

ON ONE KIND OF REDUPLICATION IN OLD SERBIAN SACRAL POETRY

Milosav Ž. Čarkić (Belgrade – Opole)

In this work the author treats the issue of *parallelism*, but only one kind of it, namely parallelism as a *reduplication* of different lexical units (concepts) which have between them the general copulative conjunction „i (and)“ as a sign of their *parallel relation*. This reduplication, the author believes, is not purely a lexical-conceptual, but also a syntactic and stylistic phenomenon. Therefore the reduplication method has been analysed from the *syntactic, semantic and stylistic standpoints*. It was conveyed from Old Testament books, *the Psalms* and the Byzantine rhetoric of the time into *old Serbian religious poetry*, and became a principle there. It expresses, in this poetry, a certain regularity (canonicity) and symmetry, in accordance with the spiritual world-views of that time.

Key words: old Serbian poetry, parallelism, reduplication.

0.0. In this paper we will not be dealing with the complex issue of *parallelism*¹, but will, according to the title, focus our attention on only one of its types, namely *reduplication*² of different lexical units (concepts)³ with the general copu-

¹ Parallelism is a stylistic term for a subtype of the figure of speech – repetition. Parallelism represents a repetition of sentence parts or whole sentences. Like *isocolon*, i.e. repetition of grammatical structures, parallelism is found among *Georgian figures*. Such parallelism has remained one of the main figures of speech in poetry and prose to the present. A parallelism of sentences according to their meaning is a primary stylistic feature of old Hebraic poetry, particularly of King David's *Psalms*. Such a form of parallelism is also frequently found in old Germanic poetry. The stylistic effects of parallelism by grammatical structures are intensified by *grading* its parallel sentence parts or sentences. The *antithesis* of sentences functions similarly; when one wants to intensify their stylistic effect, their members are formed into parallelisms.

„Rhetoric has differentiated the repetition figures according to the type of the repeated language unit. Thus the repetition can be achieved on the phonemic level (the repetition of phonemes or sounds, whereby assonances and alliterations as figures are formed), on the morphological level (the repetition of morphemes, resulting in various figures the most important of which is the etymological figure), then on the lexical, syntactic, and finally on the sentence level (namely by repeating words, phrases and sentences, resulting in numerous repetition figures). For a textual analysis, it is essential to establish a correlation to lexical and syntactic repetitions, namely to rhetorical figures formed by repeating words, phrases and sentences, but one should bear in mind that even phonetic repetitions (rhymes and alliterations), not to mention morphemes (especially root-morpheme repetitions) can cohesive elements of a text no less important than the former“ (KOVACHEVIĆ 1991: 184).

² According to Đ. Trifunović there are in dictionaries of the modern language several names for the observed phenomenon: „doubleness, doubling, dual quality, dualism, duality, duplexity, duplication,

lative conjunction „i“⁴ (=and) between them as a sign of their *parallel connection*. This reduplication is not a purely lexical-conceptual, but also a syntactic phenomenon⁵. It indicates a certain regularity (canonicity) and symmetry. We have used as material *old Serbian sacral poetry*, into which this method was conveyed from the *Psalms*⁶ and other Old Testament books, as well as the Byzantine rhetoric of the time, and became a principle there. We have analysed reduplication as a *syntactic, semantic and stylistic* phenomenon. The context was provided by the strophoid, part of a poem between two blanks. Old Serbian sacral poetry, as a special form of discourse, also required a specific approach to the observed phenomenon, which is not the only feature of this kind of poetry.

1.0. *The syntactic aspect*. As regards the syntactic structure of old Serbian sacral poetry, parallelism as a poetic-stylistic method is often realised in the forms of reduplicated *subject, predicate, object, attribute and adverbial*. We will therefore pay particular attention to these phenomena.

1.1. *The reduplicated subject*. The subject reduplication method is a widespread phenomenon in old Serbian sacral poetry. Their coordination in a subject phrase is intended to indicate that there is not one agent, but two of the same rank. That means neither of them has priority. Such a method of subject reduplication is aimed at decreasing the value and significance of the agent. This suggests the logical conclusion that in spiritual texts (and in old Serbian sacral poetry as such)

duplicity, twoness“ (TRIFUNOVIĆ 1979: 190). We shall, like Prof. Trifunović, be using the term *reduplication* as the most suitable one.

³ This way of reduplication of different lexical units resulted from the already well-known manner of forming two-syllable words, which was widespread during the *Second South-Slavic period* (V. writes about this in VINOGRADOV 1978: 131-133), and is not only typical of the old Serbian sacral poetry. The large number of two-syllable words in *Camblak's Services* is discussed by Đ. Trifunović (TRIFUNOVIĆ 1975: 76). However, this method is typical of the style *pletinja sloves*, which means that it represents a major feature of an age's style.

⁴ In the Serbian language, conjunction „i“ serves for *linking concepts with different contents (occasionally of antonymic character), which stand in coordination (sometimes as collocations), indicating their unification, addition, combination* (cf. Rečnik SANU 1971: 199).

⁵ The reader can find out more about paired syntactic and other types of repetition in Kukuskina's work *Парный синтаксический повтор и его сочетания с другими типами повторов* (КУКУШКИНА 1989: 246-261).

⁶ „Мы говорим об этом для того, чтобы стало понятным воздействие художественности Псалтыри и ее лексики на прочие произведения и жанры средневековой литературы. На самом деле, параллелизм (итеративность) средств выражения – это излюбленный прием средневековой греческой литературы, сохранявшийся, естественно, и в славянских переводах /.../ В акафисте художественный эффект покоится исключительно на этом приеме, но прием этот встречается и в песнях канона (в ирмосах, а также стихах), и в икосах, и в кондаках, и в тропарях – практически во всех жанрах рассматриваемого рода литературы“ (ВЕРЕЦАГИН 1975: 63).

the subject, as the main member of sentence structure, does not have the importance it deserves according to its position and rank in the sentence⁷.

- (1) Nepokloni stlpi crkve Hristovi,
Simeon i Sava javista se,
 Vi bo jako prst jeresi popravše,
 Ljudi svoje vazvisiste ka vere blagočastija,
 Tem anđelom sagraždane biste,
 Vaspevajušte sa njimi:
 Svet, svet, svet
 Otac i Sin i Duh sveti
 (Serbian Liturgical Book I, 198).

- (2) *Ljudije* tvoji, oče, **i čeda**
 Duhom svetim poroždena,
 Žalosna ostavljaše
 Radosna tebe vaspevajut penija,
 Vapijušte: ne ostavi nas, svete,
 Va radosti Gospoda svojego
 Mole o dušah naših
 (Serbian Liturgical Book II, 486).

In examples (1) and (2) the reduplicated subjects represent different concepts united by a common action: (1) „*Simeone i Savo, javite se*“ (= *Simeon and Sava, appear*); (2) „*Ljudi i čeda...pevaju pesme*“ (= *People and children...are singing songs*). There is another interesting thing. That is the position of the reduplicated words functioning as subjects in sentence structure. As shown in the examples, they very often take an intermediary position, with the copulative conjunction not linking two words in a sequence, but at a certain distance. However, Đ. Trifunović does not mention such cases in the *Psalms* and Sava's original works: *Korejski tipik, Hilendarski tipik, Žitije svetoga Simeona* (Trifunović 1979: 191).

1.2. *The reduplicated predicate.* The method of reduplicating the predicate is somewhat less present than subject reduplication. The reduplicated predicate position almost only includes verbs, signifying the performance of two actions.

- (1) *Teče i preminu* božastavnaja ti žizanj
 I nebesnago te seljanija ne ostavi,
 Ibo ne smetši se noga plti tvojeje
 Dremanja duhu hranještemu te ne odole,
 Temže moli za ni Gospoda
 Presveštene oče Arsenije
 (Serbian Liturgical Book II, 42).

⁷ For example, B. Tošović treats the types of aesthetic subject in his work *The Aesthetics of a Language Relation* (TOŠOVIĆ 2002: 21).

- (2) *Naprezi i spej,*
Carstvuje i carujej vasemi,
 I varvari potrebi ot pastve svojeje,
 Da poznajut, bestudni,
 Jako ti jesi Bog naš,
 Tebe molim se
 I na te upovajem
 (Serbian Liturgical Book II, 302).

In examples (1) and (2), as demonstrated, the function of reduplicated predicate is performed by verbs, signifying various kinds of actions attributed to the subject. The structure of predicate parallelism is characterised by a direct relation between the two predicate words: (1) „*teče i preminu*“ (=lasts **and** elapses), (2) „*carstvuje i caruje*“ (=reigns **and** rules), which does not apply to subject parallelism.

1.3. *The reduplicated object.* The object reduplication method is used on a broader scale than the reduplicated predicate. Due to its frequency of occurrence it sometimes appears to be the most dominant reduplication category in old Serbian ecclesiastic poetry⁸. As regards the structural image of a reduplicated object, it is realised in its pure form – the concepts are directly linked by the copulative conjunction „i“ (=and).

- (1) *Višnjiju slavu i svetlost,*
Naslaždenije i neizrečenuju krasotu,
Neuvedajuštjuju dobrotu va seljeh pravednih
 Sa likostojanmi anđelskimi
 I sa sabori mučeničaskimi
 I vasemi prepodobnimi
 Dostojno prijem, oče Simeone,
 Sa anđeli vaspevaješi:
 Blagosloven Bog otac naših
 (Serbian Liturgical Book I, 358).

- (2) *Obrazi prosijal jesi bogorazumija,*
Zareju oblistal jesi srpskoje dostojanije
 I čeda tvoja nastavil jesi slovesi tvojimi,
Ništeljubije i ljubov istočil jesi,
 Avramovu stranoljublju podobe se,

⁸ This occurrence is also confirmed by research by Đ. Trifunović in *Žitije svetoga Simeona*, written by the hand of St Sava. Trifunović points out: „From over ninety cases, three fifths are nominal words. Most nouns take the role of objects“ (TRIFUNOVIĆ 1979: 192).

Oče Arsenije, Hrista Boga moli
 Darovati nam veliju milost
 (Serbian Liturgical Book II, 26).

In both examples, total symmetry of the reduplicated elements is established: (1) „*slavu i svetlost*“ (=glory **and** light), (2) „*ništenjubiye i ljubov*“ (*love of the poor and love*). However, it sometimes happens that the symmetry is not achieved as in the quoted verses. Another word with a different syntactic function comes between the words of the reduplicated object. Usually it is a modifier of one of the object members.

1.4. *The reduplicated attribute.* The function of a reduplicated attribute, which does not constitute a frequent type of parallelism in old Serbian sacral poetry, is most often performed by adjectives and verbal adjectives. This type of reduplication is without exception established on the principles of complete symmetry.

(1) Mudri svetitelj,
 Pastir *sveti i blagi*
 I svetilnik crkovni javi se,
 Svešteni oče Savo,
 Bogu služe
 I ljudije otačastva si prosveštaje
 Svetom si bogorazumija
 (Serbian Liturgical Book I, 102).

(2) Bog *milostiv i štedar*,
 Bog revnjiv i mastej,
 Mnoga o tebe milost,
 Mnogo že i obličeniye,
 Lica ne obinuješ se,
 Komuždo po puti jago sudiši,
 Ne predažd nas pravednomu si sudu
 (Serbian Liturgical Book 1, 308).

1.5. *The reduplicated adverbial.* As regards reduplicated adverbials, they are realised in various ways, namely by using different parts of speech. Yet the words most often used as adverbials are nouns.

(1) Saj blaženi revnuje
 I porevnova po ljudeh otačastva svojego,
 Boga nikoliže otstupaje *dan i nošt*
 Moltvami i milostinjami sebe tomu privode,
 Taj te i prijet
 I satvori va tebe obitalište svetomu Duhu,

Spodobi i nas Duha svetago
 Molitvami, svete, tvojimi,
 Veroju vaspevujuštih te
 (Serbian Liturgical Book III, 90).

- (2) Nebesni Vladika Hristos na tvrdi vernih
 Jako zvezdu te utvrdi srpskomu narodu,
 I tvojemu srodstvu posledoval jesi
Učenmi i razumi
 (Serbian Liturgical Book III, 330).

In the quoted examples, the reduplicated adverbial forms consist of nouns. However, their meanings are different: the adverbial in example (1) is a temporal adverbial „odsupaje *dan i nošt* (=day **and** night)”, the one in example (2) is an adverbial for manner, „posledoval jesi *učenmi i razumi* (=by learning **and** reason)”.

2.0. *The semantic aspect.* With respect to the semantic structure of old Serbian sacral poetry, parallelism as a poetic-stylistic method is most often realised in the form of reduplicating concepts the semantic relation of which is that of *synonyms*⁹, *antonyms*¹⁰ and *different meanings* (which cannot be classified either as synonym or antonym structures). We will therefore treat these phenomena accordingly. Regarding parallelisms in the *Psalter*, Vereschagin holds that concerning semantic relations between words, three types of such relations can be identified by quantitative analysis and from the synchronic standpoint. First, words with related semantic meanings are linked – *synonymy*. Second, this includes words which semantically complement each other – *thematic lexis*. Third, semantically opposite words – *antonyms* also belong here (cf. Vereschagin 1975: 63). Our position is, as demonstrated, very close to Vereschagin's. The only difference is in that he introduces, along with *synonymy* and *antonymy*, the semantic concept *thematic lexis*, while we hold that this refers to all the meanings implying neither synonymy nor antonymy, but comprising both semantic components, but not so manifestly as with synonyms and antonyms. In our interpretation the concept of *different meanings* includes all those meanings covered by a broader subject, but not belonging to thematic lexis, where the words used express only partial meanings fitting (or not fitting) into the general, thematic meaning.

⁹ This refers to *poetic synonyms*. The reader can learn more about them in: ČARKIĆ 1992. 295-306; 1995: 181-199).

¹⁰ This refers to *poetic synonyms*. The reader can learn more about them in: ČARKIĆ 1992. 195-306; 1995: 200-218.

2.1. *Synonymic reduplications* of concepts constitute a widespread method in old Serbian sacral poetry. The reduplication is realised by means of several parts of speech, dominated by nouns.

- (1) Divnije va svetih imuštije drznovenije
 Tebe, bože,
 Grehi *ispuštajuštu*
I strasti *potrebljajuštu*
I rabi tvoje *spasajuštu*
 Privodim va molitvu,
 Savu i Simeona
 (Serbian Liturgical Book I, 348).

- (2) Višnjuju slavu i svetlost,
 Naslaždenije i neizrečenuju krasotu,
 Neuvedajuštuju dobrotu va seljeh pravednih
 Sa *likostojnimi* andelskimi
I sa *sabori* mučeničaskimi
 Dostojno prijem, oče Simeone,
 Sa anđeli vaspevaješi:
 Blagosloven Bog otaca naših
 (Serbian Liturgical Book I, 358).

The quoted examples demonstrate reduplications of nominal words – example (1): „*ispuštajuštu* (=destroyers) **i** strasti *potrebljajuštu* (=exterminators)“, example (2): „sa *likostojnimi* (=councils) andjelskimi **i** sa *sabori* (=parliaments)“. Studying Sava's works, and coming across this phenomenon, Đ. Trifunović explains it as follows: „The synonymic juxtaposition of concepts in Sava's language, for example, corresponds to the sense of symmetry and rigour of the whole period, which had not as yet embarked on the artistic and extensive superstructure“ (Trifunović 1995²: 133). However, our examples, selected according to the principle of indisputable synonymy, mostly lack symmetry, which question contests Trifunović's opinion.

2.2. *Antonymic reduplications* of concepts also represent a prevalent method in old Serbian sacral poetry. The reduplications are realised mostly with nominal words. Rarely, antonymic structures feature adjectives¹¹ too.

- (1) Satvoršago medovnuju *sladost*
I *žlči* nas radi na krste vakusivšago

¹¹ Verescagin quotes many antonymic pairs taken from the language of the *Psalter*. We will cite the most interesting ones: „veqerę – ěaútra, grh, ynikę – pravdydnę, dyny – nośy, dati – li, iti, starosty – ũnosty, ěpadę – vęstokę, vhrynę – poroęenę, more – sú,a, vęstati – pasti“ (VERESCAGIN 1975: 69).

Ljuboviju, oče, ukrepljajem,
 Gorka jadij ne stuži si
 Dondežde togo blagodetiju
 Va mani mesto preložiše ti se
 (Serbian Liturgical Book I, 500).

- (2) Obrazi prosijal jesi bogorazumija,
 Zareju oblistal jesi srpskoje dostojanije
 I čeda tvoja nastavil jesi slovesi tvojimi,
Ništeljubije i ljubov istočil jesi,
 Avraamovu stranoljubiju podobe se,
 Oče Arsenije, Hrista Boga moli
 Darovati nam veliju milost
 (Serbian Liturgical Book II, 26).

In both examples real antonymic structures are realised in the clearest forms of concept reduplication: „*sladost i žlci*“ (=sweetness **and** bitterness), „*ništeljubije i ljubav*“ (=love of the poor **and** love). Antonymic relations are established by using nominal words. However, antonymic reduplication can also be realised on the level of two phrases („*dušam spasenije i telesem zdravije*“ (=salvation of the *soul* **and** health of the *body*), Serbian Liturgical Book 3, 124). It should be noted that such antonymic structures are not rare in old Serbian sacral poetry, but we must point out that they do not play a dominant role, and do not match antonymic lexical reduplications.

2.3. *Reduplications of different meanings.* When no *synonymic* or *antonymic* reduplications take place, the question arises: what semantic relation is established between the reduplicated concepts? E. M. Vereschagin, as mentioned above, tried to answer this question. In brief, he thinks that apart from *synonymy* and *antonymy* a third semantic category should be introduced – *thematic lexis*. But bearing in mind that Vereschagin was dealing with the language of the *Psalter*, and considering the examples¹² he quotes, we can say that he was right in many respects. The language of old Serbian sacral poetry manifests a similar tendency.

- (1) Bože, Spase moj,
 Otvrzi mi *usne i jezik* moj ujasni
 Jako da vaspouju pamet svetitelja tvojego,
 Jegože na zemlji udivil jesi,
 Slavno slaviti te:
 Slavno bo proslavi se
 (Serbian Liturgical Book II, 28).

¹² „ústa – óčǣfkǣ; bouró – gnhvǣ; beäakonie – èčłoba; gradǣ – selo; grǣlica – pǣtica; ogný – plamený; milostý – ÷edrotǣ; dobro – krasyno; onhmhti – úmlǣqati“ (VERESCAGIN 1975: 66-67). However, some of these are pairs which can be classified as synonyms.

- (2) Ljubavlju nas ne zabil jesi
 Ašte i ot nas prestavljen bil jesi
 Jakože drevlje Ilija,
 Na nam izostavil jesi svetije tvoje mošti
 Jako milot časnejšuju,
 Imiže nas, preblažene, *pokrivaj i sahranjaj*
 Da vam mire vaspevaju:
 Veličit duša moja Gospoda
 (Serbian Liturgical Book III, 104).

In both (as in most) examples, the structure of parallelisms is realised in its clear form: „*usne i jezik*“ (=the lips **and** the tongue) (1); „*pokrivaj i sahranjaj*“ (=protect **and** shelter) (2). Apart from sameness, there are certain structural differences between such cases. Namely, lexical reduplications are accompanied by double repetitions at intervals, as well as triple, which transform from contact into distant ones. From the semantic point of view, parallelism of this type, even though at first glance confirming Vereschagin’s thesis on thematic relations between two concepts, disproves it to a large extent. What first strikes one is that individual meanings of lexical units are united by a more general subject. The structure *usne i jezik* (=the lips **and** the tongue) is united by the subject – the mouth; the structure *pokrivaj i sahranjaj* (=protect **and** shelter) is united by the subject – to tend, take care of; the structure *šlem i oružje* (=helmet **and** arms) is united by the subject – arms; the structure *ridaj i drehluj* (=cry **and** weep) is united by the subject-cause – negative connotation, and the structure *veliki i prvi* (=great **and** foremost) is united by the subject – positive connotation; the structure *zubnije i nožnije* (=the teeth **and** the legs), *glavobolija i srdobolija* (=headache **and** heartache) is united by the subject – disease; and the structures *ocna zrenija, ušna slišanija* (=eyesight, hearing) are united by the subject – human senses. On the other hand, if we analysed in more detail the semantic relation of the two words within an established parallelism structure, and included the direct context, it would turn out that every lexical pair expresses a synonymic or an antonymic relation.

The following examples, and there are many in old Serbian sacral poetry, completely disprove Vereschagin’s thesis on reduplicating thematic lexis.

- (1) Upasij žazlom svoje ljudi,
pravdoju i krotostiju, blažene,
 i skiptri carstvija varučivšomu ti,
 semu dobre ugodil jesi
 i sugubi vence ot njego prijel jesi
 i smirenije glbokoje pevcem si podavaješi
 (Serbian Liturgical Book II, 106).

- (2) Tričesnoje sili duševnije
 božastavnoj mudrostiju, oče, okrmiv,
 slovesnoje *pravdoju i mudrostiju*,
 jarosnoje že mužastvom krepkim,
 želateljnoje že, blažene, celomudrijem,
 ihže va žitiji
 ništože potrebneje, blažene
 (Serbian Liturgical Book II, 266).

In both cases it is impossible to find a common thematic denominator for the two concepts. In examples (1) and (2) the word *pravda* (=justice) forms parallelisms with the words *krotkost* (=gentleness), *mudrost* (=wisdom) („*pravdoju i krotostu*“, (=with justice **and** gentleness) (1); „*pravdoju i mudrostiju*“ (=with justice **and** wisdom), (2) – where the correlated concepts display a difference rather than a thematic affinity.

3.0. *The stylistic aspect.* As regards the stylistic structure of old Serbian sacral poetry, parallelism as a poetic-stylistic method is most often realised in the form of figures of diction (*anaphora*, *epistrophe*, *symploce*, *anadiplosis*¹³) and figures of construction (*inversion*, *polysyndeton*). We will therefore lay special emphasis on these phenomena.

3.1. *Figures of diction.* Although figures of diction include all sound figures, we shall leave out all the figures the effect of which is based on the repetition of certain sounds or certain sound clusters, imitation of certain sounds from nature, and repetition of whole words. In our case, figures of diction constitute repetitions of lexical units at the beginning of verse lines (*anaphora*), at the end of verse lines (*epistrophe*), both at the beginning and end (*symploce*) or at the end of the previous and the beginning of the following line (*anadiplosis*). These figures are jointly called *syntactic parallelisms* (cf. Kovačević 1998: 33), and due to their frequent use in lyrics they have been termed *lyrical parallelisms* (cf. Solar 1980⁵: 63).

3.1.1. *Anaphora* represents the repetition of words at the beginning of verse lines. However, in this case *anaphora* is a repetition of concepts at the beginnings of two lines expressed by different lexical units linked by the copulative conjunction „i“. The examples are not numerous.

- (1) *Pridete*, straždušteji,
i *primete* iscenjenija,
 ot kovčega sveštenago
 jako ot netlena istočnika

¹³ This does not refer to stylistic figures implying as a criterion the reduplication of words belonging to the same semantic or association circle (cf. KOVAČEVIĆ 1991: 93).

va Savu Spasu i Bogu proslavljajuštomu
iže togo proslavljajuštih
(Serbian Liturgical Book II, 318).

- (2) *Care* ustrašil jesi
i *kneze* nizložil jesi,
i ninja tvoje stado ratujuštih nizložil
Besove ubojaše se, Stefane,
toboju posramljeni,
i njina časnim ti moštmi progonet se
(Serbian Liturgical Book II, 356).

These are typical cases of anaphoric repetitions: „*Pridete*, straždušteji / **i** *primete* isceljenija“ (=Come, sufferers, / **and** receive healing) (1); „*Care* ustrašil jesi / **i** *kneze* nizložil jesi“ (=You have frightened *emperors* / **and** humiliated *princes*) (2).

3.1.2. *Epistrophe* represents the repetition of words at the end of verse lines. In contrast to the rhetorical concept of *epistrophe*, we take this figure to mean the reduplication of concepts at the ends of two successive lines. *Epistrophe* is somewhat more widespread than *anaphora*.

- (1) Vazašadši na visotu dobrodeteljej,
Andelino velikoimenita,
vragom ubo nizložil strmljenije,
nam že sa Bogorodiceju prosi *smirenije*
i veliju *milost*
(Serbian Liturgical Book III, 30).

- (2) Prepodobne oče, svešteniče Savo,
pištal glaseštija glasa spaseni
veliki organ Božiji,
dostohvalnaja truba istinaja,
slatki istočnik blagodetni,
Hrista moli, prepodobne,
darovati pojuštım te *mir*
i veliju *milost*
(Serbian Liturgical Book I, 92).

The quoted examples display typical cases of *epistrophe*: „nam že sa Bogorodiceju prosi *smirenije* / **I** veliju *milost*“ (1); „darovati pojuštım te *mir* / **i** veliju *milost*“ (2).

4.0. The investigation of individual aspects of structuring the discourse of old Serbian sacral poetry would require much more space. However, this short analysis was intended to explain the phenomenon of reduplication and the forms

of its functioning. Drawing attention to the *syntactic*, *semantic* and *stylistic* aspects of this phenomenon, we have tried to demonstrate how important it is in constituting this type of discourse. During our analysis we searched for the most striking cases which fully reflected the observed phenomenon, while we set aside all borderline examples and examples also displaying other ways of structuring the context, as they would require additional explanations which would lengthen the text considerably. We therefore focussed only on typical reduplications which, due to their predominance, represented an essential structural factor of old Serbian sacral poetry. Observing the three aspects individually was intended to generalise them, for highlighting their importance in the analysed discourse. In the structure of old Serbian sacral poetry as such, the three phenomena make up a complex constellation in which they are inextricably linked, as any syntactic element becomes a semantic and stylistic element.

Literature:

- ВЕРЕЩАГИН, Е. М.: Прием параллелизма в Псалтыри и вычлениение смысловых связей между словами первого литературного языка славян, Советское славяноведение, 2, Москва 1975, с. 60-72.
- ВИНОГРАДОВ, В. В.: Избранные труды. – История русского литературного языка, Москва 1978, с. 130-134.
- JOVANOVIĆ, B., Značaj srpskih parimejnika za tekstološko razvrstavanje slovenskih prepisa i rekonstrukciju prvobitnog ćirilo-metodskog originala, Zbornik istorije književnosti, Odeljenje jezika i književnosti, knj. 10, Stara srpska književnost, Beograd 1976, 1-20.
- KOVAČEVIĆ, M.: Gramatika i stilistika stilskih figura, Sarajevo 1991, s. 228.
- KOVAČEVIĆ, M.: Stilske figure i književni tekst, Beograd 1998, s. 215.
- КУКУШКИНА, Е. Ю.: Парный синтаксический повтор и его сочетания с другими типами повторов (на материале лирики А. Блока). – Проблемы структурной лингвистики. Москва 1989, с. 246-261.
- LOTMAN, J. M.: Predavanja iz strukturalne poetike (Uvod, teorija stiha). Sarajevo 1970, 107 str.
- MOŠIN, V.: O periodizaciji rusko-južnoslovenskih književnih veza, Slovo, knj. 11–12, Zagreb 1962, s. 92-106.
- MULIĆ, M.: Srpski izvori „pletinja sloves“. Sarajevo 1975.
- Rečnik SANU, Rečnik srpskog književnog i narodnog jezika, knj. 7, Beograd 1971, 798 s.
- SOLAR, M.: Teorija književnosti, Zagreb 1985, 264 s.
- TRIFUNOVIĆ, Đ.: Stara srpska crkvena poezija. In: O Srbijaku. Beograd 1970.

TRIFUNOVIĆ, Đ.: Osobnosti književnog postupka i stila u Camblakovim službama Svetom Jovanu Novom i Svetom Stefanu Dečanskom, PO, Zbornik za slavistiku, br. 9, Novi Sad 1975, s. 60-79.

TRIFUNOVIĆ, Đ.: Udvajanje i ponavljanje kao načelo književnog dela Svetoga Save, PO, Zbornik radova Sava Nemanjić – sveti Sava, istorija i predanje, Naučni skupovi Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti, knj. VII, Predsedništvo, knj. 1, Beograd 1979, s. 189-199.

TRIFUNOVIĆ, Đ.: Stara srpska književnost, Beograd 1995², 377 s.

ČARKIĆ, M. Ž.: Fonika stiha. Beograd 1992, 349 s.

ČARKIĆ, M. Ž.: Fonostilistika stiha. Beograd 1995, 249 s.