

Parallelism in Verbal Art and Performance: An Introduction

Frog, in collaboration with Lotte Tarkka

Parallelism¹ has been considered a fundamental feature of artistic expression. Robert Lowth (1753:180) coined the term *parallelismus membrorum* (“parallelism of members”) to describe a variety of different types of equivalence or resemblance that he observed between verses in Biblical Hebrew. Lowth’s study is in many respects the foundation of research on parallelism,² although his terminology only began to spread across the nineteenth century. The concept expanded considerably during the twentieth century, especially through the far-reaching influences of Roman Jakobson. From early in his career, Jakobson looked at parallelism as an abstract text-structuring principle of “le rapprochement de deux unités” (Jakobson 1977 [1919]: 25) (“the bringing together of two units;” translations following a citation are by the present authors), later referred to in English as “recurrent returns” (1981 [1966]:98). Jakobson saw parallelism not only at the level of words, syntax, or meanings of verses as discussed by Lowth, but also at the level of sounds and rhythms within and across verses as well as in larger, complex structures. The breadth of Jakobson’s perspective allowed textual parallelism to connect fluidly with parallelism in music and other forms of expression. His views are the foundation for advancing the concept from language to a general semiotic phenomenon—a phenomenon observable within and across all sorts of media. Parallelism has become a central term and concept on discussions of literature, poetics, and beyond, and yet the phenomenon is so basic, so pervasive, that it is challenging to pin down.

The discourse surrounding parallelism has constructed the ways we think about the concept. Recognizing what has happened in that discourse can make it easier to make sense of the different ways the concept is handled. Nigel Fabb recently observed that parallelism “has remained undertheorized.”³ Across the past century, research on parallelism has developed considerably, but James J. Fox describes this research as developing “in silos:” it builds up in towers of discussion on parallelism in a particular culture, language group, or field of research

¹This introduction draws on the structure and examples of the introduction to the working papers of the 2014 seminar-workshop, “A Preface to Parallelism” (Frog 2014).

²For a valuable review of discussions of parallelism in Classical Hebrew and a contextualization of Lowth in that history, see Kugel (1981).

³Personal comment when discussing parallelism at the conference *Frontiers in Comparative Metrics 2*, 19th-20th April 2014, Tallinn, Estonia.

with little dialogue between them.⁴ The analytical definition of the broader concept does not seem to have advanced significantly beyond Jakobson's "recurrent returns." Since Jakobson's time, more attention has been given to how parallelism functions in discourse, its relationship to text cohesion, how parallelism is perceived, and the meanings or connotations it may carry. Developments in research have not fed back into definitions of the broader concept. Rather than a shared analytical definition, we each tend to develop a familiar and often intuitive understanding of parallelism related to the research materials with which we work and discussions associated with them. Perspectives on parallelism in a particular language or tradition can be quite sophisticated but cannot be applied elsewhere without modification (see for example the contributions of HOLM and SAARINEN; references to articles in this special issue are indicated by placing authors' names in small capitals), while more abstract definitions often narrowly concern linguistic parallelism (for example Fabb 2015:140). We each engage with other research where it connects with our own while what is beyond that horizon easily remains invisible to us. When we go beyond the comfort zone of the familiar, the variety of approaches to parallelism can be dizzying and the concept can easily appear amorphous, leaving it bewilderingly unclear where "parallelism" ends and "not parallelism" begins.

We do not presume to describe and define parallelism comprehensively here, nor even to offer a full survey of the diversity of its forms and uses. This introduction is instead intended to familiarize the reader with some of the topics and themes that are found across the contributions to this volume, as well as with some of the significant questions concerning parallelism that connect and relate the articles to one another. It surveys some of the basic ground covered in this special issue as a preliminary frame of reference with which the articles can be approached and deliberated. More generally, this introduction brings into dialogue the variety of phenomena addressed as parallelism in their multitude of forms as a way to stimulate thinking about parallelism as a phenomenon and how to relate the diverse insights and perspectives brought together here.

What Makes Parallelism Parallelism?

The modern study of parallelism ultimately develops from Lowth's (1753) pioneering work in Biblical poetics. He established *parallelismus* as a term for the poetic structuring of phraseology and meanings of verses and clauses in a way comparable to rhyme, alliteration, or metered rhythms. What made Lowth's study ground-breaking was that he broke from Classical theories of meter and rhetoric; he insisted that biblical discourse had to be approached on its own terms, arguing that it was poetry not based on sounds and syllables but on a metrics of meanings. Parallelism, he proposed, is a valid verse-structuring mechanism in biblical discourse comparable to counting syllables and their quantities in Greek and Latin. He subjected verse and clause parallelism to detailed analytical consideration and established a typology of three varieties: *parallelismus synonymus* (1753:180) ("synonymic parallelism"), *parallelismus*

⁴This statement was in the prelude to Fox's keynote lecture at the seminar-workshop in 2014; he did not include it his paper published in this issue.

antitheticus (189) (“antithetical parallelism”), and *parallelismus syntheticus* (191) (“synthetic parallelism”). He later also referred to the third of these in English as “constructive” parallelism, describing what would now be called syntactic parallelism (1778:xvii). Lowth founded parallelism as a principle of poetics.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, parallelism came into focus as a structuring principle of phrases, clauses, and verses in an ever-increasing number of traditions. It became recognized as “widespread in the languages of the world” (Jakobson 1981 [1966]:98), which Fox (1977:69-70) considers to “suggest it is a phenomenon of near universal significance.” Verse parallelism remains at the center of discussions and many researchers define parallelism strictly in terms of verse or clause parallelism.⁵ The density of verse parallelism in a tradition can vary considerably and it is exceptional that parallelism uniformly structures all verses. Where the particular “similarities between successive verbal sequences are compulsory or enjoy a high preference,” this is described as *canonical parallelism* (Jakobson 1981 [1966]:98), a term often used with specific reference to semantic parallelism. Discussions can foreground dyadic structures to the point of seeming to eclipse alternatives,⁶ but such views are linked to certain traditions and discussions rather than being uniform across parallelism research.⁷

Rather than remaining limited to language and verses, parallelism has been extended to the full spectrum of expression. This development tends to be traced back to Gerard Manley Hopkins’ statement that “The artificial part of poetry, perhaps we shall be right to say all artifice, reduces itself to the *principle of parallelism*” (Hopkins 1959 [1865]:84, emphasis added). However, responsibility for paving the trail in current scholarship belongs to Jakobson, who based his approach to poetry on “the obvious fact that on every level of language the essence of poetic artifice consists in recurrent returns” (Jakobson 1981 [1966]:98).⁸ Like Hopkins, Jakobson saw parallelism at every level of a text. Nevertheless, he was working within the paradigms of his time and focused on expression as a linguistic text-script, even if his approach was oriented to looking at parallelism as a fundamental semiotic phenomenon that could also encompass parallelism across media. As research attention shifted from text to performance, the same principle could be extended to parallelism between word and gesture or action. Once parallelism is lifted from something that happens specifically in language to an abstract type of relation, it

⁵The difference between “poetry” and “prose” concerns the degree to which verse structure is formalized and periodic rather than whether it is organized into sections that can be called “verses” (Hymes 1977; Fabb 2015:20; Frog 2017:14-18). This was already apparent to Classical rhetoricians, who observed that *contra nihil quod est prorsa scriptum non redigi possit in quaedam versiculorum genera uel in membra* (Quintilianus, *Institutio oratoria* IX.iv.lii) (“certainly there is nothing written in prose that cannot be reduced to some sort of verses or indeed parts of verses”).

⁶See for example James J. Fox’s classic review (1977:77-80) and Barbara Johnstone’s response to dyadic parallelism perceived as the hegemonic norm (1991:21-32); regular dyadic structuring can even be found as imposed editorially on a text, misrepresenting it (Carrasco and Hull 2015:2, 5).

⁷For example, the illusion that semantic parallelism is regularly dyadic is absent from the discussion of so-called Kalevala-meter poetry and its relatives in Finnic languages because the number of parallel members in a group clearly varies.

⁸Jakobson seems only to have learned of Hopkins’ similar views after beginning to develop his own (Fox 1977:59).

becomes possible to consider parallelism between texts, between performances, or between text and perceived reality. In verbal art, parallelism tends to be thought of first in terms of paired verses that say the same thing in different ways, but the patterns described as parallelism echo outward in all directions, begging the question of what precisely unites this diversity of uses—and whether they are united at all.

In broad terms, parallelism refers to a perceivable quality of sameness in two or more commensurate units of expression so that those units refer to one another as members of a parallel group (see also Cureton 1992:263). It involves one or more types of repetition but is normally (but not always: see Fabb 2015:140) distinguished from exact repetition by entailing difference as well as sameness. Unlike deictic words such as *it*, *this* or *that*, which refer to a preceding stretch of text, parallelism has a formal aspect that allows it to become perceivable without such explicit terms: a parallel member of a group is recognized in part through a formal equivalence to the preceding member as a unit of utterance, whether it is a verse line, hemistich, or stanza, or a clause or phrase in a form of discourse that lacks recurrent meter. The deixis or indexicality of parallel members creates formal relations between signs and qualifies as a type of syntax (Morris 1971 [1938]:22; Du Bois 2014:387-400). Recognizing and interpreting those relations relies on perception.

The quality of sameness of parallel members may be at the surface level of signs in formal features such as recurrent sounds, vocabulary, syntax, morphology, or metrical and rhythmic structure. It may also center at the level of semantics, images, or symbols that are communicated through those signs. Sameness at this level of meaning or content is normally accompanied by some type of formal sameness that makes the parallelism more observable. The “recurrent returns” are perceived as linking parallel members to one another, a perception that invites mapping the elements of each parallel member onto the other(s). This mapping brings organized alignments and oppositions into focus, whether foregrounding sameness or difference, and whether operating at a purely formal level of sounds and structures, at the level of meanings and mediated symbols, or some combination thereof. In practice, the relations between members can be organized in countless ways that all fall under the ægis of parallelism.

***Parallelismus Synonymus*—Semantic Parallelism**

Semantic parallelism refers to two or more commensurable units that express “the same thing.” Such parallelism is often structured at a lexical and phrasal level. In other words, each word in a verse corresponds to a word in the parallel verse, as in the Zhuang epic poetry discussed by DAVID HOLM: “sam gaiq sam vuengz ciq / seiq gaiq seiq vuengz caux” (“three worlds three kings establish / four worlds four kings create”) (HOLM).⁹ The lexical structuring of parallelism leads the couplet to reduce semantically to “three//four worlds three//four kings establish//create.” Correspondence may only be required in semantically significant elements while other particles of speech are handled more flexibly, like the conjunction *ma* (“and”) in

⁹Semantically parallel elements are underlined in relevant examples for ready identification, using different types of underlining to differentiate distinct parallelisms where these are relevant to a particular example.

Rotenese ritual poetry discussed by FOX: “Faik esa matetuk / Ma ledo esa matemak” (“On one determined day / And at one appropriate time”) (FOX). The poetic form may allow ellipsis in parallel verses, as in Finno-Karelian Kalevala-meter poetry discussed by JUKKA SAARINEN: “Laski virkkuo vitsalla / Helähytti helmi-vyöllä” (“Hit the horse with a rod / clouted with a beaded belt”) (SAARINEN). In this case, the horse being struck need not be mentioned in the parallel verse. Meter is a factor in kalevalaic ellipsis. Each verse must be formed of eight positions, which normally means eight syllables; the longer the words, the fewer can fit in the verse, so ellipsis can have a metrical motivation. Periodic meter does not apply to the Ch’orti’ Maya ritual discourse discussed by KERRY HULL. Parallel verses thus do not necessarily match the main verse’s length: “Ink’ajti ubriyador uyespejir o’k, / uyespesir ak’ab” (“I ask for the shininess of the mirror of your eyes, / the mirror of your hands”) (HULL, ex. 5, ll. 5-6). Canonical parallelism is a social practice, a tradition, and each tradition develops its own conventions for what recurs in parallel members and how those members are structured in relation to the poetic form.

Semantic parallelism as a phenomenon is not restricted to verse units as wholes. It can occur with units of larger scope, such as the couplet (SAARINEN, §3, and see below), or with units of smaller scope. Especially with these smaller units, it is more apparent that parallelism is built into the syntax of how language is used. Rather than a whole verse, Old Germanic poetics commonly employed half-line parallelism: a noun phrase forming a half line would semantically parallel a preceding noun or noun phrase. This poetry was based on alliteration linking half-lines of a verse, and half-line parallelism with a phrase in a preceding verse was a device used in producing alliteration, as in the following Old Norse example: “Þá gengu regin qll / á rokstóla // ginnheilög goð / ok um þat gættusk” (*Völuspá* 23.1-4) (“Then went all the gods / to the judgment seats // magic-holy powers / and on that considered”). Here, the parallel member “magic-holy gods” repeats the grammatical subject “all the gods” while being syntactically dislocated from the half-lines surrounding it (but alliterating with *gættusk*). Such parallelisms may be in complex arrangements, such as the chiasmic structure in these Old English verses: “þa nædran sceop / nergend user // frea ælmihtig / fagum wyrme” (*Genesis* 903-04) (“then made the viper / our Savior // Almighty Lord / the colorful worm”). In other poetics, this type of parallelism may be less flexible. In Kalevala-meter poetry, parallelism below the level of a line only occurs within a verse; the parallel members will not be separated and the longer member will almost invariably be second: “oi emoni kantajani” (“oh mother.mine, bearer.mine”). EILA STEPANOVA addresses such parallel units as pleonasm, a term for verbal redundancy from classical rhetoric. She observes that the parallel members of pleonasm in Karelian lament, which are organized through alliteration without a periodic meter, are also always adjacent but the longer member always comes first: “armahilla ilmoilla šiätelijä aikojainen” (“dear.PL world.PL establisher maker.DIM” [PL = plural, DIM = diminutive]) (STEPANOVA, ex. 5.i).

Pleonastically paired nouns or verbs have deep roots in Uralic languages with correspondents in Russian, such as the verb-pair formula *žil-był* (“lived-was”) for beginning folktales (Tkachenko 1979:*passim*). In Khanty, for example, it is easily found in non-poetic contexts with both nouns, as in “łs’lal jeklal pärkatəs” (“he shook off snow, ice”), and verbs, as in “χäs’ lelajat jis’lajat” (“they were almost eaten, drunk”) (Schulze 1988:137). The same device is also used quite naturally in English scientific prose, as in “Canonical parallelism is a social

practice, a tradition” (above). Many rhetorical figures are built on parallel constructions. A merism, for instance, is comprised of (normally) two nouns referring to a third broader category of which both are metonymic (Watkins 1995:15), like Bandanese *sotong gurita* (“squid octopus”), which is used to describe someone who avoids confrontations and conceals his or her intentions (KAARTINEN). When recognized among units of this scope, “parallelism” rapidly begins to populate even the most casual discourse (Du Bois 2014:359-63, 368, 370-92).

Semantic parallelism between minimal units like *emoni//kantajani* (“mother.mine// bearer.mine”) requires lexical variation or it would be full repetition. At the level of full verses, lexical repetition can be combined with variation, as in the Ch’orti’ Maya and Zhuang examples above. In Khanty poetry, it is common for only a single lexical element to vary: “*naŋ ārən śat āt xotat, / naŋ mońseŋ śat āt xotat*” (“may your song end there, / may your tale end there”) (Austerlitz 1958:48). Lexical repetition makes parallelism more salient while highlighting the variation. In her discussion of this phenomenon in Chatino ritual discourse, HILARIA CRUZ refers to a repeating verbal sequence with a variable slot as the “frame,” such as *naŋ X śat āt xotat* in this Khanty example; she describes the slot X as the “focus,” which gets completed with a series of alternating elements like *ārən//mońseŋ* above. Rotenese ritual discourse and Kalevala-meter epic are at the opposite end of the spectrum: in Rotenese, the frequency of lexical repetition in parallel verses is low in comparison to Khanty or Chatino poetries, while in Kalevala-meter epic it is generally avoided in semantically parallel verses. Verse parallelism is organized in series in Rotenese and kalevalaic poetries, while elsewhere an additional verse or verses may be interspersed between parallel lines or even advance to complex patterns, for example in Khanty (Austerlitz 1958:47-48) or Zhuang epic (HOLM, type D). In each tradition, parallelism is organized in relation to conventions of the poetry, which reciprocally structure expectations about how lexical repetition is perceived.

Variations on Semantic Parallelism: Analogical, Additive, and Macro-Parallelism

Not all forms of semantic parallelism conform to element-to-element sameness of meaning in paired phrases. Wolfgang Steinitz (1934:92-174) coined analogical parallelism to distinguish parallelism based on metaphorical or other equivalence from semantic parallelism in which a single propositional unit is expressed with alternative words. For example, in the Kalevala-metric couplet “*kynsin kylmähän kivvehen / hampahin vesi-hakohon*” (“By the nails into a cold stone / By the teeth into a water-log”) (FROG_I, ex. 4), the pair *kynsi : hammas* (“nail : tooth”) are not semantic equivalents. They may be interpretable as a merism like English *tooth and nail*, but combination with the alliterating counterparts *kivi : hako* (“stone : log”) inclines the two clauses to be perceived as symbolically equivalent references to “the same thing” without reducing to a single semantic unit “nail//tooth into a stone//log.” Where parallelism advances to units larger than a single verse, such as in couplet parallelism (SAARINEN) or ABAB parallelism (HOLM), it is commonly analogical, as in this example from Zhuang epic:

Baz vuengz baenz baz vuengz	Only the wife of a king can be the wife of a king,
Boux biengz lawz ndaej ciemq	How can a subject of the realm usurp [this position]?

Byacoeg vanz byacoeg	Only a green bamboo carp returns to a green bamboo carp,
Byandoek lawz ndaej ciemq	How can a pond-corner fish usurp [its place]?

(HOLM)

Steinitz’s distinction concerns the variety of sameness. It was developed through the study of Kalevala-meter poetry, in which analogical parallelism is organized with the same element-to-element correspondence as in full semantic parallelism. This formal convention is not required in all poetries. Although Steinitz’s distinction works well for certain cases, he did not fully take into account nuances of poetic diction, in which meanings can be flexed (see below). There is no clear-cut line between semantic and analogical parallelism, which is on a spectrum with a broad swath of grey through the middle (Sarv 2017:78-79).

Whereas elements can be omitted from parallel members through ellipsis, some traditions allow elements to be added in the progression of a series. Karelian laments are composed in units referred to as “strings” rather than verses because they are much longer sequences of text than in most poetries. Here, the combination of difference with sameness in semantically parallel units includes what STEPANOVA describes as “additive parallelism.” As a result, not only does parallelism prolong expression of the semantic unit; it also produces a slow informational progression.¹⁰ Because of the verbal variation and complex poetic circumlocutions of this poetry, additive parallelism becomes more evident when the parallel strings are reduced to their semantic content:

<u>Father, come</u>	<u>a last time</u>	<u>and unbraided the bride’s hair</u>	
Father, come	with luck	<u>and unbraided the bride’s hair</u>	
<u>Father, let’s go</u>	into the yard	<u>to unbraided the bride’s hair</u>	<u>a last time</u>

(See STEPANOVA, ex. 8 for full text)

Additive parallelism is observable in a variety of forms. One strategy for this is to use the same verbal frame in multiple verses while changing the semantic unit that is the slot-filler or focus (CRUZ). For example, in the Arandic poetry discussed by MYFANY TURPIN, the couplet “Namaywengkel rnternep-ernem / Taty-tatyel rnternep-ernem” (“Spirit women are piercing the air / With a dancing stick, piercing the air”) (TURPIN, ex. 17), repetition of *rnternep-ernem* (“are piercing the air”) at the end of each line reinforces apprehending these lines as parallel members of a group. As wholes, the lines “say the same thing” as alternate and complementary representations of a symbolic action, first mentioning who is dancing, then mentioning that she is dancing with a stick. Both refer to “the same thing” or represent a common referent, but rather than a mere redundancy, additive parallelism enriches meanings and brings about qualitative rather than quantitative informational surplus.

Parallelisms may be organized into a hierarchy or with parallel members of significantly greater scope than a single verse. In Chatino prayers discussed by CRUZ, parallel groups can form a larger parallel series, which becomes salient through lexical repetition linking the recurrent frames of the different groups. In the following example, repetition of the pronoun *no⁴*

¹⁰ See also James L. Kugel (1981:45-48) on “compensation” and “ballasting,” in his discussions about biblical parallelism.

(“those who”) links a parallel group of four verses with a subsequent parallel group of three verses:

<u>No</u> ⁴ <u>yqu</u> ²	<u>Those who</u> <u>survived</u>
<u>No</u> ⁴ <u>ndlu</u> ³	<u>Those who</u> <u>thrived</u>
<u>No</u> ⁴ <u>sug</u> ³	<u>Those who</u> <u>matured</u>
<u>No</u> ⁴ <u>sen</u> ³	<u>Those who</u> <u>multiplied</u>
<u>No</u> ⁴ <u>ya</u> ⁴² <u>tykwi</u> ⁴	<u>Those who</u> <u>lived</u> <u>entirely</u>
<u>No</u> ⁴ <u>ya</u> ⁴² <u>nyj</u> ⁴	<u>Those who</u> <u>lived</u> <u>directly</u>
<u>No</u> ⁴ <u>ya</u> ⁴² <u>ykwa</u> ⁴	<u>Those who</u> <u>lived</u> <u>evenly</u>

(CRUZ, ex. 3, Text I, ll. 4-10)

The long strings of Karelian laments facilitate additive parallelism in each member, because, adapting the terminology of CRUZ, the number of semantically parallel elements with varied phraseology in the string become a frame against which additive information becomes a focus “Father, come//go X unbraid the bride’s hair.” In contrast, Chatino verses are quite short, limiting the scope of the frame so that difference in additive parallelism between parallel verses would be less pronounced and the verse group would still yield a fairly rapid informational progression. In the Arandic poetry above, prolongation is accomplished through repetition of the same couplet multiple times. In Chatino prayers, a unit is first established through semantic parallelism and its duration, which makes a difference in the focus between parallel groups more salient even with a minimal frame like *no*⁴ *X* (“those who X”). Additive parallelism occurs as an informational progression from one parallel group to the next as parallelism at a higher level in the structural hierarchy. The distinction between equivalence and additive information is not always clear. In this case, the physical and moral fullness of the ancestor’s lives is an explicit elaboration at the level of propositional information. However, we cannot assume that stating the ancestors lived “long//well” is *not* semantically parallel in the same way as “survived//thrived” simply because the parallel members are at a different structural level. Strategies and conventions for organizing and interpreting parallel groups within a hierarchy may vary considerably.

A hierarchical structure may combine semantic parallelism and analogical parallelism. Analogical parallelism is often used for lists in a series of complementary information, and each of those units may also be expressed through semantic parallelism, as in the following Rotenese example:

<u>Tane leu Tuda Meda</u>	<u>They plant at Tuda Meda</u>
<u>Ma sele leu Do Lasi</u>	<u>And they sow at Do Lasi</u>
<u>Tane leu Teke Dua</u>	<u>They plant at Teke Dua</u>
<u>Ma sele leu Finga Telu</u>	<u>And they sow at Finga Telu</u>
<u>Tane leu Tanga Loi</u>	<u>They plant at Tanga Loi</u>
<u>Ma sele leu Oe Mau</u>	<u>And they sow at Oe Mau</u>

(FOX)

A hierarchy can also be organized formally in the commensurability of members of a parallel group. A common three-part structure in Kalevala-metric poetry presents parallelism between two half-lines followed by a semantically equivalent full line, a structure marked by lexical repetition, which is otherwise avoided. Within this pattern, the two half-lines are formally commensurate units that together form a unit commensurate with the full line: “Kutšuu rujot, kutšuu ramm / Kutšuu veri-sogiat” (SKVR II 224.9-10) (“Invites the crippled, invites the lame / Invites the blood-blind”).

The potential for parallelisms within parallelisms grows as the scope of parallel units increases. Greg Urban (1986:26-29) coined the term *macro-parallelism* to refer to parallelism between longer sequences of text. In the following example from Kalevala-meter epic, *vesi* (“water”) and *tuli* (“fire”) vary as possible causes of death in the recurring eight-line sequence made up of four pairs of parallel verses:

<u>Tuonen tytöt sanoo</u>	<u>Death’s daughters say</u>
<u>Lapset kalman kalkehtiu</u>	<u>children of death ramble</u>
<u>“Kyllä tunnen valehtelian</u>	<u>“Sure I recognize a liar</u>
<u>Ymmärrän kielastajan</u>	<u>realize a cheater</u>
<u>Kun ois <u>vesi</u> tuottan Tuonelaah</u>	<u>when <u>water</u> would have brought to Death</u>
<u>Vesi soattan Manalle</u>	<u><u>water</u> got to Mana</u>
<u>Vesi voatteskin valuis</u>	<u><u>water</u> would flow from your clothes</u>
<u>Hurmehin huraelis”</u>	<u>would roll with gore”</u>
[. . .]	
<u>Tuonen tytöt sanoo</u>	<u>Death’s daughters say</u>
<u>Lapset kalman kalkehtiu</u>	<u>children of death ramble</u>
<u>“Kyllä tunnen valehtelian</u>	<u>“Sure I recognize a liar</u>
<u>Ymmärrän kielastajan</u>	<u>realize a cheater</u>
<u>Kuin ois <u>tuli</u> tuottan Tuonelaah</u>	<u>when <u>fire</u> would have brought to Death</u>
<u>Tuli soattan Manalle</u>	<u><u>fire</u> got to Mana</u>
<u>Tuli voatteiskin valuis</u>	<u><u>fire</u> would flow from your clothes</u>
<u>Hurmehin huraelis”</u>	<u>would roll with gore”</u>

(SKVR I₁ 361.22-27, 41-48, punctuation removed)

Parallelism separated across a stretch of text becomes more salient by greater density of recurrent language and syntax. Two individual verses must therefore normally be in closer proximity to be perceived as parallel members of a group than two series of verses in macro-parallelism (FROG_i). The complexity of parallelism in these different types of units may be approached as purely formal. However, NIGEL FABB discusses the operation of parallelism at a cognitive level, addressing the significance of the line as a unit and the processing of such units. Parallelism of greater scope and complexity seems unlikely to be processed in the same way as parallelism at the level of verse units (FABB, §4).

***Parallelismus Syntheticus*—Structural and Grammatical Parallelism**

Whereas semantic parallelism is defined in terms of meanings, other varieties of parallelism are defined in terms of form. The most prominent of these today is *grammatical parallelism*, parallelism based on language grammar. Attention to grammatical parallelism was greatly stimulated by Jakobson’s influential article “Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet” (1981 [1966]). *Syntactic parallelism* is sometimes used interchangeably with the term grammatical parallelism, although it may also be distinguished as a subcategory based on syntax and as opposed to *morphological parallelism* as recurrence of a morphological pattern (Johnstone 1991:55-62). Grammatical parallelism is often an integrated part of semantic parallelism (Kugel 1981:49), as seen in many of the examples above. In his discussion of Zhuang epic, HOLM considers as “semi-parallel” those verses that present the same essential idea but deviate from a strict correspondence between each element in parallel verses. He describes the combined use of semi-parallel verses with structurally parallel couplets as “augmented parallel couplets.” In the following example, variation in the first couplet is in parallel verbs for drinking and the object being drunk from. The third verse is connected to this by opening with *boh raeuz* (“our father”) but presents a third statement of weakness comparable to examples of additive parallelism above. In this case, the additive verse is marked by a change in syntax:

<u>Boh raeuz</u> gwn raemx lwt	<u>Our father</u> drinks water from a small bamboo cup
<u>Boh raeuz</u> swd raemx rong	<u>Our father</u> sips water through a rolled-up leaf.
<u>Boh raeuz</u> fuz mbouj hwnj	<u>Our father</u> even if supported cannot stand up

(HOLM)

As seen in examples of analogical parallelism above, grammatically parallel verses may be similar in meaning without a full convergence of expressing precisely the same thing. However, a series of information structured through grammatical parallelism does not necessarily form analogical parallelism. The following kalevalaic description is organized in a “chain” (Krohn 1918 I:79; Steinitz 1934:120-22) or “terrace” (Austerlitz 1958:63-69) structure, using the last word of one verse at the beginning of the next (anadiplosis), but no line is analogically equivalent to the next:

Jo tuli <u>tulini</u> koski	Already came <u>a fiery</u> rapids
Kosell’ <u>on tulini</u> korko	<u>On</u> the rapids <u>is a fiery</u> shoal
Koroll’ <u>on tulini</u> koivu	<u>On</u> the shoal <u>is a fiery</u> birch
Koivuss’ <u>on tulini</u> kokko	In the birch <u>is a fiery</u> eagle

(FROG₁, ex. 8)

Formally-based parallelism may also manifest through meter and rhythm, which can become particularly salient in meters that regulate syllables. In the following Kalevala-metric example, the first couplet is grammatically and metrically parallel while the third line is metrically parallel only, but the recurrent form and lexical repetition reinforce cohesion of the series:

<u>Laulo leppäseñ</u> venehen	[He] sang a boat of <u>alder wood</u>
<u>Laulo leppäsen</u> isännäñ	<u>Sang</u> a master of <u>alder wood</u>
Melañ <u>leppäsen</u> kätehe	An oar of <u>alder wood</u> in his hand

(FROG_I, ex. 15)

More generally, periodic meter itself manifests parallelism between units in the same meter. This purely formal parallelism makes a series of verses into a parallel group organized as a unit distinguishable from preceding and following discourse. Such an observation might seem self-evident in the context of a performance where para-linguistic features would reinforce distinctions from surrounding expressions. In written text, we recognize the organization of verses into metrical groups visually. As with the examples above, editorial practice of presenting how verse appears on the page makes clear transitions from prose to verse. A reader of a medieval prosimetric manuscript, on the other hand, may depend on recognizing metrical rhythms as forming groups of verses within a text completely written as prose.

Structural parallelism can easily operate quite subtly and even be almost subliminal in relation to the organizing principles of the discourse. Grammatical parallelism is often unnoticed when integrated with semantic parallelism and it is deviation rather than parallelism that becomes marked, as in the Zhuang epic example above. In metered poetry, grammatical and metrical parallelism easily converge. Grammatical parallelism is a common packaging for complementary units of information, as in the following Old Norse example where grammatical and rhythmic parallelism unite: “unz fyr útan kom / iotna heima // oc fyr innan kom / ása garða” (*Þrymskviða* 5.3-6) (“until (he) came out from / the worlds of giants // and came into / the realm of the gods”). Grammatical parallelism is no less common outside of poetry. Students are recommended to use it in writing rather than bouncing between active and passive constructions; it is even an emergent feature of co-produced conversation (Sakita 2006:487-92). Grammatical parallelism is a strikingly pervasive device for structuring discourse. This pervasiveness is instructive for reflexive views on how parallelism may be perceived: the presence or lack of grammatical parallelism may be perceived as sounding better or worse, compelling or ineffective, but we tend not to be objectively conscious of the parallelism as such in the flow of oral or written discourse.

***Parallelismus Antitheticus*—Contrastive Parallelism**

Today, “semantic parallelism” normally refers to what Lowth described as *parallelismus synonymus*, parallelism of semantic equivalence or identity, whereas semantic relations that foreground difference are distinguished with another term: here, contrastive parallelism, also called, following Lowth, *parallelismus antitheticus* (“antithetical parallelism”). The terms “negative parallelism” or “negative analogy” are also common, sometimes restricted parallelism with use of negations. Contrastive parallelism may be formed in a single couplet, as in the song of couplets *Ei se suu laulais, / vain suru laulaa* (“The mouth wouldn’t sing, / but the sorrow sings”) analyzed by LOTTE TARKKA. However, contrastive parallelism is formed from a minimum of two semantic units, each of which becomes open to prolongation or elaboration

through semantic parallelism. Such elaboration produces complexity within a hierarchy of parallelisms.

Parallelism with negation is prominent in North Russian *bylina* poetry. A common structure is of two equivalent negative statements followed by a third, positive statement:

<u>Ne krasno solnyško porospeklo</u>	<u>It was not the dear sun that began to shine</u>
<u>Ne mlad li svetel mesjac prosvetil</u>	<u>It was not the clear moon that began to glow</u>
A pokazalsja vo Care-grade	Rather appeared in Cargrad
Saryj kazak Il'ja Muromec	The old cossak Ilya Muromec

(Harvilahti 1985:102, italic and punctuation removed)

Felix Oinas (1985 [1976]:78) reveals that parallelism organized around negation exhibits a three-part structure in Kalevala-meter poetry. This structure is made up of (a) an initial statement or question, (b) its negation, and (c) a positive solution. The following example illustrates that each of the three component parts may be expanded through semantic parallelism:

(a) <u>Kuuli miehen itkövängi,</u> <u>Urohon ulizovangi;</u> Läks' itkuo perustamahan:	She heard <u>a man weeping,</u> <u>An old man lamenting;</u> She went to check the weeping:
(b) <u>Ei ole itku lapšen itku</u> <u>Eig' ole itku naizen itku,</u>	<u>The weeping is no child's weeping,</u> <u>The weeping is no woman's weeping,</u>
(c) <u>Itku on parđasuun urohon,</u> <u>Jouhileuvan juorotannan.</u> (SKVR I ₁ 13.84-90)	It is <u>the weeping of a bearded man,</u> <u>The wailing¹¹ of someone with a beard.</u> (Oinas 1985 [1976]:80)

The three-part structure with internal parallelism presents a complex rhetorical figure. Oinas observed that the structure could vary by the omission of element (a). In that case, the figure presents only a contrastive parallel structure, in which the two contrasted elements could both still be extended through subordinate parallel structures. It is also possible to find examples lacking (c) (FROG_I, ex. 6) or in which the order of (b) and (c) are regularly reversed:

(c) <u>Kutšuu rujot, kutšuu rammat,</u> <u>Kutšuu verisogiat,</u>	<u>Invites the crippled, invites the lame,</u> <u>Invites the blood-blind,</u>
(b) Van ei kutsu Lemmingäistä,	Just doesn't invite Lemminkäinen, (SKVR II 224.9-11)

Contrasts may be structured without negation, as in this Kalevala-metric example where the opening couplet presents a primary claim followed by a contrasting claim:

¹¹ Oinas translates "lamentation," but lament is a vernacular emic category of performance designated by a different word.

<u>Pihall' oñ veret paremmat</u>	<u>In the yard is blood better</u>
<u>Kagaroill' on kaunehemmat</u>	<u>In the manure more beautiful</u>
<u>Pessüt penkit hierelömmä</u>	<u>Scrubbed benches we would spoil.</u>
<u>Hüväñ tuvañ turmelomma</u>	<u>The good room we would ruin</u>

(FROGI, ex. 10)

Contrastive parallelism is inherently more complex than semantic parallelism and this complexity seems to incline toward the generation of more complicated structures than normally exhibited by semantic parallelism. In Karelian lament, for example, an extended parallel series of contrastive claims can be framed by parallel expressions of the same primary claim both before and following that series (STEPANOVA, ex. 10). Contrastive parallelism may also be within a parallelism hierarchy. The poem discussed by TARKKA is organized as a parallel series of negative parallelism couplets beginning with “Ei se suu laulais, / vain suru laulaa” (“The mouth wouldn’t sing, / but the sorrow sings”). Contrastive parallelism is formally different than semantic parallelism, but no less dynamic in its potential variety of uses.

Phonic Parallelism

Jakobson’s (1981 [1966]:98) view that rhyme and alliteration are forms of parallelism as “recurrent returns” to certain sounds may seem peculiar to those who have looked little beyond semantic and grammatical verse parallelism. However, the study of parallelism in semantics and structures distinguished through Lowth’s (1753) three categories blossomed in an environment where the patterning of meanings was seen as analogous to the patterning of sounds in poetry. Already a century earlier, Hebrew poetry was described as organized through rhythms “non in sono, nisi fortuito, sed in sensu; idem vel simile, diversa phrase reduplicans” (Mede 1653:114) (“not in sound, except by chance, but in sense; reduplicating the same or resemblant [sense] with diverse phrases”). Lowth’s description of parallelism was thus described in French as an *espèce de rime* (“species of rhyme”) and a *rime du sens* (“rhyme of sense”) (des Champs 1754:269). This term was carried into Latin, translated as *rhythmus sensus* in contrast to a *rhythmus soni* (Ullholm/Aurivillius 1758:8; Porthan 1766:22). *Gedankenreim* (“thought rhyme”) as well as *Gedankenrhythmus* (“thought rhythm”) later became common terms for semantic parallelism in German. Jakobson merely returned parallelism to recurrence of sounds, unifying discussions that had become separated across the centuries. “Recurrent returns” at the level of sounds can be collectively referred to as phonic parallelism. Treating different types of phonic parallelism as “parallelism” contextualizes them as different types of a much broader phenomenon. The utility of addressing something as a form of phonic parallelism rather than alliteration is dependent on the aims of a particular investigation or the concerns of a particular discussion.

Semantic parallelism and phonic parallelism both concern “recurrent returns” of sameness combined with difference of signs in a sequence of text. In Saussurian terms, a word is a sign made up of a signifier, that which has meaning, and its signified, that which it means (Saussure 1967 [1916]:97-100). Semantic parallelism is based on “recurrent returns” at the level of signifieds with variation in signifiers, saying the same thing with different signs. Phonic

parallelism is based on “recurrent returns” at the level of signifiers, elements of which recur in a noticeable way linking different signs. “Recurrent returns” at the level of phonic texture generally receive less attention in discussions of parallelism, but they provide a useful frame of comparison for considering how other types of parallelism operate; they are also relevant for considering parallelism as a broader semiotic phenomenon.

Phonic parallelism is most familiar as a poetic text-structuring principle of rhyme, “recurrent returns” in the endings of words or syllables, and alliteration, “recurrent returns” in the beginnings of words or (sometimes only stressed) syllables. Rather than meanings, these patterns connect sequences of utterance. When such phonic recurrence is canonical, it may be integrated into a periodic meter, such as end-rhyme in countless European poetries or alliteration connecting half-lines in Old Germanic verse. Metricalized alliteration is in fact rare in the world’s poetries (Fabb 2015:124). For example, it is a fundamental feature of Kalevala-meter poetry no less than semantic parallelism (SAARINEN), yet it is not connected to particular metrical positions nor required in every verse. Conventional line-internal use of phonic patterning enhances the perceivability of verses as units and the distinction of those units from one another. Like semantic parallelism, phonic parallelism can be a device that helps demarcate poetic units in the place of a regular metrical form, as in Karelian laments (STEPANOVA). Phonic patterning can also be more complex than recurrence of a single sound, such as Finnish vowel rhyme, in which the same sequence of vowels is repeated in series irrespective of surrounding consonants (Sykäri 2017:140). Welsh *cynghanedd* involves parallelism between sequences of consonants, as within each line of the couplet: “Dilwch yw dy degwch di / Darn fel haul, dyrnfol heli” (“unpolluted is your beauty, a fragment of the sun, gauntlet of the salt sea”), where the parallel pattern is d l ch d : d g ch d / d r n f l h l : d r n f l h l (Fabb 2015:167). In Turkic and Mongolian oral poetries, recurrent sounds at the onsets and endings of verses create links between lines even though this patterning is not regular (Harvilahti 2003:81-82; Reichl 2017:43-44). In Arandic song-poetry, such patterns may be constructed by adding sounds to the beginnings or endings of verses so that each verse in a couplet is repeated with a phonic variation, and those variations link across the repetition of each verse in a quatrain structure (TURPIN, §2.1).

Phonic patterns are most salient when parallel members are in close proximity, such as within a verse, across adjacent verses, or patterned in a tight verse group. Salience is reinforced by predictability, which can allow the distance between parallel members to be increased. In Old English, a rhetorical device is the so-called “echo-word” (Beatty 1934:*passim*) or “responion” (Foley 1990:340), a parallel phonetic sequence of a syllable or more that may be separated from its counterpart by several lines. This device easily goes unnoticed before it has been pointed out, after which, the more times it is observed, the more easily and automatically it is perceived.

What acts as correspondence in phonic parallelism is language-dependent. Alliteration in Germanic languages is based on onset consonants and all vowels alliterate with one another (Sievers 1893:36-37), while in neighboring Finnic languages alliteration should ideally include both the consonant and the following vowel (Krikmann 2015:16-17). Categories of equivalence may also be historically based. In the example of *cynghanedd* above, /l/ and /g/ alliterate in the pattern d l ch d : d g ch d. In Zhuang, some formally distinct phonemes are perceived as rhyming

because the conventions of language use have been carried through phonological changes from Proto-Thai (HOLM). Phonic parallelism, organizing the sounds of words, is found in no less a variety of forms than semantic parallelism, organizing meanings.

Phonic parallelism operates at the level of verse texture and extends beyond the phonemes of language to the melodies and rhythms with which language is realized. In many traditions, “recurrent returns” at the level of melodic phrases play a crucial role in the salience of verses as units of utterance. They produce a “metered frame” that distinguishes the units from one another while inviting their correlation through formal equivalence as metered units for the assessment of sameness and difference (FROG; see also Silverstein 1984:83). As KATI KALLIO discusses, the relationship between melodic units and parallel verses may be quite diverse. A semantically parallel group may be extended or truncated to coincide with a series of melodic units. Conversely, the prolongation of semantic content through parallelism may be independent of melodic structures so that “recurrent returns” of multi-verse melodic sequences do not relate to semantic groupings of verses. TURPIN shows the importance of attending to melodic structures by illustrating that the potential combinations of sameness and difference that constitute parallelism in Arandic women’s ritual poetry extend to melody and rhythm: lines that appear in a text-script as repetition are perceived as parallel in performance because they vary in tempo or melody.

Melodic and rhythmic structures that mediate language make metered units of utterance salient as comparable and simultaneously have the potential to create the tension of difference between units that are otherwise inclined toward full identity. Melody and rhythm are beyond reconstruction for many historical traditions, such as Old English and Old Norse poetics, yet the oral poetry adapted to text-scripts was initially received aurally, and the potential for strategies operating at the level of acoustic texture is thus relevant and cannot be simply rejected and ignored as “unknowable” (see also Gunnell 2016:94, 102, 109-10). It is important to acknowledge parallelism at the level of sounds because sounds operate subtly in the background of many other types of parallelism, especially, as TURPIN stresses, where several different types of parallelism combine in complex ways.

Parallelism, Language and the Lexicon

When first approaching a tradition from the outside, we intuitively consider vocabulary and its semantics according to words’ use in the language more generally, or, in cases of more unusual words, in relation to etymology. However, this may not give an accurate view of how language was perceived by people fluent in the traditional idiom. The linguistic idiom of a tradition can be described as a *register*,¹² a term that is particularly valuable when vocabulary and syntax deviate considerably from conversational speech. Formal principles for structuring discourse shape a register in a “symbiotic” relationship (Foley 1999:66-83). In a form of verbal art where one or more varieties of parallelism are canonical, parallelism requires performers to

¹² On “register” see, for example, Halliday (1978:31-35, espec.); Foley (1995:49-53, 82-92, 110-15, 150-75); Agha (2001 and 2007:154-89); Frog (2015).

“say the same thing” with different words, and the register evolves in ways that allow them to do so—at least for those things conventionally addressed in the verbal art. Recognizing what happens to language in a register structured by parallelism is thus significant to approaching the tradition.

The expansion and maintenance of alternative but equivalent vocabulary to “say the same thing” works in relation to the type or types of parallelism used and how they operate. Verbal art structured through dyadic parallelism requires two equivalent words, one for each verse, like Rotenese *inak* (“woman”) paired with *fetok* (“girl”) or Zhuang *ciq* (“establish”) paired with *caux* (“create”). Where parallel groups form a longer series, the number of corresponding terms needed is increased, although the range of vocabulary that is affected may differ. In Chatino prayers, there is a recurrent frame forming verses of a parallel group of which only the focus varies, and thus expansion of vocabulary is connected with the semantic element of the focus. In kalevalaic epic, all semantic elements should have parallels in the preceding semantically or analogically parallel verse, even if some of the elements in the preceding verse undergo ellipsis. Metrical conventions of phonic parallelism can have a particularly pronounced impact on a register. A whole set of vocabulary becomes required to say something as simple as “man” or “woman” beginning with whatever sound is required by the verse, for example to meet alliteration in Old Germanic or Finnic Kalevala-meter poetries. Old Germanic verse is accentual, so it is sufficient to have a set of equivalent words beginning with different sounds without concern for how many syllables they have. Kalevala-meter has a syllabic rhythm, which means that words must have the right number of syllables to fit in a verse: it is not enough to simply have a set of equivalent words that begin with different sounds; ideally, there should also be options with the same alliterative sound but different numbers of syllables. These metrical conditions are augmented by the prominence of semantic parallelism, “saying the same thing” with different patterns of alliteration. This difference in metrical conditions and the prominence of semantic parallelism in Finnic alliterative poetry produce several times more equivalence vocabulary for semantic units than is found in Old Germanic verse (see Roper 2012:85-86).

Features like parallelism structure the lexicon and words’ semantics. The use of vocabulary to “say the same thing” allows so-called “archaisms” on-going relevance and currency in a register of verbal art although the words have become exceptional for other ways of speaking (see also Foley 1996:33-37; HULL). A large portion of vocabulary may also be used freely in other contexts, but the meanings of the words have been “flexed,” “bent,” “stretched,” or “subordinated” to the needs of the register. In Middle English alliterative poetry, a word like *tolc* (literally “translator”) was thus simply the poetic word alliterating in /t/ used to say “man” without additional connotations (Roper 2012:89 *et passim*), and in Old Norse court poetry common nouns for sounds like *dynr* (“din”) and *gnýr* (“roar”) could mean “battle” (Egilsson and Jónsson 1931:s.vv.). We tend to discuss distinctive uses of vocabulary in a tradition of verbal art as “poetic,” but the way of speaking is the natural way of speaking to the performance context no less than another register is natural to casual conversation (Foley 1996:25). Rather than simply flexing meaning, canonical parallelism also causes a pair or series of words regularly used to “say the same thing” to evolve into a formula, into a unit of language more complex than a dictionary headword that expresses a single unit of meaning (Wray 2008:11-21). For example, the Rotenese words *inak* (“woman”) and *fetok* (“girl”) have not simply flexed in meaning to be

semantically equivalent (*inak* : *fetok*); the pair has evolved into a formula *inak//fetok* that, even if the words are spread across verses, communicates a single, consistent unit of meaning: “female person” (see also Fox 2016:xi *et passim*; CRUZ). The formula *inak//fetok* is semantically transparent, whereas other formulaic pairs are idiomatic, like *tua bou//neka hade* (“syrup vat//rice basket”) (Fox 2014:205 and 201-05). As FABB points out, the unit of meaning may be distinct from the words that form it, like Nahuatl *b’iineem* (“walking”) and *chakaneem* (“crawling”) that form a canonical pair *b’iineem//chakaneem* (“daily activities”). Such lexical pairs can establish semantic pairs which may remain intact although the words of the pair undergo renewal as a socio-historical process (Fox 2014:378; see also FOX). The semantic relationship between terms may be hierarchical, so that one phrase carries meaning that additional phrases merely echo and prolong (Steinitz 1934:136; Anttonen 1994:123). Kalevalaic *vitsa* : *helmi-vyö* (“rod : beaded-belt”) may present such a hierarchy, varying the object with which the horse is struck according to the required alliteration (SAARINEN).

The evolution of a register of verbal art is not constrained by boundaries of language and dialect. Performers capitalize on the full spectrum of linguistic resources available to them in order to have different words for “the same thing.” They may draw from different dialects (Foley 1996:25-37; Fox 2014:374-79) or, in multilingual environments, from other languages. Thus Spanish vocabulary has been assimilated into ritual discourse in Cho’rti’ (HULL) and Chatino (CRUZ), Malay words get used in Bandanese (KAARTINEN), Chinese in Zhuang epic (HOLM), Russian in Karelian lament (STEPANOVA), and such developments appear quite dynamic in multilingual environments of Australia (TURPIN). The assimilation of vocabulary associated with a different language can involve affixes or other adaptations, naturalizing it to the register (HULL, ex. 17; STEPANOVA, ex. 3-4). The outcomes of these processes get discussed in terms of loanwords, but they are best seen as the exploitation of vocabularies linked to different ways of speaking,¹³ and how or whether such vocabularies are exploited reflects language ideologies of the register’s users. Thus, the assimilation of Spanish vocabulary into Cho’rti’ ritual discourse is an indicator of how ritual specialists perceived Spanish language and their own register of ritual speech (HULL). It is no less informative about ideologies that the rich diction of Old Norse poetries lacks any evidence that poets drew on vocabularies of Celtic, Finnic, or Sámi languages. Instead, poetic vocabulary seems to have been generated on the basis of analogy within the language, such as the set of noise-words that could carry different alliterations: *brymr*, *glymr*, *hlymr*, and *rymr* (Egilsson and Jónsson 1931:s.vv.). HULL observes that assimilation of words into canonical parallelism involves what he calls “semantic transference,” flexing or subordinating the semantics of the new term to the vernacular meaning of the parallel pair. It is not uncommon in canonical parallelism that one term of a pair be semantically opaque or generated like the Norse noise-words. Peter Metcalf (1989:40-44) describes such pairings as “blind dyads,” where one word carries meaning while the other is simply understood as its parallel. Terms generated for parallelism are often texturally oriented, producing alliteration or rhyme across paired elements (1989:44) or within parallel verses (Sarv 2017:77), while verbs of motion in parallel verses of Kalevala-metric poetry are often onomatopoeic, activating the

¹³ Jørgensen, Madsen et al. (2011) have coined the term *linguaging* to describe processes of this type, shifting emphasis from language as an object to language as something people “do.”

mimetic aspect of performance (Tarkka 2013:154-56). Although assimilated and generated words expand a register, HULL points out that it does not do so endlessly: conventional word pairs or equivalence vocabulary are restructured while some earlier elements drop out of use in the ongoing process of the register's evolution.

Semantically parallel words often have complex conceptual and categorical relations and can offer information about the culture's ontologies. Parallelism has potential to provide "an objective criterion of what, in the given speech community, acts as a correspondence" (Jakobson 1987 [1956]:111) or insight into "the connectivity of semantic elements" (Fox 2014:8). The relationship between semantically parallel elements takes a variety of forms. Even where paired words are clearly used as synonyms like "knees : knee caps" in Rotenese "Ma lele poum neu lungu langam / Fo lungu langa fafa'en" ("And raise your sarong to your knees / To the knee caps") (FOX), they are also semantically distinct in other contexts. Old English *nædre* : *wyrm* ("viper : serpent") above pairs "viper, venomous snake" with a broad category of which it is a member, "serpent, reptile, worm," just as in Arandic women's ritual poetry, the common term *anter* ("fat, oil") is accompanied by the specific category member *rtway* ("oil/fat used for healing purposes") (TURPIN, ex. 29). Old Norse *gōð* : *regin* ("gods : powers") above pairs the category of "gods" with a poetic equivalent that may highlight a contextually relevant characteristic. Pairings also frequently generate metaphorical and metonymic tensions and thus new or altered meanings. Cho'rti' *o'k* : *ak'ab'* ("eye : hands") are paired metonyms for the embodied supernatural being that is summoned, potentially as features emblematic of agency (Hull 2003:93). The Chatino formulaic parallel series above *kqu*²⁴//*klu*²⁴//*ksuq*²⁴//*kxin*²⁴ ("grow//thrive//mature//multiply") is encoded with cultural information about a good life. Tensions that we might describe as aesthetic effects also arise where analogical parallelism resists an anticipated collapse into a single unit of meaning like Kalevala-metric *kivi//hako* ("stone//log") that can refer to a single place or object paired with *kynsi//hammas* ("nail, claw//tooth") which remain complementary metonyms of a broader category.

When assessing language in parallelism, it must be viewed within the context of the register. The tension between the "stone//log" and "nail//tooth" pairs is not clear until these are contextualized in the register of Kalevala-metric poetry. Similarly, the development of equivalence vocabulary in Old Germanic poetics leveled categorical differences so Old English *nædre* and *wyrm* could operate as synonyms that differ in texture rather than semantics. The information about categories built into their use mainly concerns the time when this use was established, when distinct categories were being linked, before the words became established as poetic equivalents. A dyadic formula like the Nahuatl pair *b'iineem//chakaneem* ("walking//crawling") may seem surprising for "daily activities," but when the pair is the established expression for "daily activities" in the register, it is the predictable, natural way to express that meaning: people fluent in the register may not reflect at all on a relationship between the components. Not all vocabulary is necessarily exclusive to one semantic pair or even to one semantic field, thus the vocabulary of Rotenese ritual discourse exhibits a distinctive and complex semantic network (Fox 2014:374-83). Where pairing is more flexible, people may be more conscious of semantic relations and the potential to vary them, as may be the case in pairings with "eye" or "hand" in Cho'rti' (Hull 2003:92). Within the curse quoted above, rather than *oy'it* ("eyes") being used as a metonym for an embodied agent in its pairing with *akwerpo*

(“body”), normal semantic emphasis is inverted for the contextual use to refer to eyes as part of the body (HULL). The long history of approaching language in verbal art in terms of “simplistic categorization based on synonymy and antonymy” (Fox 1977:72) has resulted in highly idealized models that can even misrepresent how language works in the tradition (see also SAARINEN). Registers of verbal art subsume lexicon and semantics that have been heavily stratified by socio-historical processes while individuals may also creatively use and manipulate the way of speaking. When considering the language of a form of verbal art, it is important to acknowledge and appreciate its social constructedness while keeping its potential variability and nuances in sight.

Parallelism beyond Linguistic Signs

When parallelism is conceived of as a phenomenon of signs that is not exclusive to language, the range of its applications increases exponentially. Three broad areas of the concept’s extension are particularly relevant to verbal art. One of these is melodies and rhythms that mediate language, already introduced above in connection with phonic parallelism. A second is in signs mediated through language, such as images, motifs, and even whole stories for which language is only one of several possible forms of expression. The third concerns signs used alongside language in a complex performance.

Recognizing that images, motifs, and stories are distinct from the language that communicates them allows parallelism between these symbolic units to be explored as well as how such parallelism may connect or contrast with parallelism in use of language. “Recurrent returns” to images and motifs or whole episodes is not dependent on recurrence at the level of language, but linguistic macro-parallelism can make them immediately recognizable (FROG₁). Indeed, linguistic macro-parallelism is often an indicator of a recurrent return at the level of what is being expressed. The interplay of language and images or motifs allows equivalence between parallel verses to be linked to expressing the same image or motif even if they do not reduce to the same semantic content at a lexical level. In the Arandic couplet, “*Namaywengkel rnternep-ernem / Taty-tatyel rnternep-ernem*” (“Spirit women are piercing the air / With a dancing stick, piercing the air”) (TURPIN, ex.17), two aspects of the same action are represented. These verses, discussed as an example of additive parallelism above, may be viewed as equivalent through alternative references to a single symbolic activity. From this perspective, correspondence of *namaywengkel : taty-tatyel* (“spirit women : with a dancing stick”) is as paired metonyms emblematic of a symbolic motif comparable to Cho’rti’ *o’k : ak’ab’* (“eye : hands”) as paired metonyms for an embodied supernatural being or Finno-Karelian *kynsi : hammas* (“claw, nail : tooth”) as metonyms for a capacity to harm. In this case, additive parallelism can be seen in the progression of verses while symbolic equivalence occurs in each verse’s relation to the motif. On the other hand, HOLM reveals that verse parallelism can be built through parallelism of motifs, seen in the dyadic juxtaposition of Zhuang and Chinese cosmological models in grammatically parallel lines. Parallelism brings the alternative models into alignment, and, by structuring them through conventions of semantic parallelism, confers equivalence on them. More extended and complex members of a parallel group tend to be perceived as analogical rather than identical, and

the organized correlations and contrasts become less likely to reduce to simple synonymy and antonymy. ANTTI LINDFORS addresses parallelism on the scope of full narratives juxtaposed in a stand-up comedy routine, where humorous effect is dependent on recognizing parallelism and the correlations and contrasts it creates. Once the variety of ways parallelism may operate among signs communicated by language is recognized along with the ways that these can interact with linguistic parallelism, viewing parallelism exclusively among words and verses becomes comparable to a two-dimensional perspective on a three-dimensional phenomenon.

Traditions of verbal art were approached in terms of text transcripts through the first half of the twentieth century, until a shift in paradigm transformed the frame of reference from linguistic products to performance and practice. This broadening of perspective opens the potential to consider relationships across different types of expression in terms of parallelism. For example, a coherent image may be referred to simultaneously through words and gestures that express or refer to the same thing (FROG_{II}, LINDFORS). In ritual discourse, it is also common that language is used for what is called metapragmatic representation (Keane 1997:50): performers use language to describe what they are doing, with references to, reflections on, and representations of the verbal art being performed and of the performer in the act of performance, as in the Chatino prayers discussed by CRUZ. TURPIN points out that parallelism takes on an added dimension in Arandic song-poetry by conferring the identities of agents in mythic time on the dancers who embody their actions through ritual. STEPANOVA discusses how, in Karelian laments, parallelisms generated between mythic images expressed through verbal art and their empirical counterparts construct unseen realities beyond the surface of ordinary perception. FROG_(II) theorizes that, in the context of a ritual performance, people naturalized to the tradition undergo a shift in their expectations about reality and how reality works, priming them for engagement with unseen beings and forces. When such beings and forces are perceived as having objective existence, that perception can equally be conceived as forming parallelism with what is expressed through verbal art, and ritual specialists thereby actualize and orchestrate unseen realities. LINDFORS carries parallelism still further to include the embodied performer and his or her relationship to what s/he expresses. The performer becomes an embodied sign and LINDFORS shows that a crucial aspect of what creates humor in the stand-up routine he discusses is not just parallelism between stories but also the relationship of the performer to the parallel stories: the performer makes himself a participant in the parallelism that he orchestrates. When performer and performance are seen as able to form parallelisms, dyadic performance may also be seen as manifesting parallelism, whether there is a second singer or a chorus who echoes each verse as in the singing of Kalevala-metric poetry (KALLIO; Tarkka 2013:131-32), or the main performer and his counter-role proceed syllable by syllable as in the South American Shokleng dyadic performance of myths (Urban 1991:102-03), or the alternation of roles is on the scope of whole speeches, as when a Kuna chief's performance is followed by a spokesman's performance of what was said in a more publicly accessible register (Sherzer 1983:76). If we accept Steven C. Caton's (1987:244) position that "intertextual relationships can be seen to involve parallelism" (see also Wilce 2008:109-10), references to mythology as in a poem discussed by TARKKA also constitute parallelism, as may the relationship between a parodic performance and its object, or simply one poem composed in response to another. Parallelism is a lens through

which a wide variety of relations between signs and configurations of signs (including complex texts) can potentially be viewed.

Meanings and Functions

Among the most difficult aspects of parallelism to get a handle on is what it “does,” because the possible answers are so diverse. The preceding discussion has already brought forward many of parallelism’s potential meanings, abilities to affect meanings, and discourse functions in performance. Therefore, only a few additional remarks will be added here.

A subtle but very significant function of parallelism is that it produces cohesion. Parallel members can be recognized as parts of groups, and identification as groups sets them apart from surrounding expressions. Phonic parallelism can help make a verse unit more salient; semantic and grammatical parallelism can help make units of information more salient. This aspect of parallelism can be capitalized on for aesthetic and rhetorical effect. Although parallelism is most commonly addressed as occurring between sequential verses, verse groupings may also be arranged in more complex patterns (HOLM). M. A. K. Halliday (1973:121) underscores aesthetic potential when he describes the subtle interconnections created by grammatical parallelism in literature as producing “syntactic imagery.” “Recurrent returns” across stretches of text produce connections for rhetorical effects, especially where their use is an established part of the tradition. A so-called “envelope pattern” in Old English poetry demarcates a larger unit of discourse by forming a frame of “any logically unified group of verses bound together by the repetition at the end of (1) words or (2) ideas or (3) words and ideas which are employed at the beginning” (Bartlett 1935:9). Parallelism separated across a stretch of text may be made more salient by greater density of recurrent language and syntax, as in the example of macro-parallelism above. It may also be more salient through the concentrated recurrence of semantic or symbolic content, for example by saying three or four of “the same things,” as is done in Karelian laments to weave complex rhetorical structures (STEPANOVA). Rather than mere repetition with variation, people can use parallelism in dynamic ways, not only to create text coherence but also to articulate content.

Where parallelism is purely formal, such as at the level of sounds or syntax, it may simply link a series of verses or clauses together so that they can be recognized as connected or “doing the same thing.” Viewed as reiteration, parallelism has frequently been seen as an emphatic device,¹⁴ as a type of redundancy that can reduce ambiguity (Sarv 1999:126), or even produce indeterminacy (FROGI). Reiteration of semantic units creates emphasis through their repetition but also through their relative duration in the flow of performance, which seems quite widely to index symbolic or emotional significance; in other words, more parallelism connotes more importance (Hendricks 1993:218; Honko 1998:55; HOLM; STEPANOVA). Prolongation may also produce aesthetic tensions, or have other rhetorical effects that extend across a longer stretch of discourse (Cureton 1992:146-53). Parallelism may be emblematic of authoritative or ritual discourse (Sherzer 1983:40-41; Kuipers 1990) or even of magical force (Wilce 2008:109-10). It

¹⁴ See for example the views of diverse scholars reviewed in Kugel (1981:ch.3-6).

may also vary in function by discourse, for example whether as a tool for instruction in proverbs (TARKKA) or humor in stand-up comedy (LINDFORS). It can also be a device linked to fluency in performance, and FABB observes that this is also relevant to fluency in processing what is heard. Parallelism is a mnemonic and may also produce rhetorical force, not to mention increasing the length of a performance as a whole, which may be valorized (Sherzer 1990:75-76). On the other hand, lack of parallelism may be the feature that is marked in a tradition: the prominence of parallelism can make so-called orphan lines, verses without a parallel, meaningful, as Paul Kiparsky (2017) has recently argued for orphan lines in Kalevala-metric poetry. TIMO KAARTINEN reveals the culture-dependence of parallelism's connotations in discourse by elucidating the differences between how parallelism and repetition are used in Bandanese. As parallelism is extended from linguistic text to speech and gesture, speech and embodied performance, and speech and the performance environment, the potential significance and functions also increase exponentially. The diverse contributions to the present volume offer perspectives on the range of potential that parallelism has in discourse.

Formal syntactic and structural recurrence invites mapping the elements of each parallel member onto the other(s). Such mapping can bring sameness of semantics or symbolics into focus, so that units are understood to “say the same thing” with different words. Especially where most elements are “the same,” mapping foregrounds any semantic or symbolic contrasts. In other words, mapping allows organized semantic alignments and oppositions to come into focus. These are the processes that shape the meanings of canonically parallel words, but the parallelisms can reciprocally build the concepts that they are used to express, especially as they become organized in complex hierarchies. For example, the boundary between pure semantic parallelism and additive parallelism blurs the Ch'orti' prayer example above, where the conventional parallel set *yqu*² : *ndlu*³ : *suq*³ : *sen*³ (“survived : thrived : matured : multiplied”) are paired with *ya*⁴² *tykwi*⁴ : *ya*⁴² *nyi*⁴ : *ya*⁴² *ykwa*⁴ (“lived entirelyly : lived directly : lived evenly”). At the lexical level, *suq*³ (“matured”) and *sen*³ (“multiplied”) seem like complementary concepts while *No*⁴ *suq*³ (“Those who matured”) and *No*⁴ *ya*⁴² *tykwi*⁴ (“Those who lived entirelyly”) may seem full semantical equivalents, yet the overall series of seemingly innocent pairings render emblematic features of the cultural notion of good life, into which the parallelism reciprocally offers insight. Whereas these parallel groups seem to have an established social basis, TARKKA illustrates how a performer can strategically develop links between parallel groups to construct cumulative meanings in communication. In practice, the multitude of ways that recurrence (and contrast) of what is expressed can be organized under the ægis of parallelism can manifest effects ranging from producing text cohesion to developing meanings not present in any single parallel member. Slapping a single label on “what parallelism does” is problematic in part because of the diversity of forms parallelism can take.

Parallelism as a strategy or convention may also supersede or subordinate meanings of the individual parallel members in a group. When formal features have a priority, the elements that occur in parallel verses may simply be understood as formulaic alternative iterations of the main verse. Subsequent verses in the group may be perceived mainly as giving the texture and duration of parallelism: their words are semantically light or void, carrying little or no meaning in context. For example, the smith Ilmarinen gets referred to with the couplet “Se on seppo Ilmarinen / takoja ijän ikuinen” (“He is the smith Ilmarinen / forger eternal aged-one”).

Reference to mythic age is an authority attribute, and in some contexts may be used to underscore his authority, but the endurance of the parallel verse is because it also completes alliteration in /i/ and meets correspondence conventions of parallelism (smith : forger ; Ilmarinen : eternal-aged-one) while forming an eight-syllable line. Like calling Achilles “swift-footed” while he is at rest, words in a parallel construction may complete formal units rather than carry much or any propositional information. Current trends in research have placed emphasis on meanings, which makes it important to also keep in mind that, in the flow of live performance, sometimes a parallel verse is just a parallel verse.

Closing Perspectives

Parallelism is fundamental to human expression, permeating all levels of discourse, and parallelism research is moving in a variety of new directions. Jakobson’s principle that parallelism offers “an objective criterion of what in the given speech community acts as a correspondence” (1987 [1956]:111; see also HULL) has been expanded to examine the semantic networks and formal associations of equivalence vocabulary in a whole poetic system (Fox 2014:374-83; see also FOX). This principle can also be extended to consider parallelism at the level of interpreted meanings (TARKKA) and symbols mediated through expression (FROG_{I-II}). Fox has been developing methodological strategies for mapping lexical and semantic progressions of parallelism through a text (2014:34-36, 110-13, 117-18) and for mapping semantic networks in the lexicon of a tradition (2014:374-83). John W. Du Bois (2014:376-78) has developed a method for visually mapping semantic and grammatical parallelism between units of utterance in conversation, a model that has been adapted for the analysis of parallelism in semantic and symbolic units in this volume (FROG_{I-II}). HOLM illustrates a framework for approaching parallelism in a particular tradition by identifying the dominant or ideal form of parallelism as a platform for a typology based on variations that can then reciprocally be used to analyze the uses and potential significance of the different types. FABB pursues the cognitive operation of parallelism and its implications that may enhance our understandings of cognitive poetics and of language more generally. New foundations are being laid that pave the way for new research.

Current insights into the workings of parallelism mandate reassessing earlier research while they simultaneously reveal areas where further research is needed. For example, the historical tendency to isolate verbal text-scripts had rendered some types of parallelism invisible, such as where variation of the phonic medium may qualify otherwise lexically identical lines as parallel (TURPIN). While foundations have been established for new explorations of the operation of language in semantic parallelism, cross-cultural perspectives on the workings of negative and contrastive parallelism are still lacking. The perceivability of parallelism is recognized as relevant, but questions of how perceivability works and how far parallel members might be separated from one another by time or intermediate text remains to be explored. The potential directions expand rapidly as parallelism is considered across media and potentially as a device of intersemiotic syntax (FROG_{II}). Questions arise whether parody qualifies as a form of contrastive parallelism with its referent object (LINDFORS), or whether equivalent but different practices

across different groups may be viewed as a variety of parallelism manifesting shared yet distinct identity (TURPIN). There is much work to be done.

The many contributions to this special issue reveal the diversity and potential of parallelism as a tool for approaching verbal art. Bringing them together here to engage one another in discussion is a major step in breaking down the “silos” in which parallelism research has developed. Parallelism may at first seem an extremely broad concept owing to the variety of things it may be used to address. The preceding discussion provides an overview that suggests parallelism is more basic than broad, and that differences in what it is used to address, which initially might seem irreconcilable, are based on advancing parallelism from words and their meanings to other levels and types of signification. At the same time, the perspectives offered here underscore that parallelism is a tool that we adjust to a particular investigation, whether by treating it as a broad semiotic phenomenon that organizes all aspects of expression or as narrow and adjusting its definition in relation to language use in a particular tradition being brought into sharp analytical focus. We have introduced a broad, descriptive working definition of parallelism above. However, it is characteristic of terminology for research on cultural expression that definitions vary because definitions are tools for research. Broad, inclusive definitions easily lack the precision required in a certain investigation, or it may be more practical and clear to start off defining parallelism in terms of language in a study focused exclusively on linguistic parallelism; a particular study might even warrant a pragmatic definition not generally applicable elsewhere. Of course, a shared understanding of terminology is crucial for the communication of research-based knowledge, but asserting a monolithic, hegemonic definition would compromise the value of the tool for many specific investigations. Such a definition would also easily become construed as prescriptive, leading to misrepresentation of individual traditions. In this special issue, “parallelism” is revealed to be a flexible instrument: there is an underlying unity to the basic concept, which can be calibrated to specific research materials and the questions posed concerning those materials. The variety of uses reveals that apparent variation in what is called parallelism is related to this flexibility as a research tool, because it is not the concept that varies but the manifestations of parallelism that are brought into focus.

A significant contribution made by the essays gathered here is not that they define what parallelism is or is not, but rather that they illuminate the versatility and ranges of parallelism as a tool. For the researcher, parallelism is an abstract analytical tool that is adjusted and defined for analysis. On the other hand, these studies reveal that parallelism is equally an emic tool that is used by individuals in performance for the production of meanings and rhetorical or aesthetic effects in communication. These two sides of parallelism are not contradictory or mutually exclusive: many studies of parallelism are pursuits precisely to develop a descriptive model of the emic phenomenon in a particular tradition and to understand how it is used by performers. Our hope is that, by breaking down the tendency to develop parallelism research in “silos” and by raising awareness of parallelism’s potential, the present special issue may lead it to be handled with greater sensitivity and precision when it is taken up in the future, however narrowly or broadly defined by the researcher.

References

- Agha 2001 Asif Agha. "Registers of Language." In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Ed. by Alessandro Duranti. Malden: Blackwell. pp. 23-45.
- Agha 2007 _____. *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anttonen 1994 Pertti Anttonen. "Ethnopoetic Analysis and Finnish Oral Verse." In *Songs Beyond the Kalevala: Transformations of Oral Poetry*. Ed. by Anna-Leena Siikala and Sinikka Vakimo. *Studia Fennica Folkloristica*, 2. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. pp. 113-37.
- Austerlitz 1958 Robert Austerlitz. *Ob-Ugric Metrics*. *Folklore Fellows' Communications*, 174. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
- Bartlett 1935 Adeline Courtney Bartlett. *The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in Anglo-Saxon Poetry*. Morningside Heights, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Beaty 1934 John O. Beaty. "The Echo-Word in *Beowulf* with a Note on the Finnsburg Fragment." *PMLA*, 49.2:365-73.
- Caton 1987 Steven C. Caton. "Contributions of Roman Jakobson." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 16:223-60.
- Cureton 1992 Richard D. Cureton. *Rhythmic Phrasing in English Verse*. Longman: London.
- Du Bois 2014 John W. Du Bois. "Towards a Dialogic Syntax." *Cognitive Linguistics*, 25.3:359-410.
- Egilsson and Jónsson 1931 Sveinbjörn Egilsson and Finnur Jónsson. *Lexicon poeticum antiquæ linguae septentrionalis—Ordbog over det norsk-islandske skjaldesprog*. 2nd ed. København: S. I. Møllers.
- Fabb 2015 Nigel Fabb. *What is Poetry? Language and Memory in the Poems of the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foley 1990 John Miles Foley. *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Foley 1995 _____. *The Singer of Tales in Performance*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Foley 1996 _____ . “Guslar and Aoidos: Traditional Register in South Slavic and Homeric Epic.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 126:11-41.
- Foley 1999 _____ . *Homer’s Traditional Art*. University Park: Pennsylvania University
- Fox 1977 James J. Fox. “Roman Jakobson and the Comparative Study of Parallelism.” In *Roman Jakobson: Echoes of His Scholarship*. Ed. by Daniel Armstrong and C. H. van Schooneveld. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press. pp. 59–90.
- Fox 2014 _____ . *Explorations in Semantic Parallelism*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Fox 2016 _____ . *Master Poets, Ritual Masters: The Art of Oral Composition among the Rotenese of Eastern Indonesia*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Frog 2014 Frog. A Preface to Parallelism.” In *Parallelism in Verbal Art and Performance: Pre-Print Papers of the Seminar-Workshop, 26th-27th May 2014*. Ed. by Frog. Folkloristiikan Toimite, 21. Helsinki: Folklore Studies, University of Helsinki. pp. 7-28.
- Frog 2015 _____ . “Registers of Oral Poetry.” In *Registers of Communication*. Ed. by Asif Agha and Frog. *Studia Fennica Linguistica*, 18. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. pp. 77-104.
- Frog 2017 _____ . “A Preface to Formula.” In *Formula: Units of Speech—‘Words of’ Verbal Art*. Ed. by Frog. Folkloristiikan Toimite, 23. Helsinki: Folklore Studies, University of Helsinki. pp. 9-19.
- Genesis* In *The Janius Manuscript*. Ed. by George Philip Krapp. The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records, 1. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1931. pp. 1-87.
- Gunnell 2016 Terry Gunnell. “Eddic Performance and Eddic Audiences.” In *A Handbook to Eddic Poetry*. Ed. by Carolyne Larrington, Judy Quinn, and Brittany Schorn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 92-113.
- Halliday 1973 M. A. K. Halliday. “Linguistic Function and Literary Style: An Inquiry into the Language of William Golding’s *The Inheritors*.” In *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. Ed. by M. A. K. Halliday. London: Edward Arnold. pp. 103-43.
- Harvilahti 1985 Lauri Harvilahti. *Bylinat: Venäläistä kertomarunoutta*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

- Harvilahti 2003 _____ . *The Holy Mountain: Studies on Upper Altay Oral Poetry*. Folklore Fellow's Communications, 282. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
- Hendricks 1993 Janet Wall Hendricks. *To Drink of Death: The Narrative of a Shuar Warrior*. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press.
- Honko 1998 Lauri Honko. *Textualising the Siri Epic*. Folklore Fellows' Communications, 264. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
- Hopkins 1959 [1865] Gerard Manley Hopkins. "Poetic Diction." In *The Journals and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Ed. by H. House and G. Storey. London: Oxford University Press. pp. 84-85.
- Hull 2003 Kerry Hull. "Verbal Art and Performance in Ch'orti' and Maya Hieroglyphic Writing. Unpubl. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Texas, Austin.
- Hymes 1977 Dell Hymes. "Discovering Oral Performance and Measured Verse in American Indian Narrative." *New Literary History*, 8.3:431-57.
- Institutio oratoria* Fabius Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian I-IV*. Ed. and trans. by H. E. Butler. London: William Heinemann, 1920-22.
- Jakobson 1960 Roman Jakobson. "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics." In *Style in Language*. Ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok. New York: Massachusetts Institute of Technology. pp. 350-77.
- Jakobson 1977 [1919] _____. Fragments de 'La nouvelle poésie russe': Esquisse premier: Vélimir Khlebnikiv." In *Roman Jakobson, Huit questions de poétique*. Paris: Editions de Seuil. pp. 11-29.
- Jakobson 1981 [1966] _____. "Grammatical Parallelism and Its Russian Facet." In *Selected Writings III: Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*. Ed. by Stephen Rudy. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 98-135.
- Jakobson 1987 [1956] _____. "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances." In Roman Jakobson, *Language in Literature*. Ed. by Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. pp. 95-114.
- Johnstone 1991 Barbara Johnstone. *Repetition in Arabic Discourse: Paradigms, Syntagms and the Ecology of Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jørgensen et al. 2011 J. N. Jørgensen, M. S. Madsen, L. M. Karrebæk, and J. S. Møller. "Polylinguaging and Superdiversity." *Diversities*, 13.2:23-37.

- Keane 1997 Webb Keane. "Religious Language." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 26:47-71.
- Kiparsky 2017 Paul Kiparsky. "Formulas and Themes." Presented version of the paper (different from that printed in the associated volume of working papers) given at Formula: Units of Speech—'Words' of Verbal Art, held 17th-19th May 2017. Helsinki, Finland.
- Krikmann 2015 Arvo Krikmann. "On the Vowel Euphony in Finnic Alliterative Folksongs." *Folklore Fellows' Network*, 46:12-17.
- Kugel 1981 James L. Kugel. *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kuipers 1990 Joel C. Kuipers. *Power in Performance: The Creation of Textual Authority in Weyewa Ritual Speech*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lowth 1753 Robert Lowth. *De sacra poesi Hebræorum: Prælectiones academic Oxonii habitæ a Roberto Lowth A. M. collegii novi nuper socio, et poeticæ publicæ prælectore: Subjicitur metricæ harianæ brevis confutatio et oratio crewiana*. Oxonius: Clarendonia.
- Mede 1653 Josephus Mede. *Dissertationum ecclesiasticarum triga: De sanctitate relative, De veneratione sacra, De sortitione et alea: Quibus accedunt [sic] fragmenta sacra*. Londini: Jo. Martin, Jac. Allestrye, et Tim. Garthwait.
- Morris 1971 [1938] Charles W. Morris. "Foundations of a Theory of Signs." In *Writings on the General Theory of Signs*. Ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok. Approaches to Semiotics, 16. The Hauge: Mouton. pp. 17-72.
- Oinas 1985 [1976] Felix J. Oinas, ed. "Negative Parallelism in Karelian-Finnish Folklore." *Studies in Finnic Folklore*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. pp. 78-92.
- Porthan 1766 Henricus Gabriel Porthan. *Dissertationis de poësi Fennica*. Åbo: Joh. Christoph. Frenckell.
- Roper 2012 Jonathan Roper. "Synonymy and Rank in Alliterative Poetry." *Sign Systems Studies*, 40:82-93.
- Sakita 2006 Tomoko I. Sakita. "Parallelism in Conversation: Resonance, Schematization, and Extension from the Perspective of Dialogic Syntax and Cognitive Linguistics." *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 14.3:467-500.

- Sarv 1999 Mari Sarv. "Regilaul: Clearing the Alliterative Haze." *Folklore: Electronic Journal of Folklore*, 10:126-40.
- Sarv 2017 _____. "Towards a Typology of Parallelism in Estonian Poetic Folklore." *Folklore: Electronic Journal of Folklore*, 67: 65-92.
- Saussure 1967 [1916] Ferdinand de Saussure. *Cours de linguistique générale*. Paris: Éditions Payot and Rivages.
- Schulze 1988 Brigitte Schulze. *Der Wortparallelismus als ein Stilmittel der (nord-) ostjakischen Volksdichtung*. Studia Uralo-Altaica, 29. Szeged: Universitas Szegediensis de Attila Josef Nominata.
- Sherzer 1983 Joel Sherzer. *Kuna Ways of Speaking: An Ethnographic Perspective*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Sherzer 1990 _____. *Verbal Art in San Blas: Kuna Culture through its Discourse*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Silverstein 1984 Michael Silverstein. "On the Pragmatic 'Poetry' of Prose." In *Meaning, Form and Use in Context*. Ed. by Deborah Schiffrin. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press. pp. 181–99.
- SKVR *Suomen Kansan Vanhat Runot I-XV*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 1908-97.
- Steinitz 1934 Wolfgang Steinitz. *Der Parallelismus in der finnisch-karelischen Volksdichtung untersucht an den Liedern des karelischen Sangers Arhippa Perttunen*. Folklore Fellows' Communications, 115. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
- Sykäri 2017 Venla Sykäri. "Beginning from the End: Strategies of Composition in Lyrical Improvisation with End Rhyme." *Oral Tradition*, 31.1:123-54.
- Tarkka 2013 Lotte Tarkka. *Songs of the Border People: Genre, Reflexivity, and Performance in Karelian Oral Poetry*. Folklore Fellows' Communications, 305. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
- Tkachenko 1979 Orest Borisovich Tkachenko. *Sopostavitel'no-istoricheskaa frazeologia slavanskih i finno-ugorskih azykov*. Kiev: Naukova Dumka.
- Ullholm/Aurivillius 1758 Sven Ullholm (student)/Carol Aurivillius (professor). *De poësi biblica*. M.A. Thesis. Upsaliae: L. M. Höjer.

- Urban 1986 Greg Urban. "The Semiotic Functions of Macro-Parallelism in the Sholkeng Origin Myth." In *Native South American Discourse*. Ed. by Joel Sherzer and Greg Urban. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 15-57.
- Urban 1991 _____. *A Discourse-Centered Approach to Culture: Native South American Myths and Rituals*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Völuspá* In *Edda: Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern 1: Texte*. Ed. Gustav Neckel and Hans Kuhn. 4th ed. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1963. pp. 1-16.
- Watkins 1995 Calvert Watkins. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilce 2008 James M. Wilce. "Scientizing Bangladeshi Psychiatry: Parallelism, Enregisterment, and the Cure for a Magic Complex." *Language and Society*, 37:91-114.
- Wray 2008 Alison Wray. *Formulaic Language: Pushing the Boundaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brymskviða* In *Edda: Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern 1: Texte*. Ed. Gustav Neckel and Hans Kuhn. 4th ed. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1963. pp. 111-15.