It is difficult to translate as the original neologism means “a waterlilly that pours water”, which is attained by adding two letters to the Croatian word *vodolilije* and might have been translated so with the meaning kept but without the important defamiliarization of phonetic/lexical dimension/effect.

[tinysuchness], *trakošćanskojezerskastost* – [Trakošćan lakeness], *teberisanje* - [you-drawing], *vodorisanje*- [watersketching]...). The specific state of Slava's consciousness (the subtlety that leads to a sort of insanity) is suggested by a series of surreal images made as creations in language (golden dogs, foggy serpents, and stinging waters). This is the discourse, the demanding and subtle linguistic watercolour, into which Slava "translates" Vidrić's poetry paralleling the lines Vidrić – Slava,¹³ due to which the differences are obvious in their aesthetics and senses. It is more than obvious that Slava condenses the means of expression and reduces them to clear, concentrated words/images.

Iveljić – Funda Correlation

Nada Iveljić's text suggests Slava-Nada as the victim of her surroundings, the times, the conventions and prejudices. Her (their) marginalized position and the unrecognized gift that the relevant arbiters (art critics) could have recognized are presented as injustice. Describing Nada Iveljić's text as a "rashomon" polyperspectiveness (Slavko Mihalić, in Iveljić, 2008, p. 129) substantiates the quest for truth and the (pseudo) authenticity of its interpretation, but the general impression is unique, however: Slava is wrapped in a veil of myth, a legend and she is portrayed as an extraordinary and unjustly neglected being. By means of producing obvious contrasts (Me – others) and taking the positions in the easily detected sympathy for the character, the author creates a text overburdened with pathos and thus takes away the possibility of attaining polyvalence. The idea of being neglected connects the past and the present times, Slava and Nada ("What has changed up to now? /.../ Don't tell me fairy tales, anything but that", Iveljić, 2008, pp. 122-123).

On the other hand, Funda's Slava is a superior, strong and self-confident person who does not arouse pity. She is de-contextualized, independent of the social and intellectual surroundings and as she is deaf-mute and an artist, she is free and extremely sovereign in her circle of freedom that is defined in this way. The denotations of insanity are lyrical ones in the construction of expression and they are emotionally suggestive, so there are no signs of pathos, compassion and similar sentimental feelings. Whereas Iveljić remains within the framework of the *misunderstood poor girl* model, Funda builds up Slava's character as a heroine who might be experiencing her *swan's song* but she is living it uncompromisingly.

Krleža as a Reference for Funda's Story and Character

A possibility for comparing *The Mighty People* to *Croatian God Mars* starts with section 41 (Funda 2004, pp.355-396) that opens the theme of war and becomes a cycle of war stories. There is a series of characters, narrative moments and themes suggesting an interliterary approach. The function of approach is pointing out the

¹³ It would be interesting to compare Vidrić's poem to Slava's/ Funda's transformations into another poetic model.

similarities and differences: the more considerable the similarities, the more important are the differences.

Imagologically speaking, Funda re-describes Krleža's story about a Home Guard soldier. As Funda occasionally deals with similar periods and positioning of men from the Northwest part of Croatia, and, moreover, as he is very close to Krleža's *Ballads* and *God Mars*, these texts can be read in parallel on numerous occasions. It is certain that a competent reader of section 42 (whose main character is Eugen Jambreč, Čokljo) will read it interlineary as the associations to Krleža's *Barrack 5b* are inevitable. In the marked possible parallel with *Croatian God Mars*, the intrinsic motivation of Funda's heroes is quite clear. Krleža's universal ideological profile, when paralleled with Funda contextually, places the things in the mentality of the surroundings and considers the characters to be the collateral victims of impersonal/suprapersonal ideas and ideals, they are toys of the given courses of a strong reality. However, Funda gives his character more space, i.e. his voice as the author's voice is more subdued and one can thus see the intimate and inner motivation of characters, for example the ambition that has grown out of envy and mutual rivalry ("Why should I be worse than my brothers /.../I said to myself that I would not be the worst one, for sure. /.../ The boys that used to come home would dress smartly, they looked as pheasants. And they behaved so. I could hardly wait to dress in that way myself, so that, away from mowing and sawing/.../ I can present myself as well", Funda, 2004, p. 448). In other words, Funda burdens his character with the responsibility of making a choice stemming from the particular personality and the conditions. This is the way in which Funda particularizes persons – they are not objects in somebody else's game only but the creators of the situation as well.

Besides the thematic affinities, parallels can be observed at other levels as well, especially at the levels of content and language. For example, section 41 (Juraj Lehpamer), besides being an overture of the war part of the story, contains a trace of Krleža's floral vocabulary: the hero of the story, a passionate florist, a *rose-grower*, utters lines consisting of the names of flowers (roses are dominant, but there are also *buds, daisies, chrysanthemums, pansies, carnations, violets*, Funda, 2004, p. 389) while he is explaining his *rosely* view of the world and suggesting the correlation to Krleža's ballad *Ni med cvetjem ni pravice* [There Is no Justice Among Flowers Either].

Funda's deliberate and conscious inscription of a Krležian layer into his story and entering into the intertextual liaisons is especially visible in the incorporation of anthroponomy (Homeguarder Vid and Corporal Pesek), and in narrative sequences: Franjo Cargač (section 46) has a monologue in which he retells Krleža's story of the death of Trdak Vid from *Bitka kod Bistrice Lesne* [The Battle at Bistrice Lesna]. There is an incontestable affinity of the linguistic materials and it is sometimes visible even in vocabulary and the stylization of sentences:

Table 1
Affinities of character and story

Krleža	Funda
Trdak "Trdak Vid grabbed /him/as if he had been drowning. Lovrek only felt how Trdak Vid was limp and was collapsing to the ground while the blood globed at his mouth and dripped on his hands." (Krleža, 1976, p. 36)	Trdak "Then Vid grabbed me as if he was drowning /.../ he was becoming heavier and heavier and was collapsing to the ground /.../ His clenched relented and he fell onto the ground.."
Pesek "It was strange to Pesek that mister Corporal Pesek yelled at him so intensely and, moreover, threatened him with the revolver." (Krleža, 1976, p. 38)	Pesek "Corporal Pesek stopped by me. He waved the gun and yelled at me to continue forward. I told him to fuck himself. He grabbed me by the collar and drew me upward. "Who the hell are you to tell me to fuck myself", he asked me weaving the gun under my nose." (Funda, 2004, p. 416)

Unlike Krleža, who is the master of the indirect internal monologue and the engagement concept and who is frequently not apt to let his characters speak, this fragment obviously shows how Funda's solutions are different: his voice as the author and his presence are "weaker", they are present in the undertext whereas the foreground of the (lexical) utterance gives characters the right to speak in the 1st person singular and convey personal intonation. Krleža's footsteps are as well followed in the letter that Marija Cargač wrote to her husband who is in the battlefield. Krleža suggests the authenticity of letters graphically in the epilogue of *Bitka kod Bistrice Lesne* [The Battle at Bistrice Lesna] (spelling rules mistaken, phrases); Funda attains it by means of a multivocal letter writing sequence: Marija's words and the writer's /Parson's moralistic comment on the profile of the world and the mentality of the heroes as well as their immediate life context.

Table 2
Letter concepts

Krleža	Funda
"If I had swift wings I would fly to your luscious chest. If I had a hawk's eye I would peep into your lavish bosom." (Krleža, 1976, The Letter by Katica Rodeš, p. 42)	"Granddad is the least well of us all, but this is due to this socialism of his because they quarrelled about all things in this silly matter. We pray a lot for Granddad but it is of no use. Franc, now I am writing to you, your Parson of Margečan. Your father has fallen into the deep mud of sin and delusion. He does not come to church any more." (Funda, 2004, p. 413)

In the quoted letter, Funda attains, by means of dismantling the styles and intonations, within this lexically predominantly naturalistic complex (the prevalence of vulgarisms – curses and the lexis of obscene actions: *ferdučenje* [fucking]) an unexpected yet visible and effective poetic quality (Marija's morality and ashamedness: she does not dare to utter the fact of her pregnancy: "I would like to say one thing more, but I am ashamed. I do not want the priest to write it.", Funda, 2004, p. 414).

The above mentioned two voices in the letter (the words by the teller and the words of the writer who acts from the position of moral authority) is a lively sign from which the mentioned Funda's difference in relation to Krleža can be seen – the inscription of the social environment and its valorisational imperative that significantly determines the persons.

Unlike Krleža, who develops a strong voice of the author and frequently includes his indirect attitude, for Funda it is the story that is most important as well as the individuality of a particular storyteller, which makes the series of his stories suitable for a wider scope of readers.

Conclusion

It is considered that the facts presented by this paper substantiate both the maturity and the relevance of the modern Kajkavian literary expression. Even a superficial insight into the production shows that the Kajkavian dialect has yielded a number of respectable works which have in spite of that (i.e. value) remained in the peripheral interest zone of the literary science.

The emergence of works whose structure is demanding and complex requires the maturity of the recipient, i.e. these works count on a competent reading, not on an *ad hoc* one. The situation that was up to recent times concentrated on the lyrical discourse has significantly been changing through a well-thought encouragement and through the change in the social-political-cultural circumstances in which, pursuant to the postmodern practices, the margins tend to prove themselves (local idioms, dialects that are considered to be autonomous languages). The relevant results in all fields – both in the literary science and art (in all genre realms of art) – the Kajkavian dialect is presented as a complete system which is to be integrated better in the national corpus as its integral part. There are numerous multilingual authors (out of which a number has in turn taken high positions thanks to the standard discourse) whose dialectal sections go hand in hand with the standard language in terms of style and value; this is the reason to be taken into consideration while the national literature and its (dialectal) elements are being assessed. In line with this, the attitude and the activity types of Željko Funda are to be pointed out since he does not accept the mourning pathos tone in discussions on language, and he does not ask what the future of this language is – the language that has been pushed to the peripheral zone of interest and use – but works instead to render the perspectives of the language as well as possible in the mentioned future.

References

- Andelković, Lj. (2002). Pomiriti smjerove i osobnosti. *Vijenac* 206. Retrieved from <http://www.matica.hr/vijenac/206/Pomiriti%20smjerove%20i%20osobnosti/>
- Dukić, D. (2009). Uvod u imagologiju. In D. Dukić, Z. Blažević, L. Plejić Poje, & I. Brković (Eds.), *Kako vidimo strane zemlje: O imagologiji* (pp. 5-22). Zagreb: Srednja Europa.
- Dyserinck, H. (2009). O problemu „images“ i „mirages“ i njihovu istraživanju u okviru komparativne književnosti. In D. Dukić, Z. Blažević, L. Plejić Poje, & I. Brković (Eds.), *Kako vidimo strane zemlje: O imagologiji* (pp. 23-35). Zagreb: Srednja Europa.
- Funda, Ž. (2004). *Ljudeki* [The Mighty People]. Varaždin: vlastita naklada.
- Horvat, I. (2005). Horvati su svoj jezik razpeli i vmoriti ga hoćeju, *Vjesnik* March 5, 2005. Retrieved from <http://trnac.net/2013/04/20/zeljko-funda-ljudeki-prvi-pravi-kajkavski-roman-v-hrvatske-knizevnosti/>
- Iveljić, N. (2008). *Bijela kopriva* [The White Nettle]. Zagreb: Svitava.
- Krleža, M. (1976). *Novele*. Sarajevo: Zavod za udžbenike, Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Pažur, B. (2005). Poticajna uloga časopisa *KAJ* u obnovi i reafirmaciji suvremene, novokajkavske književnosti. *KAJ*, XLII(3), Zagreb. Retrieved from <http://hrcak.srce.hr/file/104873>
- Peričić, D. (2003). Hrvatska kajkavska proza, Prvi hrvatski roman!. *Vijenac* 236. Retrieved from <http://www.matica.hr/vijenac/236/Prvi%20hrvatski%20roman!/>
- Pintarić, J. (2011). Stvarnosna književnost: Narcis u zrcalu kvartovske zbilje. *Nacional* br. 828, 2011-09-27. Retrieved from <http://arhiva.nacional.hr/clanak/116885/narcis-u-zrcalu-kvartovske-zbilje>
- Radaković, B. (2012). *Poputbina za EU: Laganje povijesti. Serijal o hrvatskom nacionalnom identitetu - 6. Razgovor; 07.2012.* Retrieved from <http://mojzagreb.info/zagreb/hrvatska/poputbina-za-eu-borivoj-radakovic-laganje-povijesti>
- Skok, J. (2007). *Ignis verbi kajkavicae: Nove kajkavske studije, eseji i rasprave*. Zagreb: Kajkavsko spravišće.
- Šicel, M. (2001). *Antologija hrvatske kratke priče*. Zagreb: Disput.

Emilija Kovač

Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb
Ante Starčevića 55, 40000 Čakovec, Croatia
elija.kovac@gmail.com

Što, kaj, ča (Kajkavski dio sustava: Naracija)

Sažetak

U radu se preispituje odnos modernog i tradicijskog izričaja u prostoru geografski definiranom kao periferija, za koji se podrazumijeva afirmativn(ij)a okrenutost tradiciji. Dinamika generacijskih i prostorno-socioloških (dis)kontinuiteta dovodi do višestrukih kulturoloških rascjepa, što generira nove načine profiliranja kulturne scene, a time i načine djelovanja. Kajkavski umjetnički izričaj profilira se kao (post) moderan i poetički aktualan, no često je nevidljiv i prešućivan unutar korpusa hrvatske književnosti. Komparativno-analitičkom metodom rad detektira oblike suodnošenja relevantnog dijela recentne kajkavske narativne produkcije i prema tradicijskom i prema modernom tipu diskursa.

Ključne riječi: *imagologija; intermedijalnost; postmoderno; tradicija.*