COLLOQUIA

HUMANISTICA

Amir Kapetanović

Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics
Zagreb
akapetan@ihjj.hr

Kaya: from Novella to Film

Abstract

The paper analyses the transformation of Kruno Quien's novella *Kaya* into a screenplay adaptation and a film of the same title by eminent Croatian director Vatroslav Mimica. The analysis points out significant characteristics of both the transformation of the text and the transformation of the portrayed Mediterranean urban area (a crime in Trogir), as well as the linguistic stylization of the characters' Trogir dialect, which contributes to the atmosphere of the film. Discussions surrounding the film have so far only unfolded on the basis of a comparison between Quien's novella and Mimica's film. This analysis thus contributes important information about the structural and narrative characteristics of the unpublished screenplay, shedding more light on the paths towards leading to the creation of this Croatian film, which is considered Mimica's best work and one of the best Croatian films.

Keywords: Cakavian, dialect, film analysis, Vatroslav Mimica, Croatian cinematography.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 PL License (creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/pl/), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited. © The Author(s), 2018

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences

Editor-in-chief: Jolanta Sujecka

Conception and academic editing of this issue: Maciej Falski, Tomasz Rawski, Jolanta Sujecka with the collaboration of Ewa Niedziałek

1. Introduction

The film *Kaya* (*Kaja, ubit ću te*, 1967) is considered the most successful film by director Vatroslav Mimica (1923), as “a world-class contribution of Croatian cinematography to the tendencies of European modern film, in which the plot and characters are not key determinants of the scenes; instead, they become simply visuals or serve to conjure up an atmosphere” (Kragić & Gilić, 2003, p. 285). The director’s contribution to Croatian cinematography was summarised by D. Radić, who wrote that Mimica was:

“... the creator of the first true Croatian melodrama (*In the Storm*), who first introduced slapstick elements to Croatian film (*The Jubilee of Mr Ikel*), who was the first expressly modernist member of the Zagreb School of Animated Film (*Alone, The Inspector Is Back!, A Little Story*), who was the first systematic and most radical full-length modern Croatian filmmaker (*Prometheus of the Island, Monday or Tuesday, Kaya*), who was the first and only Croatian author to make a series of (pseudo)historical films (*Suleiman the Conqueror, Anno Domini 1573, The Falcon*)” (Radić, 2000a, p. 39).

Kaya was well received by foreign audiences (New York) and won international awards (Naples), but domestic audiences at the Pula Film Festival did not understand it, as they were not prepared for the deep modern incision it made into the Yugoslav cinematography of the time. With its associative editing (which had been applied to Mimica’s two previous films, *Prometheus of the Island*, 1966, and *Monday or Tuesday*, 1966),¹ its manner of examining irrational evil in World War II and fascism in a small Mediterranean town, and its abandonment of the classical narrative procedure, *Kaya* is a brave, shocking step away from the Yugoslav cinematography of the time, which was dominated by partisan war films. From beginning to end, Mimica’s film vibrates with tension between nature (flora and fauna) and civilisation (social traditions, architecture), land and sea, the world of children and the world of adults, evil personified (Pjero) and simplicity (*Kaya*), etc. Film critics have long since noted that Mimica’s film stands at the beginning of a series of Italian and Yugoslavian (Croatian) films that would discuss fascism in small Mediterranean towns (after Mimica, such films were made by e.g. Luchino Visconti, Vittorio De Sica, Federico

¹ All three films were edited by Katja Majer (she co-edited *Kaya* with Josip Remenar).

Fellini, Pier Paolo Pasolini, Bernardo Bertolucci, Lordan Zafranović).

The film *Kaya* is an adaptation of the eponymous novella by Croatian poet and dramatist Kruno Quien (1917–1990), who co-signed the screenplay with Mimica. Both hail from Mediterranean locations: Mimica was born in Omiš, while Quien was born in Zadar (he spent his childhood and youth in Trogir). After Quien's first poetic phase (*Rime*, 1943), his poems began to show an expressly Mediterranean atmosphere (*Kameni grad*, 1956), as did his novella *Kaya, I'm Going to Kill You* (*Kaja, ubit ću te*, 1967). Mimica describes how he came to collaborate with Quien to create the film version of the novella in a conversation with Damir Radić:

I was told about Kruno Quien's text by Fedor Hanžeković, who was the art director of Jadran Film at the time. I found it somewhere among the old manuscripts. ... I worked with Kruno Quien, who had forgotten about this old text of his by then, in a unique way. Nothing specific could be drawn from him, and yet everything he said and wrote was precious and inspiring. Later, he completed his old text according to the film and published it as a novella in *Forum*. ... He wrote *Kaya* in the form of a novella, I believe even in first person. It was based on the true story of the murder of Kaja Sicilijani. He started with the town of Trogir, where no crime had been committed for a century, and he built the atmosphere, that stone, those stone stairs; I remember even now the exact impression that text left on me when I first read it; it got me quite excited immediately. I made contact with Kruno and we worked quite well together (Radić, 2000b, p. 23).

Mimica first speaks non-specifically of Quien's "old text", but if one knows that he is talking about Quien's screenplay, Mimica says that Quien's text was written "in the form of a novella". Why would Quien "complete his old text according to the film", and how could he have managed to do this if the novella was already published by mid-1967 (issues 7-8 of *Forum* magazine) and the film was approved for screening on 12 July 1967 and was first shown at the Pula Film Festival in the same year (26 July – 1 August)? To Radić's additional question of whether Quien's text was more classically told or if he took a modern approach, Mimica answers that it was a "linear, cause-and-effect story, but with elements of poetry within it" (Radić, 2000b, p. 23). The director's statement gives the impression that the screenwriters had "made contact" only then, however they were known to have worked together prior to this (Quien co-wrote the screenplay of *Prometheus of the Island* with Mimica and Slavko Goldstein, 1964). At the same point, Mimica discusses pressures after the editing of the film: "After editing, they put pressure on me from all sides to add the voice of a narrator with textual commentary to the film. But I refused. What voice could you give to that silence of stone?!" (Radić, 2000b, p. 24).

This work will examine some important characteristics of the *screenplay adaptation* of Quien's literary text (the transposition of some parts of the plot, how far it departs in content and structure from the original) and the *execution of the film* according to the screenplay by Quien and Mimica.² Special attention shall be paid to the linguistic design of the dialogue.

2.

Discussion

2.1. Screenplay Adaptation

Although Quien's short prose text *Kaya, I'm Going to Kill You* deals with one event (a murder) tied to a number of characters during a particular time period (World War II) in the same location (Trogir), it cannot be described as a typical novella. After the narrator's introductory note on the city in which no crime had been committed for three hundred years, he speaks of the slaughter of a calf, and then talks about the young people of Trogir (Kaya's and Pjero's friends), then about the frequent illness and fevers of a character with whom the narrator identifies, the flat in which Mara Karantanova lives, the events on the town square and the inclusion of some citizens of Trogir in the ranks of the fascists, with a special discussion about Pjero, then about the meeting in the old mill and Pjero's speech, about the town dignitaries and the town madman Ugo Bali, upstanding citizen Tonko, the drunk Nikica, and Kaya's partisan mission. Kaya's murder at the end of the story is the most prominent event and the reason all the other notes about the area and people were mentioned, giving the novella a digressive character and leaving the impression of a weak, broken structure. This is what allowed the screenwriters to leave out or incorporate some parts of the novella in different contexts without difficulty. For example, the slaughter of the calf described at the beginning of the novella (Quien, 1967, p. 137) is included in the screen adaptation (Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 17) immediately before Lovro's fever and illness is described (in the novella, no cause-and-effect relationship between these events is suggested). The "hygienic walks" of the three city dignitaries (described in the novella after the fever and the raising of the Italian flag on the square; Quien, 1967, p. 143) is incorporated in the screenplay adaptation (Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 9) into the description of the usual everyday events on the city streets prior to the appearance of fascism in the town.

² The typewritten screenplay contains 79 pages, and is held at the Croatian National Archive (no catalogue number). The front page reads: *Po istoimenoj noveli Kruna Quiena / Vatroslav Mimica / Kruno Quien / Kaja, ubit ću te! / Scenarij za igrani film / Zagreb / 1967*. The screenplay is not orderly (e.g. the scenes are not numbered, and some are not separated).

The novella also had to be expanded in the screenplay adaptation. For example, the children do not play in the shallows and no one yells to them (Mimica & Quien, 1967, pp. 4-5). This scene in the film prior to the opening credits is full of biological optimism (fish and seahorses are seen swimming). Even though the children are portrayed in a harmless game, the boy makes a threat (*Jo, tebi kad dojdeš doma; Jo, tebi, Luce, kad te uvatin*), which is a foreshadowing of Pjero's threat emphasised in the film's title. Foreshadowing is important in Mimica's atmosphere film (e.g. waves breaking against the promenade foreshadowing a social "storm"; the metaphorically charged horror scene with the sidewalk filled with blood, which corresponds to the later scene of the sidewalk with dirty water welling up through its stones; the gathering for dinner at Vinko's and the guests' departure as they break bread 'like fishermen' and the suggestion of the portrayal of the Last Supper on the kitchen rag). The statements of characters in the adaptation also underwent changes or were amplified, e.g. Mara Karantanova says nothing in the novel, while she speaks a few consecutive lines in the screenplay/film. The typical Trogir saying *Sve je crna zemja* (English: 'Everything is but black earth'), which is uttered by a different character in the novella (Quien, 1967, p. 141), is incorporated into the screenplay as spoken by Mara (Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 30). In the novella, nothing more is told of the fate of Mara Karantanova, but the screen adaptation includes scenes in which Mara is thrown dead from her flat into the cemetery, together with her bed, during the bombing. Quien dedicated a separate story to Mara in which this segment of the screenplay can be found (published in Italian, see: Quien, 1993).

The narrator in Quien's novella is not one of the main characters (Kaya or Pjero); instead, he legitimizes himself as one of the members of their *klapa* singing group, and he witnesses the events in Trogir at the time. He narrates in the first person a quarter of a century after the murder. At one point in the novella, it is revealed that the character with whom the narrator homodiegetically identifies himself is named Kruno,³ just like the author of the text. This character testifies that, among other things, it was he who played the piece by Toselli on the violin and that we see the farce of the raising of the Italian flag on the square through his eyes:

1. Nakon prvih nekoliko taktova prestao sam osjećati njihove poglede na prstima i zaboravio da mi pažljivo motre gudalo, pa mislim da sam tu laku stvar Tosellijevu sasvim decentno izveo. Kada sam dosvirao, dobro se sjećam, Pjero mi je šćepao lijevu ruku i ljubio mi prste (Quien, 1967, p. 140).

³ Pjero refers to him by name only on the 145th page of the published novella: "A ti, Krune, cini švoj komod." He later comments on this with the words: "Pomislit će netko, da se sjetio mog sviranja..."

2. Kad sam kroz pukotinu, četvrtast otvor na mjestu gdje je sa škure otpao kapak, povirio vani, na rivi se odigravala nevjerojatna farsa. Najprije sam ugledao talijansku zastavu. Spuštala se polako niz šandarac. U podnožju šandarca trubio je trubač s perjem na glavi. Zatim je u izduljenu četvorinu stao red vojnika pod kacigama. Pomićući glavu otkrio sam desetak njih u crnome i prepoznao lica gradskog ološa. (...) Kad sam mislio da je to sve, u desnom gornjem uglu otvora na škuri ukazala mi se crna čizma, nešto više visjela je druga, a zatim sam otkrio čitavog Pjera. Stajao je na jednoj nozi, vraga izija cotavog, u crnoj košulji, s ispruženom rukom (Quien, 1967, p. 142).

The role of the narrator is more emphasised in the screen adaptation than in the novel, as it was foreseen that he would reveal himself to the camera among the city ruins at the start of the screenplay after his first few sentences, as if he were showing the scene of the crime to a commission, by first explaining where the northern town gates and Kaya's cigarette shop once stood among the ruins, then describing how the murder happened and to quote their words: *Kaja, ubit ću te! - Ubij, Gospe ti lude!* The narrator continues with the comment that there has been no crime in the town for three hundred years, then uncovers the point of time from which he is narrating: exposing the wrinkles on his face to the camera, he says that a quarter of a century has passed since the crime and that he remembers it well, and that he does not know why the crime took place. The words of the commentary from the novella are put in the narrator's mouth, especially those that might be difficult to visualise. The narrator's speech thus ties various events into a whole from the start to the end of the screenplay adaptation, making Mimica and Quien's screenplay less structurally broken than both the novella and the film.

In the screenplay, the narrator identifies with Lovro⁴ (he plays the violin and has a fever and nausea, Mara Karantanova takes care of him, and we see the events on the square through his eyes). The narrator here is also homodiegetic, speaking about the events with a time delay. In the screenplay (Quien, 1967, p. 2), he is described as a man in his prime (50), a simple man with measured, modest gestures that do not reveal his feelings.

2.2. Execution of the Film

Scenes of the town ruins appear frequently in the screenplay as a leitmotif. However, in the film itself, the ruins are shown at the beginning

⁴ "Kaja uzima od Filipa violinu i daje je mladiću na kojega do sada nismo obračali [!] veću pažnju. Mladiću je ime Lovre (Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 24)."; "Prolazio sam uz zidove samostana svetog Bernarda (...) Bolovao sam dugo. Stanovao sam u staroj kućerini izvana trošnoj, iznutra truloj. (...) Osim mene, po kući se muvala još jedino stara Mare Karantanova (...) (Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 28)."

and the end, an example of *bookending* (Kallay, 2015, p. 106): the past is framed by the present (the town ruins “bear silent witness” to past events). One significant change between the screenplay and the execution of the film is the breaking of the cause-and-effect narration in the film through the removal of the narrator, who comments on past events as a witness before the camera from beginning to end. This was a good directing decision (as some of the narrator’s statements are redundant, confirming essentially what could also be concluded on the basis of the picture; this also gave the film a structurally modern, even experimental character). This decision also caused the director a great deal of problems, as plot fragments (scenes connected only by the narrator’s comments) had to be reconnected without great losses. These consecutively connected fragments from the beginning of the screenplay are rearranged in the film: first we see Ugo, the town in its entirety, the rough sea and the promenade, and two young men at the town gate (they say only *E!*), followed by streets and details of figures from the cathedral portal interwoven with the funeral procession in the town streets, which turns into a surreal and grotesque scene about the “orientation” of Nikica the drunk. This is followed by a richly orchestrated large scene on the town square featuring a few simultaneous events: town music is playing, a grotesque conversation about food is unfolding between three city dignitaries, children are playing near the cathedral portal while Prošpe scorns and chases them through the streets; we then see Pjero fixing shoes, Vinko weaving a net, Kaya selling sweets to children, and the children playing with Ugo. All this seems (nearly) simultaneous; in the screenplay (albeit ordered differently), it is described and connected linearly. In addition to some scenes being moved and edited to give the impression of various simultaneous events on the town streets (tied together by connecting shots of animals, plants, and children running), some scenes foreseen in the screenplay were not included in the film. For example, the scene from the church (used in the film for the opening credits) segues into scenes showing the sinking of a ship and the crashing of a plane, a scene of Ugo’s conversation with a child, a scene with drunks, a scene of youths following a girl through the streets, a scene of nude boys and girls swimming. In the screenplay, the scenes of Vinko weaving a net, Pjero fixing shoes, and Kaya working at the shop (which is connected to the events on the square) are linearly connected, and this segues into *klapa* singing (Kaya stands aside and watches) and the fireworks arranged by Kaya. By reordering events that seem simultaneous or directly connected temporally, the director managed to improve on the screenplay by portraying the lively, everyday atmosphere of Mediterranean public space. The Mediterranean atmosphere is especially important to this film. However, in its execution, the opposition of *quiet*

Mediterranean town – primitive hinterland is lost. In Quien's novella, these opposing dimensions are explained as follows:

3. Zločin na hajdučkom, deseteračkom, handžarskom kamenjaru, zločin na kakvoj zabačenoj štreki, okružen blatnim čizmama u magli i u blatu slavonskom, tu se zločin, vizuelno i historijski, događa na svom terenu, imanentan je i kad se ne događa, jer šta bi drugo tu da se i dogodi. (...) U Trogiru, govorilo se onda, već trista godina nije bio ubijen čovjek, a tamo gore, za gorom... ej pusto tursko... šta da i pričamo, "oci vaši rodiše se tudijer" (Quien, 1967, p. 136).

The screenplay attempted to transmit this opposition through the narrator's words at the beginning and the end of the film:

- 4.1. Nesreće, propasti, ubistva – sve se to događalo tamo, za brdom, u nekim zemljama, na nekim morima, a kod nas ovdje, tu su bili zidovi, obrambeni jarci. Tu je sve štitilo grad. Ovdje zločina nije bilo trista godina (Mimica & Quien, 1967, pp. 10-11).
- 4.2. Zločin više nije bio tamo, za brdom, u nekim zemljama, na nekim morima. Bio je tu, u samom gradu (Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 76).

This opposition of the Mediterranean with the hinterland was lost because the narrator was excised. This was another good directing decision, as the focus was on unprovoked evil that came to a small Dalmatian town from the other side of the Adriatic, not from the hinterland. It is difficult to say if political reasons influenced this decision, however, it is interesting that Nikica's fate is not described fully in the film, as it is in the screenplay:

5. Kad su konačno u grad ušli oslobodioci i kad je trebalo dijeliti pravdu(...) našli su u gradu samoga Nikicu. (...) Prisustvovao je mnogim zločinima, ali nije bilo dokaza da je ikoga ubio svojom rukom. Njega je teretila smrt Filipa Tudora. (...) Narodni sud osudio ga je kratkim postupkom na smrt. Strijeljan je tri sata nakon presude (Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 77).

The director's explanation that the suggestion (pressure) to add the "voice of the narrator with textual commentary" only arose after editing cannot be accepted, as the screenplay had already foreseen not only the voice but the appearance of the narrator, who was supposed to play a central role from the beginning to the end of the film. By removing the narrator, the entire structure of the screenplay was disrupted, and the remaining fragments had to be reconnected. It is as if the director returned to the loose structure of the novella, in which not all events are firmly, linearly connected through cause and effect as they are in the screenplay. The published novella does not follow the presentation of events in

the film whatsoever, as the director claims, so the claim that Quien “completed” his novella according to the film cannot be accepted. Some events described in the novella were not included in the screenplay, while some in the screenplay were not included in the film. Some events exist in the screenplay that appear neither in the novella nor in the film (e.g. the death of Mara Karantanova⁵). There are also events in the novella and the screenplay that were not included in the film (e.g. the fattened eel), while some events described in the novella were replaced and adjusted in the screenplay and the film (e.g. the dinner at the mill from the novella takes place at Vinko’s house in the screenplay/film).

2.3. The Linguistic Stylisation of the Characters’ Trogir Dialect

No film lacks pictures, however there are audio films without verbal communication (although they are more rare than those with it). This does not mean that verbal communication, if foreseen by the screenplay, may be less important than all other segments of the film. Speech “determines and identifies place, time, and participants”, “it reflects social and cultural relations” (Vlašić Duić, 2013, pp. 286–287). The director is the one who determines the level of care with which a segment of a film is approached. In the art of film, it is important to attain at least a striking, if not convincing stylisation of reality. However, just as there is a broad spectrum between the bad, striking, and convincing costumes of actors, there is also a broad spectrum between the bad, striking, and convincing speech stylisation of actors. There are screenplays in which verbal communication does or does not serve to conjure up the image of the plot location or the personality of a character (in films in which the characters do not speak their native tongue, e.g. in American film adaptations of Russian classics), or in which the characters speak their native, neutral standard language or an ambient idiom (sociolect or dialect) in which linguistic variations between the characters can also be seen, resulting in a unified speech pattern. Croatian films, if not co-produced, are not filmed in foreign languages. After experience with the linguistically “stiff” Croatian films of the 1990s, it is apparent that more recent Croatian films avoid the Croatian standard language (although the neutrality of the standard language can be functional, e.g. when one does not wish to tie a character to a recognisable micro-location).

The film *Kaya* is an example of a Croatian film in which the language of a particular area⁶ in the recent past was used to provide a Mediterranean

⁵ The conversation with the director (in April 2018) reveals that this scene was filmed, but it was not included in the film as it was “rough”, and did not fit well into the whole, especially regarding this type of surrealism.

⁶ The authenticity of the linguistic stylisation of the film can be checked, as opposed to films

atmosphere. It must first be said that the screenplay is dominated by dialogue in the Trogir dialect, with the exception of the lines of the narrator, whose dialogue is written in the Croatian standard language (even though he hails from Trogir as a witness to the events of World War II). However, as the narrator and his dialogue were removed from the film, this linguistic component of the screenplay was lost. Croatian-Italian bilingualism is present (and some Italian sentences are written in the screenplay according to Croatian orthography), e.g. when the shopkeeper is speaking or when Tonko has to drink castor oil:

6.1. Me pagara, onin... Tonko! (Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 45, cf. film, Mimica, 1967, 42:53–42:56)

6.2. Nišan van ja ža puno pit. Fala. (...) Kvando šemo in balo, balemo! (...) Ala vostra... (Mimica & Quien, 1967, pp. 53–54, cf. film 48:25–48:27, 48:50–49:00).

Bilingualism in the screenplay and film is used to create the atmosphere in which the plot unfolds, as well as the people from the area, who stand between cultural and linguistic borders on the eastern Adriatic coast. Speaking of the significance of the Mediterranean in determining the essence of Dalmatia, Bogdan Radica, aware that Dalmatia is a “Slavic balcony” (Radica, 1971, p. 73), says that Dalmatia features a “bilingualising society that actually does not know either language perfectly. The inclination for snobbery that actually exposes it to ridicule” is a world that “has always marked Meštrović as a barbarian – a ‘Vlach’ – and wondered at Marulić, who sang in ‘Croatian verse’” (Radica, 1971, p. 72).⁷ This is also supported by Quien’s commentary in the novella (which is provided indirectly through dialogue in the screenplay and the film):

7. Prostorije u palači Čipiko prozvali su, odnosno prozvali su im, „Cabinetto di lettura“, ali nije se tu čitalo. Gro posjetilaca nije znao čitati, niti je to desetak njih iz „bassi fondi“ znalo ijedne riječi talijanski, osim nešto Nikica, koji je baljezgao nekakvom svojom čorbine čorbe čorbom, nekom svojom mješavinom splitske mješavine venecijanskog dijalekta talijanskog jezika. Konte i njegov nesuđeni bratić govorili su, javno, takvim talijanskim koji Talijan iz Toscanne ne bi razumio (Quien, 1967, p. 153).

Aside from the broader, Mediterranean context, the novelist and screenwriters also introduced linguistic elements of both the town itself and

with a linguistic stylisation whose authenticity is impossible to verify (e.g. the stylised dialect of the imaginary Adriatic island of *Trečić* is only similar to Čakavian in Renato Baretić’s novel and Ivan Salaj’s film *Osmi povjerenik* [*The Eighth Commissioner*]).

⁷ For more on the Mediterranean and Bogdan Radica, Ivan Meštrović, and Nedjeljko Fabrio, see a recent contribution by Czerwiński (2018).

the broader Dalmatian area. This is seen in the use of words such as *mulac* ('bastard, brat, maniac', see Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 12) and expressions such as *e* (= greeting, 'hey, hi', see Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 14) and *eto vas* (= a town greeting expressing joy upon meeting someone, meaning roughly: 'we exist, we are alive', see Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 11).

It has already been stated that the characters in Mimica's *Kaya* speak the Cakavian local dialect of Trogir. A few decades ago, Cakavism (/č/, /ž/, /š/ > /c/, /z/, /s/ or /ć/, /ź/, /ś) was interpreted as a transcultural phenomenon (as a consequence of Venetian influence), however this was negated as it was proven that the Čakavian system contained the potential for the autonomous development of Cakavism (Moguš, 1977, p. 76). Two important pieces of dialectological research have confirmed the existence of Cakavism in Trogir. Between the two world wars, Polish linguist Mieczysław Małecki (1929, p. 28) described Trogir as a place where Cakavism was quite strong, and that there were older people who spoke nothing but Cakavian. After World War II, the existence of Cakavism in Trogir was also confirmed by Hraste (1948, p. 133). However, Cakavism disappeared in Trogir three to four decades ago (Geić, 2015, pp. 7–8; Lisac, 2009, p. 143). A monograph (dictionary and grammar) documenting the former dialect of Trogir through gathered and described material (from the mid-19th century to the mid-20th century) has been recently published. As works of art, Quien's novella and Mimica's film *Kaya* preserve this dialectal variation. In the typical Cakavian expression of Trogir, /č/ > /c/, /ž/ > /ź/ and /š/ > /ś/ (Geić, 2015, pp. 486, 491), with some exceptions (e.g. /ć/ > /c/ in the present forms *ocemo*, *necemo*). Great changes in the Cakavism of the Trogir dialect took place in the 20th century. The generations born at the turn of the 20th century retained /ž/ (in place of /z/ and /ź/) and /ś/ (in place of /s/ and /š/), while /č/ > /c/ (with a few exceptions). The generations after World War II saw the re-Čakavianisation of the pronoun *ca* > *ča* (which is being replaced in the speech of younger generations by *šta*) (Geić, 2015, p. 14). Intergenerational differences tied to the restitution of phonemes have also been noted, which causes some confusion: "As concerns the sounds *s* and *š*, or *z* and *ž*, a division is seen between older and younger citizens of Trogir. While those born in the 19th century or the early 20th century still speak Cakavian, and use only two sounds (*ś* and *ź*) instead of four, 'younger' citizens of Trogir use all four of these phonemes, and a number of them (especially in words of Italian origin) mix *s* with *š* and *z* with *ž*..." (Geić, 2015, p. 14).

In the screenplay for the film *Kaya*, there are characters who represent the oldest generation (Mara Karantanova) born in the late 19th century. The young people (Kaya, Pjero and their friends) were born after World

War I, while the children were born a few years before World War II. Mara Karantanova does not speak in Quien's novella, but she has a few striking, long lines in the screenplay that are not equivalent to the dialogue in the final film. The screenplay foresaw the small variations *zima/žima* within the same line (*jerbon mi je Mare, zima / meni je Mare žima*,⁸ Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 29) or *sirotu /širotu* in various lines (*pušti sirotu moju / meni šte žavitovali širotu švoju*, Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 30). If these variations were accepted as possible in the language of the oldest generation (Mara's speech contains *ca*), it is unclear why greater changes were made in the execution of the film as compared to the fairly consistent Cakavism of Mara's dialogue in the screenplay. Mara pronounces⁹ this line well in the film:

8. Gošpodarice, šjora Fani moja, Bog van da pokoj, nemojte mi ga još, ne žovite mi ga, meni šte žavitovali širotu švoju. Oli mu je šlabo u mene? (film 30:01 – 30:14).

However, the rest of her lines from the same scene are pronounced inconsistently in the film (or perhaps better and worse takes were edited together?), as /s/, /š/, /z/, and /ž/ can all be heard. Also, some forms of the verb *otit* are pronounced with /ć/, which is not at all convincing. In the screenplay, there is a consistent Cakavian-stylised sentence that is executed quite differently in the film:

- 9.1. Mijovilce, oce šveti, šveti Ivane i švi šveci...Špavaj, Lovre, špavaj, ja cu ti pravjat o švetoga Ivana ca še šakrija u kaduju, pa ceš lipo žašpat (Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 29)
 9.2. Mijovilce, oce sveti, sveti Ivane i svi sveci...Spavaj, Lovre, spavaj, ja ću ti pravjat o svetoga Ivana, ca se sakrija u kaduju, pa ćeš lipo zaspat (film 28:09 – 28:28).

Despite this, it cannot be said that Mara leaves a strong impression with her speech.

The dialogue of the young people, including Kaya and Pjero, are not consistently stylised in Cakavian in the screenplay (*paricali* instead of *parićali*, *ca* instead of *ća*, *druzino* instead of *družino*):

10. Ješmo li šve paricali? (...) Ajmo ca, družino (Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 21).

⁸ The typewritten manuscript does not differentiate between *ž* and *ž* (and so quotes from the screenplay always contain *ž* in place of *ž*).

⁹ The conversation with the director (in April 2018) shows that Mara's speech was dubbed in post-production, and that the voice in the film is not that of Jolanda Đačić, but that of Nada Subotić.

In the film, Pjero pronounces the first sentence without /š/ (*jesmo, sve*) and leaves out /č/ (*paričali*), while in the second sentence, Kaya pronounces the correct adverb *ća*¹⁰ and *družino*, although the others repeat *Ajmo ca* incorrectly.

Pjero's speech during dinner at Vinko's house is also marked by inconsistencies, which can be tracked from Quien's novella through the screenplay to the execution of the film (in which not only /č/ is lost, but /š/ i /ž/ as well, where they would be expected in Trogir's Cakavian):

- 11.1. *čašt švakome i žato še lipo opremimo i ca šmo žavrgli ražvrgnimo finke šan od voje* (Quien, 1967, p. 145)
- 12.2. *čašt švakomu i žato še lipo opremimo i ca šmo žavrgli ražvrgnimo finke šan o voje* (Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 41)
- 13.3. *cast svakomu i zato se lipo opremimo i ca smo zavrgli razvrgnimo finke san o voje* (film 39:35–39:41).

However, there are also situations in which a non-Cakavian line in the screenplay is pronounced in the film correctly in Cakavian, e.g. in this line of Ugo Bali:

- 14.1. *Da se pizde čude!* (Mimica & Quien, 1967, p. 8)
- 14.2. *Da še pižde cude* (film 15:06).

Similar inconsistencies are also noted in the language of the younger generations in the screenplay and the film. For example, a boy in the film says:

- 15.1. *A zasto šte še* današ švi žatvorili prije koprifoka? (...) *Pa sta da se i cuje* (...); *A zasto?* (Mimica & Quien, 1967, pp. 72, 74)
- 15.2. *Ma zašto ste se* danas svi zatvorili prije koprifoka? (...) *Pa šta da se i cuje* (...); *A zašto?* (film 01:07:56–01:08:03; 01:12:20).

Although the younger generation appropriately uses *šta* and *zašto* in place of *ča* (i.e. *ca*) and *zač* (i.e. *zac*), the Cakavism is not entirely in accordance with Trogir's Cakavian, and it is inconsistent in both the screenplay and the film. Although the speech of many generations is present in the film, the Cakavism of the older generations does not differ significantly from that of the younger generations, even though Trogir's Cakavian began to differentiate between the more conservative use of older generations and the innovative use of younger generations in the inter-war period (the re-Čakavianisation and restitution of the phonemes /s/, /š/, /z/ and /ž/). As far as the use of /s/, /š/, /z/ and /ž/ by the younger generations can partially

¹⁰ Trogir's Cakavian dialect differentiates between the pronoun *ca* (< *ča* 'what') and the adverb *ća* ('away').

be justified, the appearance of Cakavisms not typical of Trogir cannot (the phoneme /č/, /š/ > /s/, /ž/ > /s/). Mara's speech should have reflected the oldest type of Trogir's Cakavism, however not all of her dialogue succeeded in this. Instead, an impression was given of an unusual Trogir Čakavian speech without /č/ in which /š/ and /ž/ appear most often instead of /š/ and /ž/. The screenplay should have first differentiated the characters by their language, while the execution of the film should have consistently applied this and insisted on this in the work with the actors (although it must be said that the lead actors themselves were Štokavian speakers).

The dialogue in the novella and the screenplay is not accented, therefore only the film version can be commented upon. Although Mara's speech (as a representative of the oldest generation of speakers) shows the noticeable presence of new-Štokavian accentuation (1.sing.pres. *gòvorin*, gen.sing. *còvika*, acc.pl. *bùgānce*, gen.pl. *bunbákā*), her speech does reflect an older accent without metataxis (voc.sing.) and the acute in place of the old accent (1.sing. *mūcīn*, 3.pl.pres. *žovēdu*) with sporadic metatony (*ovôd* < *ovôd*). Considering that her speech shows an accentuation typical of Trogir simultaneously mixed with some archaic (conservative) characteristics (the sporadic preservation of old accentuation and the acute), the accentual stylisation of Mara's speech can be said to be mostly successful (as there are Croatian films in which the stylisation of speech is such that e.g. the acute is not present when it should be¹¹).

The events shown in Mimica's film are easy to place in a (broader or narrower) Dalmatian setting, but it would be difficult to determine the "presented time" (a term taken from Turković, 2005, pp. 167–168) on the basis of the characters' speech alone, due to the lack of differentiation between the characters and inconsistencies in their speech. Lexical indicators of time are also rare, and so Mimica's film might fit into the general picture of speech in Croatian films after 1950, in which there are "few characteristics according to which a film might be placed in the period it belongs to. Although there are temporal indicators on the lexical level, there is quite a great deal of inconsistency and a lack of authenticity, resulting in the film's speech often lacking characteristics it should have considering its belonging to the presented time" (Vlašić Duić, 2013, p. 282).

The dialogue of the characters in Mimica and Quien's screenplay contains a string of characteristics of the Trogir dialect. The main characteristics according to which the dialect can be identified as south-

¹¹ E.g. in Antun Vrdoljak's *Long Dark Night* (on the lack of the old Štokavian acute, see Jozić, 2006, p. 239). There is another film with an old Štokavian stylisation in which the acute is present (Branko Schmidt's *Sokol Didn't Love Him*).

eastern Čakavian is the adverb/conjunction *di* (< *gdi* < *kǝdǝ*) and explicit Ikavianism. This is also reflected in the screenplay (*di* 29, *lipo* 29, *bidni* 30). The dropping of /x/ or the mutation of /x/ > /j/ is typical of the dialect of Trogir (*Ocete mi virovat, izija šan i pet* 9; *Mijovilce* 29), as is the loss of the phoneme /l/ and its replacement with /j/ (*kaduju* 29, *postěji* 31). This is followed by the Čakavian-Štokavian mutation of the final -m > -n (1.sing. pres. *mucin* 29 < *mučim*, gen.pl. *bunbaka* 29 < *bumbaka*, dat.pl. *materan* 6 < *materam*) and the final -l > -a in the active verbal adjective (*sakrija* 29), while it is preserved in some nouns (*pakal* 49). The phoneme /Ǳ/ is realised in Italianisms (*djir* 10, i.e. *đir*), while it is replaced with /j/ in local words (*tuje* 37), as is typical of the Čakavian dialect. However, the dialogue of some characters (e.g. Vinko's sister Karmela) occasionally displays /Ǳ/ in some local words as well (*pridjite* 37, tj. *pridite*). The linguistic stylisation is made slightly unconvincing through the use of forms with the syllabic and devocalised /r/ (*trcana* 28, *tercana* 31),¹² while other forms contain the syllabic /r/ (with the additional vowels *a* and *e*). The prosthetic *j* is present (*jope* 29), as are apheresis (*tice* 22 < *ptice*), syncopes (*bižite* 6 < *bižite*), and apocopes (*bacit* 210 > *baciti*). There are also attestations with the old root *tepl-* (*teplo* 29), as well as other phenomena in the system of some consonant groups in accordance with the speech of Trogir: e.g. *tl* > *kl* (act.verb.adj.fem. *mekla* 29 < *metla*, from the verb *metit*), *hv* > *f* (*uvati* 24), the dropping of consonants (*jenoga* 24 < *jednoga*, *oma* 35 < *odmah*), the insertion of consonants into consonant groups, e.g. *ždlati* 5 (< *zlato*), *štrebra* 5 (< *srebra*). Some older consonant groups remain unchanged, e.g. *jd* (*dojdeš* 5). Some words that end in a vowel have an -n added (*jerbon* 29, *njiman* 23). The pronoun form *mnom* is realised in the Trogir dialect as *namon* (31). The final -j > -n (e.g. *jon* 29 < *joj*, in dat. and loc.sing. pronouns, as well as in some numbers and adjectives). Other interesting forms are seen in attestations of the Čakavian gen.pl. with the prime morpheme (*koz* 22, *žemaj* 47), verb forms in 3.sing.pres. (*zovedu* 29, *misliđu* 35, *špuštu* 9), the formation of the conditional with the simplified form of the auxiliary verb (*ja bi jeba* 22, i.e. in the film *ja bi moga* 17:46–17:56). The replacement of case forms (Loc. > Acc.) is typical in the Čakavian south (*A u moju se vidi kuca od štrebra* 5), and this is a reflection of Romance influence on the Croatian Mediterranean dialects.

¹² U Geićevu rječniku navedena je samo *trcana* (Geić, 2015, p. 424).

3. Conclusion

Although local audiences at first did not understand or accept Mimica's film *Kaya*, it was better received in time. Today this film is praised as the director's best work. It was based on a novella by Quien and a screenplay by Mimica and Quien dealing with the transformation of a small, calm, safe Mediterranean urban area in which there had been no crime for centuries into a space contaminated with crime through the penetration of irrational evil on the wings of fascism. The director succeeded in both visually and verbally portraying a Mediterranean town atmosphere as well as personal relations before and during World War II.

This paper has shown the important structural and narrative characteristics of the transformation of Quien's novella (through a screenplay adaptation) into a film (disregarding numerous small differences). Quien's published novella has a loose structure and narrative that disintegrates into digressions, which portray the atmosphere and personal relations. Parts of the novella were successfully transposed into the screenplay, although not always in the same order as in the novella. In the screenplay, narrative parts were adopted and firmly connected through the introduction of the narrator as a character, however the narrator was removed from the film. This required significant changes to the screenplay (moving, connecting and removing scenes), which gave the film its strong modern characteristics. Quien could not have "completed" his printed novella on the basis of the film, and the voice of the narrator was not forced on the director of the film after editing – both the voice and character of the narrator were foreseen in the screenplay. Quien's novella and Mimica's film do not only outline a series of opposing cultural and social borders between which people in a Mediterranean location during World War II found themselves – this Mediterranean atmosphere is also thoughtfully portrayed through linguistic usage, with the help of the Italian-Croatian bilingualism of the eastern Adriatic coast and the Čakavian dialect (specifically, the dialect of Trogir, the most striking aspect of which is Cakavism). Although the director did not consistently portray Cakavism in the film and did not take advantage of all the linguistic possibilities offered him in creating a unified speech pattern of the characters (generational differences), the film portrays the atmosphere and numerous typical characteristics of the dialect of Trogir, which underwent transformations in the early 20th century, and which was disappearing during the time the film was made. Mimica's film thus also has a documentary dimension, as it portrays the linguistic borders and characteristics of an area which eventually faded and vanished.

References

- Czerwiński, M. (2018). Mediteran – prostor susreta, sučeljavanja i stapanja. *Republika*, 74(1–2).
- Geić, D. (2015). *Rječnik i gramatika trogirskoga čakavskoga govora*. Split: Književni krug.
- Hraste, M. (1948). Osobine govora otoka Šolte, Čiova, Drvenika i susjedne obale. *Rad JAZU*, 1948(272), 123–156.
- Jozić, Ž. (2006). Opće značajke slavonskoga gora (ne)primijenjene u filmu. *Šokačka rič*, 2006(3), 233–241.
- Kallay, J. (2015). *Napiši scenarij: Osnove scenarističke teorije i prakse*. Zagreb: Hrvatski filmski savez. (Scenaristička biblioteka Palunko, 1).
- Kragić, B., & Gilić, N. (Eds.). (2003). *Filmski leksikon*. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža.
- Lisac, J. (2009). *Hrvatska dijalektologija: Vol. 2. Čakavsko narječje*. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga.
- Małecki, M. (1929). Čakawizm z uwzględnieniem zjawisk podobnych (z mapą). *Prace Komisji językowej PAU*, 1929(14), 1–98.
- Mimica, V. (Producer & Director). (1967). *Kaja, ubit ću te* [Motion picture]. Croatia: Jadran film. Retrieved March 28, 2018, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5B7NyUOj45o>
- Mimica, V., & Quien, K. (1967). *Kaja, ubit ću te*. The typewritten screenplay, Croatian National Archive.
- Moguš, M. (1977). *Čakavsko narječje: Fonologija*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Quien, K. (1967). *Kaja, ubit ću te*. *Forum*, 14(7–8), 136–159.
- Quien, K. (1993). *Mara Karantanova*. Lugano: Laghi di Plitvice.
- Radica, B. (1971). *Sredozemni povratak*. München: Knjižnica Hrvatske revije.
- Radić, D. (2000a). Filmovi Vatroslava Mimice. *Hrvatski filmski ljetopis*, 2000(23), 39–54, 194–195.
- Radić, D. (2000b). Najljepši i najzbudljiviji posao: Biofilmografski razgovor s Vatroslavom Mimicom. *Hrvatski filmski ljetopis*, 2000(23), 2–38.
- Turković, H. (2005). *Film: Zabava, žanr, stil*. Zagreb: Hrvatski filmski savez.
- Vlašić Duić, J. (2013). *U Abesiniju za fonetičara*. Zagreb: Hrvatski filmski savez.

„Kaya”, od novele do filma

U ovom radu analizira se transformacija novele K. Quiena *Kaja, ubit ću te* preko scenarističke adaptacije u istoimeni film istaknutoga hrvatskoga redatelja Vatroslava Mimice. U analizi se ističu ne samo bitne značaj-

ke transformacije teksta nego i transformacija predočene mediteranske urbane sredine (zločin u Trogiru) te jezična stilizacija trogirskoga govora likova, koji doprinosi ambijentalnom ugođaju filma. Do sada se o filmu raspravljalo samo na temelju usporedbe Quienove novele i Mimičina filmskoga ostvarenja, pa ova analiza donosi neke važne podatke o strukturnim i narativnim značajkama neobjavljenoga scenarija, čime se jače osvjetljavaju putovi kreacije toga hrvatskoga filma, koji se smatra najboljim redateljskim ostvarenjem V. Mimice i jednim od najboljih hrvatskih filmova.

“Kaya”, od noweli do filmu

W artykule analizowane jest przekształcenie noweli *Kaya, zabiję cię K.* Quiena w scenariusz adaptacji filmowej, a następnie w film pod tym samym tytułem, nakręcony przez wybitnego chorwackiego reżysera Vatroslava Mimicę. Analiza skupia się na dwóch kwestiach. Po pierwsze, dotyczy przekształcenia tekstu i obrazu przestrzeni śródziemnomorskiego miasteczka (Trogiru). Po drugie, omawiana jest stylizacja językowa, wykorzystanie cech dialektu trogirskiego, przyczyniające się do stworzenia atmosfery filmu. Dotychczasowa dyskusja o filmie jedynie powierzchownie dotykała związków z nowelą Quiena na poziomie porównawczym. Niniejszy artykuł przynosi ważne informacje o strukturalnych i narracyjnych cechach niepublikowanego dotąd scenariusza, co rzuca nowe światło na proces tworzenia filmu, uznawanego za najwybitniejsze dzieło Mimicy i jeden z najlepszych chorwackich filmów w ogóle.

Słowa kluczowe: kajkawski, dialekt, analiza filmu, Vatroslav Mimica, chorwacka kinematografia.

Przekład streszczenia z języka chorwackiego
Maciej Falski

Note

Amir Kapetanović, Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics, Zagreb.
akapetan@ihjj.hr
The preparation of the article was self-funded by the author.
No competing interests have been declared.