

*Lexical Repetitions Functioning as Connectors in Verse Discourses*¹

MILOSAV Ž. ČARKIĆ
(Belgrade)

0.0. Even though lexis as a separate branch of linguistics is treated with due attention, primarily within lexicography and lexicology, and natural language as a system, little time has been dedicated to the lexical level of the poetic text. Naturally, in stylistic research, especially in different stylistics which have treated individual language, or stylistic levels, poetical lexis has been discussed, but above all as a stylistic means of expression, namely the lexis intensifying the emotional and expressive tension of the poetic text (Гвоздев 1955; Васильева 1976; Голуб 1976; Барлас 1978; Григорьев 1979²; Кожина 1983; Розенталь 1987³; Ćorac 1982⁴; Simić 1993; Tošović 1995⁵). Even in stylistics exclusively tre-

1 We have based this article on material from modern Serbian poetry.

2 In his book *The Poetics of Words (Поэтика слова)* V. P. Grigoriev, treating various aspects of the use of words in poetic language (and verse as such), completely loses sight of lexical repetitions.

3 In his *Practical Stylistics of the Russian Language*, only in the chapter entitled *Stylistic Figures*, speaking of anaphora, epiphora and parallelism, Rozental' touches upon lexical repetitions.

4 In his book *Metaphoric Stylemes* M. Ćorac dedicates one chapter to the lexicostylemes, but with no mention of lexical repetitions. However, in the chapter on syntaxo-stylemes he discusses repetition, namely repeated sentence members and repeated sentences (Ćorac 1982: 418-431).

5 In a very thorough study *The Stylistics of Verbs*, B. Tošović dedicates one chapter to the *Lexical Stylistics of Verbs*. However, here we cannot find anything relating to the repetitions of verbs as one lexical category with stylistic value. Namely Tošović, speaking of the lexical stylistics of verbs, drawing on earlier opinions, thinks that it "represents part of linguo-stylistics investigating the stylistic potential of verbs on the plane of lexical semantics. This field, Tošović says, analyses the verb as a structural-stylistic category within lexical-stylistic phenomena (polysemy, synony-

ating lexis, *lexical stylistics*, there is no reference to lexical repetitions (Beljčikov 1988). Situation is similar in studies treating expressive and emotional lexis from the lexical-semantic standpoint, also with no mention of lexical repetitions (Апресян 1995; Ristić, Radić-Dugonjić 1999; Ristić 2004)⁶. However, lexical repetitions, like any other (e.g. sound repetitions) play an important role in structuring the poetic text. It is therefore that J. M. Lotman rightfully stresses that “various repetitions /lexical among them/ make up a highly complex semantic substance, imposing itself on the general language substance, thus creating a peculiar, verse-specific concentration of thought” (Lotman 1976: 186). Unfortunately, as far as we know, lexical repetitions as connectors in verse creations have never been

my, антонимы, омономы, паронимы), lexico-stylistic levels (neutral and expressive lexis, dialectisms, jargonisms, etc.) and as a functional-stylistic category (as a lexical system functioning in style)” (Tošović 1995: 30).

- 6 Yet, in the book *Стилистика современного английского языка* И. В. Арнольд pays certain attention to lexical repetitions, in the chapter entitled *Использование многозначности слова в сочетании с повтором* (126-130). Among other things, he says: “We will be dealing with the functions and manners of repetitions at several points, and here we shall only say that by lexical repetitions we mean the repetitions of words or phrases within one sentence, paragraph or a whole text. The distance between the repeated units and the number of repetitions can vary, but must be such as to be easily noticed by the reader (Arnold 1990: 126).” And Wierzbicka in her book *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics* dedicates a whole chapter to lexical repetitions (Boys will be boys: even “truisms” are culture-specific – Wierzbicka 1991: 391-452), in sentences of the type man is man, boys are boys. Such lexical repetitions are viewed as specific syntactic-logical language structures. Lexical repetitions are also treated by R. Dimitrijević in his *Theory of Literature*. Among other things, he observes: “The repetition of words is a means of expression representing one form of tautology, the only difference being that in this case only one word is repeated, whereas in tautology several synonyms signify one concept or phenomenon. Repetition intensifies and stresses a certain feeling, thought or image. Overwhelmed by an emotion or image, an author or speaker feel that a word used once does not convey the emotion or image in their fullness, so that they have to repeat the same word once or several times. As a powerful means of expression, repetition adds suggestiveness to style and is often used” (Dimitrijević 1969: 209). Also in individual works by some Russian scholars, e.g. Кукушкина (Кукушкина 1980/1982: 232-241; 1981/1983: 233-243; 1985-1987/1989: 246-261), Краснянский (Краснянский 1981/1983: 244-256) and Кузьменко (Кузьменко 1981/1983: 256-265), in the context of syntactic repetitions, repetitions of illustrative combinations, a poem’s semantic organization, lexical repetitions are sporadically touched upon. In her *Stylistics*, pages 272 and 273, Marina Katić-Bakaršić also mentions stylistic connectors, and later on even speaks of *Figures as Connectors*, treating as such figures of repetition, such as: “anaphora (a), epiphora (b), symploce, anadiplosis (c), parallelism (d), polysyndeton (e) and other figures of repetition can be found playing this role in diverse text types” (Katić-Bakaršić 2001: 274).

explicitly treated⁷. We are therefore convinced that such a topic requires much more space than a single article. Nonetheless, we will try to point out some forms of lexical repetitions and their connecting functions in verse discourses.

0.1. Naturally, we do not need to treat separately and exhaustively the text studying history which was initiated in old Greece, and in several directions too. Aristotle, for instance, analyses language from the philosophical-grammatical aspect; apart from terms, lexicographers and glossers also explain poetic expressions, rhetoricians study language for improving their oratory skills, whereas scholiasts were specialists for text commentaries⁸. Some, like Dubois (Dubois 1970), consider rhetoric a synonym to *discourse analysis*. However, we should bear in mind that even at that time a relation was established between the written concept of speech and its oral realization, which has affected today's problem of relation between the oral and written texts.

0.2. Dealing with a literary work included dealing with the language of that literary work. This tradition has been very long: from rhetoric and philology through the Prague structuralists and modern literary and language theories to text linguistics. In text structure Petöfi (Petöfi 1969) distinguishes the language and sound components. Both these components are distributed through the text both linearly and by hierarchy. By linear is meant a system created by repeating certain elements, and by hierarchical a system of relations in the text as a whole, where the text is considered as a composition of diverse units on different levels and of different complexity. In his text theory Dressler (Dressler 1973) especially insists on text semantics. He thinks text semantics should be dealing with issues of semantic text structure, especially semantic relations exceeding the semantic structure of one sentence. The simplest means of semantic cohesion for him is recurrence by repeating words, sentence parts or whole sentences. When the same word is used for the same denotate, co-reference is expected. If it is achieved, then in syntactic terms we are dealing with *anaphora* (reference to what has preceded), or *cataphora* (reference to what follows). There are various texts in terms of their effect, in terms of their usability in shaping certain information and contents. Thus we can form complex texts, texts combining diverse kinds of structuring without impairing the-

7 Other stylistic methods, such as e.g. paronymic connections of words, may produce specific kinds of connectors in poetic texts (Cf. Čarkić 2005: 91-111).

8 If anyone is interested in the history of text analysis, and the primary features of text structure, as well as cataphoric and anaphoric relations in a text – they can learn more in the book *Uvod u stilistiku* (Introduction to Stylistics) (Čarkić 2002: 224-235).

ir textuality, namely literary texts. "As any literary work is primarily text as shaped language, we can define literature above all as a language activity, as a text structuring method. In literary production we can also distinguish in terms of methodology between text and its constituents. Of great importance in a literary text is the difference between recurrent and non-recurrent constituents" (Glovacki-Bernardi 1990: 21). Here we should point out that, as regards such textological investigations of literary texts, they have exclusively been performed on prose, whereas verse discourses have been ignored. Thus searching for both anaphoric and cataphoric connections in poetry is pointless.

0.3. It is highly important to bear in mind that the poetic text (discourse) is a special and unique textological creation, with its own structuring principles. It is therefore held that "a verse is a compact, finished, rounded-off structure, shaped on the basis of coexistence of interaction, connectedness and dynamic gradualness of carefully selected figures which are within it transformed into elements of poetic expression. Thus the verse – on the plane of characteristic poetical methods and the manners and principles of their interconnections, their choice, their combinations – has developed into a special and complete language structure where all its properties find their original expression and make up a unified system, where the function of all elements (e.g. words, expressions, structures) is primarily formal /.../. All that has led to a synthesis of verbal material, both in terms of quantity and quality, which has resulted in the verse becoming a specially organized structure, compared to any other kind of text. Thus the verse possesses its unique demarcation means and distinct stylistic values resulting from interconnections of codified and non-codified poetic rules and methods" (Čarkić 1996: 99).

0.4. All the elements indicating the essence of verse, as a specific speech type, are realized through different organizations of language material which is "imposed by poetry, and not language-specific" (Petković 1975: 238). That means that verse as a strictly organized language segment manifests quite clearly its internal quantitative configuration and correspondence (the number of syllables, the number of accents). Thus a measure is established in the verse which through repetition becomes its basic organization principle. A verse is not conceivable as an independent unit (an utterance), being realized in a series of identical text sections, established by isotonic, or isometric or isosyllabic measure, which forcibly imposes boundaries even where there are none in the prose realization of speech. The verse configuration, with its specific measure and internal organization rules, becomes a distinct stylistic discourse, not only relating to any kind of prose, but to literary prose as well. It is then small wonder that almost all researchers, speaking of the diffe-

rences between verses and prose, stress that verses have boundaries imposed by extra-linguistic means, in oral form (for all listeners) by uniform intonation, and in written form (for all readers) by graphics, and that verses are separate, commensurate text sections, where words are more connected, more stressed and richer in meaning, than is the case in any kind of speech. Here one should bear in mind that, as regards verses, there are two kinds of verses: *bound verse* and *free verse*, which are much different in their internal structure and external form. The bound verse realizes its means of cohesion (bonding) through three constructive boundaries (the beginning of verse, the caesura, the end of verse) by strict metrical organization, isosyllabicity, isotonicity, rhyme. However in free verse (both rhymed and non-rhymed) all these elements are missing, so that it realizes its means of cohesion (bonding) through lexical, syntactic, verse and stanza repetitions⁹. In view of this, we have analysed lexical repetitions as means of connection (bonding) in contemporary Serbian poetry, which mostly employs free verse, with or without rhyme.

1.0. A lexical unit, lexeme, as an element of the lexical system of natural language realizes its functioning in a text (discourse) and in verse discourse at a higher, syntactic level. In our case its effect is, due to the specific nature of context, transferred to both verse and stanza levels, as the basic forms of poetic discourse. As a result lexical repetitions, in terms of structure, can occur in the form of: (1) *reduplication* (*I ništa ne gleda, a opet gleda značajno* = And looks at nothing, and still looks significantly – DMU, 15), (2) *syntactic*: (a) *phrases* (*Naoružaj malo kuću // Naoružaj malo šumu* = Arm the house a little // Arm the wood a little – VAP, 52); (b) *sentence part* (*da joj splete venac oko vrata ... / da joj splete od klasala žita... / da joj splete biser od ledenca* = to weave a wreath around her neck ... / to weave it from full-eared wheat ... / to weave a pearl on her bonnet – GMN, 79); (c) *sentence* (*Vi niste na javi. Vi niste na javi* = You are not in the real world. You are not in the real world. – RSK, 32); (d) *verse* (*Kadifen Dunav, Vojvodina mava ... / ... Kadifen Dunav, Vojvodina mava* = The velvety Danube, cerulean Vojvodina ... / ... The velvety Danube, cerulean Vojvodina – the first and last verses of the poem – TMK, 35) and (e) *stanza* (*Kuća u plamenu! / Bivstvovanje moje bivano! ... / ... Kuća u plamenu! / Bivstvovanje moje bivano!* = House in flames! My lived life! ... / House in flames! My lived life! - the first and last stanzas – SDJK, 54) *repetitions*.

2.0. Depending on the manner of their spreading and the type of context in which we encounter them, lexical repetitions can be: horizontal (the context of a single

9 All these repetitions can be found in bound verses, but they are of secondary importance, as well as their binding substance.

verse) and vertical (from the context of two or more adjoining verses through a stanza, a larger part of the poem, to the whole poem).

2.1. *Horizontal lexical repetitions*, depending of whether they are in direct contact or following each other at a certain distance, can be divided into contact and distant.

2.1.1. *Contact horizontal lexical repetitions*. This kind of lexical repetitions is present in all the analysed Serbian poets¹⁰.

(1) **Ružo ružo ružo** sjajna (VAP, 153).

(2) Ođvikavam se od **ljubavi, ljubavi** moja. (RSP, 280).

(3) O **džara, džara, džara**

Kroz crni dimnjak šara

O **čara, čara, čara**

Dimu tako put otvara (PMN, 34).

In example (1) by triple repetition of the lexical form “*Ružo ružo ružo*” (=rose, rose, rose) a connection is established among the graded meanings of a concept, rising from the positive to the superlative. The semantic progression is directed from the meaning of an ordinary rose to the meaning of a beautiful, exceptional rose. In example (2) the repetition of the lexeme *ljubavi, ljubavi* (= love, love) establishes a connection between the general and the individual. The first form *ljubavi* in this context signifies love in general, any kind of love, whereas the other form *ljubavi*, with the modifier *moja* (= my) signifies concrete, personal love. In example (3), in the stanza, a double triplet link (connection) is realized “*džara, džara, džara... / čara čara čara*” (=poke, poke, poke ... / stoke, stoke, stoke) which almost completely fills the context of the first and third verses. This kind of connection underlines the duration of the actions expressed by the verb forms *džara* (=poke) and *čara* (=stoke), for realizing the imagined aim: opening the way to the smoke through the black chimney. All the three aforesaid cases are unified by the same idea, to point by repeating the same form, denoting an extra-linguistic object, to its internal semantic relations, either by grading it or associating the general and the individual, which all indicates semantic cohesion.

10 However, for reasons of spatial economy we will give only three examples for each.

2.1.2. *Distant horizontal lexical connections.* This type of lexical connections is also very prominent in the analysed poetry and can be encountered in each of the poets analysed.

(1) I sve **reći** nisu više **reći**, (RBM, 53).

(2) **Duhovi** druma, pirgavi **duhovi** brzih oblaka (LIO, 211).

(3) **San** u planini – to je **san** u počelu (NRL, 76).

In example (1) the repetition of the same form of the lexeme *reći* (=words) at a distance within one verse underlines the opposite semantic relation, enantiosemia, of the concept of *reč* (=word) “*reći nisu više reći*” (= words are no longer words). In example (2), by repeating the lexical form *duhovi* (=ghosts), this notion is attributed polysemy by emphasising the difference between down (close) – up (distant). In example (3) by repeating the lexical form *san* (=dream) one lexical concept is explained by itself: “*San u planini – to je san u počelu*” (= A dream in the mountain – it’s a dream in the beginning). This type of connection is aimed at linking the contents of two half-verses, at intensifying their contents, and emphasizing, highlighting the basic concept, dominating over the context of the whole verse. In this case, as in the previous, lexical repetitions are employed for achieving semantic cohesion of diverse shades of the same concept and a closer linking of the contents of two half-verses within the same verse.

2.2. *Vertical lexical repetitions.* Depending on whether such repetitions appear in successive verses or in verses at a certain distance, they can be divided into (1) contact, (2) distant, (3) contact-distant (and the opposite) and (4) dispersed.

2.2.1. *Contact vertical lexical repetitions.* Such lexical repetitions most often occur in two, more rarely in three successive verses, even though they may cover whole stanzas or larger parts of verse texts. They can be found in all the analysed poets.

(1) Ne ova pesma; na koji **korak** od škriljca.
Na **korak** izvan reči, i evo: stranica (RBM, 41).

(2) **Koliko žarica toliko varica**
Koliko žarica toliko ovčica
oliko žarica toliko kravica (BPH, 29).

(3) **Iz budavih zemunica,**

z čadavih kuća,
 z dubokih bukava,
 z ružnih snova,
 osi iz pepela,
 z vašljivih odela,
 z mišjih rupa,
 z oblaka (SLJH, 152).

In example (1), the repetition of the lexeme *korak* (=step) indicates its importance in the given context, and establishes a connection between the two successive verses, thus merging their contents, which are relatively disproportionate: “*korak od škriļjca : korak izvan reči*” (=a step from the shale : a step beyond the word), thus revealing both the concrete and the abstract semantic dimensions of the same concept *korak*. In example (2), the triplet repetition of the sentence part “*koliko žarica toliko...*” (=as many sparks so many...) not only firmly links the three successive verses, but also effectively underlines the semantic value of the clausuras of the three verses: “*varica : ovčica : kravica*”. This connection is also reinforced by rhyme interlinking all the three verses. Lexical repetition along the vertical “*žarica, žarica, žarica*” (=sparks, sparks, sparks) on the caesura position of the three verses also establishes a connection with the rhymed units “*varica* (=cooked wheat) – *ovčica* (=sheep) – *kravica* (=kine)”, thus building a specific structure of the doubly rhymed dodecasyllabic verses. In example (3), the repetition of the prepositional lexeme *iz* (=from) interlinks eight successive verses. The replication of a single element in the form of lexical anaphora serves as connection between different concepts. By means of this method, all disparities have been brought into accord, thus building a firm, stable poetic structure which is fairly compact, notwithstanding all the lexical-semantic discrepancies.

2.2.2. *Distant vertical lexical repetitions.* This form of lexical repetitions is usually employed in no less than three verses, sometimes extending to a whole poem. The examples are numerous and present in all the analysed poets.

(1) Šta ti smeta da spojim oba sveta
 na dva, stara, iz ko zna kog veka, plava
 – Muči me jedna ptica iz usamljenog leta
 Smeta mi jedan asketa iznad koga se odmara trava (DMN, 12).

(2) Šume, polja, neba zraci
 Reč najteža: ime zore
 Sažetosti, crni znaci
 Reči! Hoće da izgore!

Možda ja već u tom času
Ne znam moje reči šta su (VAP, 10).

- (3) Jedna voda koje se prisećam: list
(...)
Ili voda znoja, i vlaga koja na zidu
(...)
Voda u plitkim uvalama, kao večernje nebo,
(...)
Najzad, voda u mleku, u krvi moje majke (LIO, 11).

In the example (1), in the quatrain, a connection between the first and fourth verse is established through lexical repetition (*mi smeta...smeta mi*¹¹). The purpose of this type of lexical connection is obviously to additionally make a contact between mutually non-rhymed verses (*sveta – trava*) in a rhymed discourse, and achieve as compact content of the stanza as possible. Namely, the used system of lexical connections forms certain relations (here it is the case of a collision between lexical repetition and rhyme) with the rhyme that acts as a connection between the first and the third (*sveta – leta*), and also between the second and the fourth verse (*glavu – trava*). In the example (2), in the sestina, the relation of lexical repetitions and rhyme is somewhat different than in the previous case. Two systems of rhyming are at work in the quoted six-verse: 1) crossed and 2) paired, through which the stanza is divided into quatrain and double verse. By repeating different forms of the lexeme *reč* (*reč, reči, reći*) the second, fourth and sixth verses are interconnected. This kind of lexical connection sets a full correlation between lexical repetitions and rhyme (*reč – reći: zore – izgore*), and additionally links the two elements of the sestina (*reč – reći: zraci – znaci, zore – izgore, času – šta su*) which are the product of the combining of different rhyming systems. As we can see, in the first two examples lexical connections are made in the context of a stanza. However, in the example (3), the context of the entire poem is in question. By repeating the lexeme *voda* (=water) in all the stanzas of the poem, a correlation is formed between them, which makes the entire content of the poem more compact.

2.2.3 *Contact-distant (and vice versa) lexical repetitions.* These lexical repetitions usually cover part of a poem, but sometimes also the whole poem. They are not characteristic of all of the analyzed poets.

11 This kind of lexical repetition corresponds to the stylistic figure called antimetabole, which is differently defined by various authors.

(1) Između tvrđave i vrta, **koliko** mogućnosti
Koliko krvi koju vetar, kiklopski nesiguran,
 Cepa zvučno kao mokru zastavu od svile,
Koliko neucrtanih paralela, **koliko**,
 Uzvika na klupama, **koliko** kula istopljenih
 Kao vosak, u strasti vazduha, **koliko** strasti
 U ponavljanju rečenice: odavde može da počne svet,
Koliko cveća na vlažnoj koži ljubavnika, (LIO, 52).

(2) Lazare na zemlji
 i **Lazare** na vodi!
Lazare u lozi vinovoj,
 u hlebu i soli!
Lazare u vinu
 i **Lazare** u košnici!
Lazare jutrom i večerom,
 kraj vatre
 i na mečavi! (RSP, 183).

(3) Stani, **alo!** Natrag, **alo!**
 Suknju dižem iznad glave. **alo!**
 Gledaj, **alo!** Nagledaj se, **alo!**
 Dobro gledaj, **alo**, da bi znala
 ako bi zagrizla na šta si zinula,
 kakva bi te **ala** progutala! (SLjH, 213).

In example (1), in eight consecutive verses, the lexeme *koliko* (=how much/many) is repeated seven times. It is omitted only in the third and seventh verse, by means of which a double contact-distant connection is formed. Through this form of interpolating of the lexeme *koliko*, the entire quoted context is imbued in form and meaning with its semantics. Due to its particular meaning and use, it functions as an expressive in the form of *surprise, astonishment* (“*koliko mogućnosti, koliko krvi, koliko ... paralela, koliko uzvika, koliko kula, koliko strasti, koliko cveća*”). All this emotionally colours the entire context, attaining for it a specially added stylistic meaning. Besides, through this established connection, not only have different notions been interconnected but also the entire context gained in compactness, wholeness and unity. In example (2), in the larger part of the poem, the repetition of the lexeme *Lazare* (Lazar) was used, by which six of seven consecutive verses got interlinked in contact-distant connection. Through this approach a superb poetic structure has been made, in which diverse notions have been placed on

the same level. (“*Lazare na zemlji / Lazare na vodi / Lazare u lozi vinovoj, / u hlebu i soli! / Lazare u vinu / Lazare u kosnici! / Lazare jutrom i večerom, / kraj vatre / i na mećavi!*” = Lazar on land / Lazar on water / Lazar in vine, / in bread and salt! / Lazar in wine / Lazar in the beehive! / Lazar in the mornings and the evenings, / by the fire / in a blizzard!) As if to say: *Lazar* in any place and any time; *Lazar* omnipresent and eternal. Thus the reiterated lexeme *Lazare*, in terms of expression, becomes a very important connecting device, and as regards the content, appearing as a contextual pillar around which the whole content is structured, becomes the centre of information and a very powerful expressive device, in fact its *expresseme*. In example (3), the six-verse, the lexical unit *ala* (=dragon) is repeated seven times in the first four and the last, sixth line. Through distinctive structuring of the context, in fact the interpolation of the lexeme *ala* into it, a semantic-emotional gradation is made (“*Stani, alo! Natrag alo! / Suknju dižem iznad glave, alo / Gledaj, alo! Nagledaj se, alo! / Dobro gledaj, alo!*” = Stop, *dragon!* Back away, *dragon!* / I lift my skirt above my head, *dragon!* Look, *dragon!* Stare, *dragon!* Look well, *dragon!*), which, on the border of transition of lexical repetitions from contact to distant ones, turns into a paradox (“*da bi znala, /...kakva bi te ala progutala*”¹² = so that you know, /... what an awful *dragon* would swallow you). In this way the lexical repetition, functioning as a connective, links two stylistic devices: gradation and paradox, in which the aforementioned lexeme appears as their *expresseme*, or poetic means of expression. In all the three provided examples, among other features, the repeated lexeme has the role of leitmotif, since in the mentioned discourses it represents repetition, but, at the same time, also the varying of a certain expressive device, thus enabling the connecting of disparate details of the artistic text into a unified whole.

2.2.4 *Dispersed lexical repetitions*. This form of lexical repetitions usually envelopes the context of an entire poem, less often only its parts. They are characteristic of a larger number of the analyzed poets.

- (1) **Reč** je **sudbina** za istinu grozna
Reč krije svoje biće kao sužnja
Sve što reč osvetli bar malo poružnja
Sve što reč i nade to jedva prepozna

Reči vitopere **sudbinu** čovečju

12 We can draw a moral out of this: no matter how big an *ala* is, there is an *ala* above that one that can swallow it.

Jer ma kud da zađeš crna reč u uglu
Pred tišinom te izvgava ruglu
Zbog tvoje preljube s prolaznom rečju (ADS, 46).

- (2) Prvo nisam znao kome sam kriv,
sad ne znam kome nisam.

**Kriv sam svome ocu ko i on svome ocu,
i kriv svom sinu ko moj otac meni,**

**kriv i svom zanatu i alatu
i onom što sam imao, i onom što sam nemo,**

**i onom što sam jeo i pio,
i onom što je mene jelo i pilo,**

**kriv sam i ovoj slami na kojoj spavam,
i ovoj vreći kojom se pokrivam,**

**svima i svemu sam kriv,
al samome sebi sam najkrivlji, ko i svako! (SLjH, 138).**

- (3) Ništa **stravilo** voda **stravilo** vazduh **stravilo**
duh **stravilo** šume **stravilo** planine **stravilo**
pokret **stravilo** snaga **stravilo** život **stravilo**
zveri **stravilo** potoci **stravilo** staze **stravilo**
ptice **stravilo** noći **stravilo** dani **stravilo**
ljudi **stravilo** žene **stravilo** deca **stravilo**
godine **stravilo** sela **stravilo** gradovi **stravilo**
stvari **stravilo** oruđa **stravilo** oružja **stravilo**
knjige **stravilo** sprave **stravilo** zvezde **stravilo**
demoni **stravilo** anđeli **stravilo** bogovi **stravilo**
ogromno **stravilo** beskonačno **stravilo** nemoguće **stravilo** (TNŽ, 88).

In example (1), lexical repetitions are dispersed through the entire context of the poem, namely in the form of individual words (*reč...reč* = word...word) and groups (*sve što reč...sve što reč* = all that a word...all that a word...). As we can see, they are mostly placed in the initial position with a tendency towards the final position. However, the final position is occupied by rhyme which in its organizational function interconnects verses into stanzas. Still, in one place, and for the given context most important one, namely the final position of the poem, it resulted in a direct contact, or actually concurrence, between the lexical repetitions and the rhy-

me. In fact, the lexeme *reč* through repetition ended up in the position of the rhyme (*čovječju – rečju*), by which the two stylistic devices, which are different but have the same purpose, have been mutually equated. In this way the poetical text is affected by a double compression: (1) in the initial positions (lexical repetitions) and (2) in the final positions (rhyme). Thus, a balance was struck on the two most important constructional lines of a poetic text, its beginning and its end. In example (2) the lexical repetitions permeated the poetical context to such an extent that we are more likely to talk in terms of lexical units that did not enter the system of lexical repetitions¹³. Actually, out of 86 used lexemes, 65 (or 75.58%) are in the lexical repetition system, and 21 (or 24.42%) out of that system. From the data shown we can realize how high the rate of connectives is in the quoted poem by Lj. Simović. In this way, one lexeme is particularly distinguished with its presence from the rest of the lexical repetitions, and that is the lexeme *kriv* (=guilty) (found in different forms), which, through its greater presence colours emotionally and semantically the whole context of the poem, thus becoming its *expresseme*¹⁴. In example (3), a unique poetic piece of work is made through alternate stringing of different terms always followed by the same modifier expressed with the lexeme *stravilo*. In fact, in the first ten lines the word *stravilo* stands as a modifier to entirely different phenomena (or terms) (for example: “*nista stravilo...vazduh stravilo / duh stravilo / planine stravilo / pokret stravilo... zveri stravilo... /dani stravilo / ljudi stravilo.../knjige stravilo.../ demoni stravilo...bogovi stravilo*”, where it refers to the words: nothing, air, ghost, mountains, movement, beasts, days, people, books, demons, gods). The primary goal of such structuring of the text is to discover an equivalent element (or dimension) in most varied phenomena. In this case it is marked with a negative connotation expressed through the word *stravilo* (=terror, monster, apparition). However, in the last, eleventh line, without changing the structuring approach, a reverse situation is created: the modifier *stravilo* becomes a head word, and various terms standing next to it reveal its main characteristics (“*ogromno* (=immense) *stravilo*, *beskonačno* (=endless) *stravilo*, *nemoguće* (=impossible)

13 Here we remember the idea expressed by Hopkins: that the structure of poetry is the structure of uninterrupted parallelism produced by repeating of the same or similar segments of the text (Hopkins, 1963).

14 The term *expresseme* is taken from V.P. Grigoriev. In his book *Поэтика слова*, he defines this term in the following manner: “An *expresseme* contains the ‘linguistic’ and the ‘aesthetic’ in their concrete mutuality, and represents the unity of general, particular and singular, of typical and individual, material and ideal, form and content (Григорьев 1979: 140).

stravilo"). So through such repetition a specific connecting relation was created aimed at pointing out *the same in the different*, or making *the impossible possible*.

3.0. Upon this short analysis of the selected material the following conclusions can be drawn. As we have seen in the introduction to this paper, lexical repetitions have rarely been the object of research. As far as we know, nobody has written about their connective function in a poetical text. However, these repetitions represent one of the constant poetical devices that are used by all schools and movements. That is why they constitute one of the most important constructive elements of verse creations. Both individual lexical repetitions, or those constituting syntactic, verse or stanza repetitions, are widely used in contemporary Serbian poetry, mostly because that poetry is written in free verse without the use of rhyme. In this type of versification (and poetry) lexical repetitions present a very prominent means of compositional organizing of a poetic text. It is especially distinctive when the lexical repetitions take some of the marked positions in the verse: initial, medial, final. Moreover, lexical repetitions take part in the creation of the poetical text even if it uses bound verse and rhyme. Then they function as an additional device, creating certain relations, in the first place with the rhyme, which among its many functions (for example auditory, rhythmical, grammatical, syntactic, semantic) also has the organizing function, i.e. linking verses into stanzas. Lexical repetitions with organizing function interconnect different elements of a poetical text, and do so at different distances, appearing in that way as a very powerful connective device, by which, besides molding, the compression of the poetic-linguistic material is performed. Of course, the organizational role of lexical repetitions entails other functions: rhythmical – when the lexical repetitions are in the marked positions of a verse; grammatical – gender, number and case are activated; syntactic – additional relations are formed between the subject and the predicate, the subject and the object, the predicate and the object etc.; semantic – different components of meaning of a term are expressed through the same form in differing contexts; stylistic – every repeated lexeme becomes an *expresseme*, colouring the poetical context with emotionality and expressiveness. Depending on the type of context and the structure of lexical repetitions, the connective function as general is segmented into separate functions, which are usually expressed in the form of (1) organizational, (2) rhythmical, (3) semantic and (4) stylistic functions. It is rarely the case that only one of these functions is realized, more often they operate together, and in that way make the poetical discourse truly complex and polysemous. What seems to be important, and is related to the connective function of lexical repetitions, is that this function is

universally expressed in connecting the form and the content of a poetical work, since it links the scope of expression and the scope of its content.

Abbreviations and sources

- ADS = Andrić, Dragoslav, 2005, *Sto pesama o ljubavi (i o rečima)*, Beograd.
BPH = Bogdanović, Predrag Ci, 1997, *Hodeći vodom*, Beograd.
VAP = Vukadinović, Alek, 2003, *Pesme*, Beograd.
GMN = Gavrilović, Manojle, 1994, *Nedelja u zavičaju*, Beograd.
DMN = Danojlić, Milovan, 1959, *Nedelja*, Zagreb.
DMU = Danojlić, Milovan, 1957, *Urođenički psalmi*, Beograd.
LIO = Lalić, Ivan V., 1997, *O delima, ljubavi ili Vizantija*, Beograd.
NRL = Nogo, Rajko Petrov, 1995, *Lirika*, Beograd.
PMN = Pavlović, Milen Agaton, 1996, *Na vrh brda vrba vrda*, Beograd.
RBM = Radović, Borislav, 1964, *Maina*, Novi Sad.
RSK = Raičković, Stevan, 1989, *Kamena uspavanka*, Beograd.
RSP = Rakitić, Slobodan, 2002, *Pesme*, Beograd.
SLJH = Simović, Ljubomir, 1985, *Hleb i so*, Beograd.
SDJK = Stojčić, Đoko, 1998, *Kopno, kopno, na vidiku!*, Novi Sad.
TMK = Tešić, Milosav, 1991, *Ključ od kuće*, Novi Sad.
TnŽ = Tadić, Novica, 2002, *Ždrelo*, Banjaluka – Beograd.

Cited literature

- Dressler W., 1973, *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*, Tübingen.
Dubois J., 1970, *Rhétorique générale*, Paris.
Hopkins G. M., 1963, *The Journals and Papers*, Oxford.
Petöfi J. S., 1969, *On the Problems of Co-textual Analysis of Texts, International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, Saga – Säby.
Wierzbicka A., 1991, *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics, The Semantics of Human Interaction*, Berlin – New York.
Апресян . Д., *Лексическая семантика, Синонимические средства языка*, Москва.
Арнольд И.В., 1990, *Стилистика современного английского языка*, Москва.
Барлас Л.Г., 1978, *Русский язык. Стилистика*, Москва.
Бельчиков Ю.А., 1988, *Лексическая стилистика: проблемы изучения и обучения*, Москва.
Васильева А. Н., 1976, *Курс лекций по стилистике русского языка*, Москва.
Гвоздев А.Н., 1955, *Очерки по стилистике русского языка*, Москва.

- Гловацки-Бернарди З., 1990, *О тексту*, Загреб.
- Голуб И.Б., 1976, *Стилистика современного русского языка. Лексика. Фоника*, Москва.
- Григорьев В.П., 1978, *Поэтика слова*, Москва.
- Димитријевић Р., 1969, *Теорија књижевности са примерима (композиција, језик и стил, версификација)*, Београд.
- Катнић-Бакаршић М., 2001, *Стилистика*, Сарајево.
- Краснянский В.В., 1981/1983, *Повторяющиеся образные сочетания в художественной речи (эпитет И. А. Бунина)*. – В: Проблемы структурной лингвистики, Москва.
- Кузьменко О.А., 1981/1983, *Семантическая организация стихотворения Ф. И. Тютчева Весенняя гроза*. – В: Проблемы структурной лингвистики, Москва.
- Кукушкина Е.Ю., 1980/1982, *О некоторых типах взаимодействия лексического и синтаксического повтори в лирике А Блока*. – В: Проблемы структурной лингвистики, Москва.
- Кукушкина Е.Ю., 1981/1983, *Синтаксический повтор в лирике А Блока*. – В: Проблемы структурной лингвистики, Москва.
- Кукушкина Е.Ю., 1985-1987/1989, *Парный синтаксический повтор и его сочетания с другими типами повторов (на материале лирики А Блока)*. – В: Проблемы структурной лингвистики, Москва.
- Лотман Ж. М., 1976, *Структура уметничког текста*, Београд.
- Петковић Н., 1975, *Језик у књижевном делу*, Београд.
- Ристић С., 2004, *Експресивна лексика у српском језику*, Београд.
- Ристић С., Радић-Дугоњић М., 1999, *Реч. Смисао. Сазнање (студије из лексичке семантике)*, Београд.
- Розенталь Д., 1987, *Практическая стилистика русского языка*, Москва.
- Симић Р., 1993, *Лингвистика стила*, Никшић.
- Тошовић Б., 1995, *Стилистика глагола*, Wuppertal.
- Ђорац М., 1982, *Морфемски лингвостилеми*, Београд.
- Чаркић М. Ж., 1996, *Стих као особен стилистички дискурс*. – In: *Styl a tekst*, Opole.
- Чаркић М. Ж., 2002, *Увод у стилистику*, Београд.
- Чаркић М. Ж., 2005, *Стилски поступци паронимских зближавања речи у постмодернистичкој српској поезији*, – In: *Stil*, no. 4, p. 91–111, Beograd.

Lexical repetitions functioning as connectors in verse discourses

The subject of this article are lexical repetitions functioning as connectors, or performing the organizational function, by serving as a means of connecting various poetic elements, giving compactness, expressiveness and multiplicity of meanings to the poetic creation as a whole.

Key words: *connector function, connection; expressemé, stylistic method; lexical repetitions: horizontal, vertical, contact, distant, contact-distant, dispersed; syntactic, verse, stanza repetitions.*