

ANAPHORA WITH DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN OBAJ/ OBA/ OBO IN SERBIAN

Violeta **Stojičić**, University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy,
violeta.stojcic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

Neda **Stefanović**, University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy,
stefanovicneda@gmail.com

Original scientific paper
DOI: 10.31902/fll.51.2025.12
UDC:811.163.41'367.626

Abstract: The paper examines anaphoric use of the demonstrative pronoun *obaj/oba/obo* in Serbian. We compiled a sample from the electronic corpus *Serbian Web Corpus* to explore the co-reference established by the anaphoric use of the demonstrative and the contexts in which it is employed. Both inter-sentential and intra-sentential usages are taken into consideration of the phrases *obaj/oba/obo + ∅* and *obaj/oba/obo + noun*. We also observe the interpretation, additional associations and the semantic prosody of the anaphor in certain contexts. The analysis has indicated that the demonstrative is used anaphorically in narrative and informative texts, with negative semantic prosody in the former and positive prosody in the latter, and that the anaphor is not merely an instrument of the resolution of a non-salient antecedent.

Keywords: anaphora, demonstrative, pronoun, semantic prosody, Serbian

1. Introduction

In this paper we present the study of anaphora in Serbian through the phrases '*obaj/oba/obo + ∅*' and '*obaj/oba/obo + noun*'. The study examines intra-sentential and inter-sentential demonstrative reference in a sample extracted from the electronic collection of texts *Serbian Web Corpus*. We have adopted a textual account of anaphora, by which anaphora involves a subsequent reference to a linguistic unit mentioned previously in the text. From the textual viewpoint, anaphora is considered to represent the relation of co-interpretation between the antecedent and the anaphor. In the analysis, we have also taken into consideration the unfolded and the unfolding text, co-textual cues, the

relations between the antecedent and the anaphor, and the semantics of the cohesive tie.

1.1 Anaphora in the literature

In the literature, both anaphora and cataphora are described as subclasses of endophoric reference, as they can be identified within the context of a sentence/text and not in the extralinguistic reality. The anaphor and the antecedent can occur within a single sentence, in which case it is intra-sentential anaphora, or they can occur in discourse, outside sentence boundaries (Huang 2005, 231). Halliday and Hasan (1976) study anaphora as an instrument of cohesion. Halliday and Hasan (1976, 4) suggest that one element presupposes the other, so the elements are the presupposing and the presupposed. Halliday and Hasan (1976, 145) categorize anaphora as the reference, which means that anaphora is presupposition at the semantic level, often used in textual presupposition to point backwards. Furthermore, they also designate anaphora as a particular form of co-interpretation (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 314).

Krahmer and Piwek (1997, 4–11) explain that the following properties of anaphora suggested in the literature should be considered its key aspects:

- a) The contextual dependency of interpreting anaphors, by which it is assumed that an expression is anaphoric if its interpretation depends on a contextually given item;
- b) The type of antecedent, which can be linguistic expressions, mental representations hearers employ when interpreting a discourse, and objects in the real world. Proper anaphora involves only expressions whose interpretation is a matter of linguistic interpretation;
- c) The location of the antecedent, which prototypically precedes the anaphor;
- d) The type of relation between anaphor and antecedent; it has been claimed that an anaphor and its antecedent are co-referential, and yet this does not seem a necessary property of anaphora.
- e) Structural constraints on the relation between anaphor and antecedent, which have been explored through the scoping domain of a quantifier; and
- f) The range of interpretations the anaphor allows for, which has been investigated usually within dynamic semantics and linked to sloppy identity in particular configurations, e.g. the way the sentence *Bill loves his wife, and so does John* can have a sloppy reading.

When we speak of the anaphoric co-reference, a prototypical example would consist of an anaphoric expression and a nominal antecedent that represents a single referent. However, the antecedent of an anaphoric expression can also be a wider discourse entity with propositional content. This type of anaphoric reference has different labels, some of which are 'discourse anaphora' (Dipper, Zeinsmeister 2009, 166), 'complex anaphora' (Marx et al. 2007, 259) and 'propositional anaphora' (Snider 2019, 319).

Cornish (2009, 2) holds that discourse anaphora refers to the result of processing and interpreting the surrounding co-text as dependent upon the appropriate context, which includes the speaker's presumed intentions. In all events, deictic and the anaphoric procedures operate, for which Cornish (2009, 6) gives the examples such as a) the co-text – i) textual deixis in A: *Our rhododendrons are in blossom right now.* B: *Oh really? How do you spell that, by the way?* and ii) anaphora in B: *...I know it's got three "d"'s* and b) the discourse already created or anticipated – i) discourse deixis: A: *Listen to this: a man went into a butcher's shop one day wanting to buy a whole sheep, and...* and ii) anaphora: A: *...Would you believe it?*

Within the cognitive approach to discourse anaphora, Huang (2000, 2) concludes that anaphora allows a speaker/writer to recall to the consciousness of a hearer/reader entities or concepts already introduced into a discourse. A cognitive dimension of anaphora is more prominent than its linguistic aspects because it raises the question of how hearers/readers understand a discourse and how it is represented in their minds (Huang 2000, 6). The latest cognitive account of anaphora is provided by Talmy (2020). He suggests that deixis and anaphora are conjoined in the same cognitive processing of discourse (Talmy, 2020). Namely, in their speech, speakers sometimes draw attention to some entities in their discourse, which are called targets. Targets are located in the speech-internal or the speech-external environment, they can be anaphoric or deictic. Talmy (2020) proposes that language engages the same cognitive system to identify both types of referents. When the speaker uses a specialized lexical form at the relevant point in the discourse and the hearer undertakes a specialized procedure, the form triggers the procedure in the hearer. Triggers usually belong to a closed set of lexical items, and in English they include *this/these, that/those, here, there, yonder, now, then, therefore, thus, so, such, yay, the, personal pronouns, relative pronouns, and tense markers*. The hearer's procedure has the following three stages: 1) the trigger directs the hearer to find certain elements of information to which he has access, which function as cues to the speaker's intended target; 2) the hearer

uses the cues in combination to narrow down to the target; and 3) the hearer relates the concept to the conceptual content of the sentence in accord with the trigger's syntactic relation to the sentence. The selection of a trigger, the three stages, and the cognitive processing of both speaker and hearer is targeting. Targeting is a linguistic/cognitive system in which deixis and anaphora represent a single phenomenon.

As already suggested, the notion of anaphora can be extended to include a variety of structures which could serve as antecedent. It can also be extended by shifting the understanding of anaphora from some type of a pronominal structure to different kinds of reiteration, even repetition, as noted in Piper et al. (2005). The authors identify the following types of anaphora: 1) the substitute is a pronominal type of word, as in *Купила је огромне јабуке. Толике јабуке никад раније нисам видела*; 2) the substitute is a synonym, e.g. *У даљини се видео воз. Композиција је била врло дуга*, a hypernym, e.g. *Добила је ружу. Цвет је дивно мирисао*, or hyponym, e.g. *Добила је цвет. Ружа је дивно мирисала*; and 3) the repetition of a word, e.g. *Упознала сам је са шефом. Шеф јој се допао* (Piper et al. 2005, 925).

1.2. Anaphoric demonstratives

Halliday and Hasan (1976, 64–65) claim that English demonstratives in anaphoric use require that in a noun phrase the noun be explicitly repeated. In this way demonstratives signal exact identity of specific reference, i.e. refer to the presupposed at the same degree of particularization. On the other hand, a demonstrative without a noun in English refers to a more general class to which the presupposed belongs. Quite the opposite, we have found that the latter is not the case in the Serbian sample we have examined. In Serbian, demonstrative words in general were thoroughly studied by Klikovac (2006, 2013).

Within textual references, Ariel (1990, 18–19) discovers that demonstratives belong to Intermediate Accessibility Markers, as they are usually found in intermediate distances from their antecedent, pronouns being High Accessibility Markers. The difference between pronouns and demonstratives is in their secondary environments, since pronouns prefer the same sentence, while demonstratives prefer the same paragraph.

Vieira et al. (2005) have investigated demonstrative noun phrases in Portuguese and French. Demonstrative noun phrases start with a demonstrative determiner and have a head noun, e.g. *cette région* and *esta região*. In the study, Vieira et al. (2005, 399) conclude that the interpretation of demonstrative noun phrases depends on the context, since for more than 80% of them the annotators could find textual

chunks as antecedents. Their findings also indicate that over 80% of demonstrative noun phrases have no additional modifier, which makes them a less informative kind of anaphora which must rely on textual context.

Demonstrative pronouns in English are one of linguistic markers of anaphora, besides pronouns and ellipses. Huang (2000) provides examples such as *"It is no great matter to me," Hotchkiss concluded, "for I had only the wages of my Portland engagement, and that was no great sum, I assure you"* for an anaphoric demonstrative, *A tall woman in a long rustling gown appeared. "Hotchkiss!" she said in a hushed but concerned voice* for an anaphoric pronoun and *"The Groundhog may be in the hole, but Steeler fans are not \emptyset ," Mayor Richard Caliguiri told the crowd...* for ellipsis.

2. The Research

In the research, we follow the interpretation of anaphora provided in Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1455-1458), as it is consistent with the textual approach we have adopted. First, we are concerned with retrospective anaphora, which is the default case of anaphora, in which the anaphor follows the antecedent, either inter- or intra-sententially. Second, the interpretation of the anaphor is determined by the antecedent while the demonstrative pronoun serves as an anaphoric marker, which implies that the interpretation of the anaphor is obtained from the antecedent. Third, between antecedent that is a noun phrase and its anaphor there is a relation of co-reference.

The sample was extracted from the corpus of the modern Serbian language *Serbian Web Corpus (srWaC)*. The sample includes two types of examples, i.e. the ones in which *овај/ова/ово* is followed by a noun and the ones in which no noun occurs after this demonstrative. For the former, the selection criteria included a nominal token to the right, and for the latter a verbal token to the right. To determine whether the demonstrative pronoun is used anaphorically, we followed the criteria stipulated in Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1455) that a) anaphora refers explicitly to a segment of the unfolded text and b) the referent is present in the text/co-text. In view of that, we excluded instances of the deictic use of the demonstrative in which it refers to an entity present in the situation of the utterance and relatively distant from the participants (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1455). Namely, in deictic use, the demonstrative is not necessarily linked to an antecedent in the previous discourse but to an element of the extralinguistic reality, as in *"А шта радиш па да би то био", одговори Андрија који поред њега сеђаше хладећи ноге у реци. Марко: "Испуњавам савесно своје*

грађанске дужности, ловим рибу и славим безазленом кичицом ову реку и њене врбаке.”

We shall also discuss semantic prosody in certain examples. Sinclair's (1996, 87–88) definition of semantic prosody stipulates that it is attitudinal, and can be located on the pragmatic side of the semantics/pragmatics continuum. It is also a key factor in the integration of an item with its surroundings and may be regarded one of its 'functions'.

2.1 Овај/ова/ово + Ø

In the sample, there is no instance of the phrase *ово* + Ø, with neuter gender demonstrative, to refer to animate entities. The neuter demonstrative is limited to references to a previous statement or fact, which we shall demonstrate below. The masculine and feminine demonstrative with zero noun refer exclusively to human antecedents. Generally speaking, in Serbian, a demonstrative in pronominal use is a marked phrase when referring to persons. Namely, it is viewed as a pejorative reference, because omitting a noun when referring to a person in question indicates that the speaker thinks the person is not to be dignified with a mention, either by a common or personal noun. The sample has showed that this type of phrase is used predominantly in narration, specifically in storytelling, and the anaphor is linked mainly to the one previously mentioned by their personal name. This kind of reference is depreciatory to an extent. The usage of *овај/ова* + Ø in the examples examined serves the primary function of disambiguation: it consistently refers to the last of multiple possible antecedents in previous discourse. It is clear that this kind of reference does not imply an intention of the speaker to be depreciative, and it is commonly not understood that way. However, native Serbian speakers would most likely notice a slight stylistic displacement as if this kind of reference, though serving the purpose of disambiguation better than the anaphoric personal pronoun, could be labelled as somewhat informal, if not disrespectful. We can see the hints of pejorative meaning even in the examples when that is not the intention, as in (1) or (2). The awareness of that meaning could have influenced the structuring of the sentence, as the antecedent of this anaphoric expression is never the more respected individual out of two in the examples that we examined in this research. We can see that in the following instances, in which it is noted that a) the antecedent is a less significant figure than some other figure, as in (1), or b) that the antecedent's position is outweighed by the achievement of another, as in (2):

(1) *Прво се јавља Роџер Бекон, љубитељ природе, филозоф који је све подредио експерименталном истраживању и због тога бачен на маргинама јер је био испред свог времена (што му црква није опростила и осудила га је на неку врсту манастирске интернације). Значајнији од њега јесте Јоханес Дунс Скотус, који се у првој тачки разликовао од Томе Аквинског: док је овај полазио од Аристотеловог интелектуализма, Скотус се враћа Платону и Августиновом стављању воље испред разума.*

(2) *Конечно, Лист је имао времена да компоује. Током наредних 12 година прерадио је или написао она оркестарска и хорска дела по којима је остао упамћен као композитор. Својим напорима, успео је да издејствује извођење Вагнерове опере Лоенгрин 1850, док је овај био у егзилу у Швајцарској.*

Belittlement is also noted in a context in which achievements other than the antecedent's are implied by the knowledge of the world. The outcome of the invention of aspirin is well-known so the rejection on the part of the antecedent in (3) is also scorned by avoiding their name:

(3) *Ајхенгрун долази код Дресера са аспирином почетком 1898, али овај одбија, са образложењем да може имати неповољан учинак за срце...*

From the examples with animate antecedents we can conclude that the demonstrative pronoun is used to refer to the latter referent out of the two in the previous discourse, i.e. the non-subject and non-topical one, which is often regarded as the less salient sentence member from the syntactic point of view although it could also be regarded as more salient, because it is closer linearly. The notion of salience still remains open, complex, and often contradictory (Molnar, Vinckel-Roisin 2019, 308). We may also consider the following examples:

(4) *Јасенко и Зоран су осумњичени да су, у Зорановој кући на Палићу коју овај користи као радионицу, преуредили две просторије за узгој марихуане у затвореном простору.*

(5) *Својевремено је, шездесетих година прошлог века, једно не баш мало шумадијско село добило амбуланту и лекара опште медицине. Али овоме ускоро почеше да додијавају зубобољни. Будили би га у сред ноћи, а дању пресретали кукајући.*

(6) *Фридрих се готово поскакујући приближавао Јанку, дотакавши најзад и шешир у знак поздрава. Он пружи руку Јанку пожелевши му добро вече, али овај остаде непомичан, као да није ни приметио пружену руку, и рече пригушено, устрептаним гласом, тако да га је Павле једва чуо: „Дајте писмо“.*

(7) *Мајка црква „православне митрополије у Црној Гори“ била је Пећка Патријаршија, али она одавно физички не егзистира.*

Могла се аутокефалија тражити и од Цариградске патријаршије, али ову Црногорска митрополија никада није признала за мајку цркву.

Judging by the state of affairs described in (4) – (7), which are essentially negative, we can note that the demonstrative in pronominal use may be associated with negative contexts. The negative set of circumstances is clearly indicated in the co-text as well. This does not mean that the use of a demonstrative is motivated by the desire to diminish someone or be offensive, as it is clearly motivated primarily by the need for disambiguation, at least in most of the cases listed above. However, a slight change of the tone and a disregarding attitude toward the referent can be noted. This is especially clear in the cases such as (5), in which there is no need for disambiguation so there is basically no linguistically motivated need for the demonstrative. In cases such as (8), the negative overtone is not expected. As we can see, this does not make the use of the demonstrative unacceptable, as it still serves its clarifying purpose, but it makes this sentence stylistically displaced and less formal to an extent.

(8) Валенти је 1965. године био специјални саветник председнику Линдону Џонсону, када је овај најавио да ће се основати Амерички филмски институт.

As mentioned above, the demonstrative pronoun of neuter gender is not used for animate entities. It is used with an antecedent which is either an idea, a sentence or a segment of it. It can be noted, however, that the antecedent in this case is usually implied. This type of anaphora represents what Halliday and Hasan (1976, 66) describe as 'reference to fact', which includes referring to extended text through demonstratives. This type of anaphora since reiterates the significance or impact of what is referred to by the antecedent (underlined), so it came with positive semantic prosody in most examples examined (which is not necessarily the case, since the semantically negative contexts could still be referred to as impactful and significant), as in the following instances:

(9) Подршка Београдској иницијативи је признање нашој метеоролошкој служби, јер Србија има дугу традицију у истраживању климе. Овим је указана и велика част професору, Милутину Миланковићу, једном од најпознатијих климатолога свих времена, који је живео и радио у Београду.

(10) Европски ђаци и студенти слободни су да уче у било којој земљи чланице. Овим се додатно унапређују културна сарадња и међусобно познавање различитих култура.

(11) Један од најбољих начина подршке учењу и размишљању у узрасту основне школе је кроз узимање активног учешћа одраслих. Ово има позитивне ефекте на ментално здравље деце.

(12) Овде је још увек претежно рурални начин живота. Ово не мора бити у старту лоше јер се заговара социјална равнотежа, идеје заједница, солидарност, јер се поштује природа.

2.2 Овај/ова/ово + noun

The sample has suggested that this type of anaphora is used to establish cohesion between sentences.

One section of the sample includes sentences in which the anaphoric noun is identical to the antecedent. The repetition of the noun is employed in descriptive and informative texts as in the following examples:

(13) Уз то, постоје посебне зелене иницијативе за подизање свести о заштити животне средине међу запосленима, попут серије едукативних текстова на интранет порталу. Ови текстови обрађују примере унапређења енергетске ефикасности код клијената које је банка финансирала.

(14) Наиме, интернет омогућује анонимност, коју је немогуће постићи у било којој другој комуникацији. Ова анонимност ослобађа и подстиче људе на интимније комуницирање од уобичајеног.

(15) Иманентни део духовно-културног препорода лужичкосрпског народа чини књижевност чији се развој може у пуној мери ставити у прву половину 19. века. Ова књижевност имала је тада важан удео при образовању прогресивних идеја социјалног и политичког покрета.

(16) Као у Борхесовом опису хиперборејских ждралова: птице које лете уназад, јер им није важно куда иду, него одакле долазе. Ови ждралови, ако је опис веродостојан, нису природна бића, као све птице, већ много више људска бића.

(17) Као да сам чекао прилику да сам Бог аранжира наш сусрет и тако увећа моју радост. Ова прилика се убрзо појавила, мада ни тада нисам могао да се лично представим оцу Јустину.

(18) Иманентни део духовно-културног препорода лужичкосрпског народа чини књижевност чији се развој може у пуној мери ставити у прву половину 19. века. Ова књижевност имала је тада важан удео при образовању прогресивних идеја социјалног и политичког покрета.

(19) Кнез Милан га указом поставља за команданта свих добровољачких дивизија Ибарске армије. Ова армија је тада у

свом саставу имала око 3.000 војника, 4 лака топа, 24 кавалериста, који су сачињавали неку врсту гарде и двадесетак пионира.

(20) *На источном зиду, уз улаз у цркву св. Апостола, постављен је мермерни „Престо светог Саве“. На овом престолу седели су српски архиепископи и патријарси када су председавали црквеним скуповима који су се одржавали у пећкој припрати .*

The anaphors in instances (13) – (20) are linked to antecedents which are non-salient elements of previous sentences. This means that through anaphora a non-topical antecedent is transformed into the topic of the next sentence, which is expected in descriptive and informative texts as they strive towards richness in information and description.

The sample has demonstrated that anaphoric links may be created through hyponymy, particularly in informative texts. This could be used in order to refer to multiple referents by a single phrase, which is an example of linguistic economy; however, since hyponymy is used to refer to a single referent in many cases, we could conclude that this use is a support to the factual basis of informative texts since hyponymy offers data on the class of the entity referred to by the antecedent, as in the following:

(21) *Драцена потиче из тропских и суптропских области Азије, Африке и Јужне Америке. **Ова лепа и радо коришћена собна биљка** може бити различитог изгледа у односу на лишће које код свих расте из розете.*

(22) *Мермер и гранит су најбољи материјали које данас можете изабрати за радну кухињску плочу. Ови природни материјали су готово савршени за употребу у просторима где је повишена хигијена неопходна и наглашена употреба воде.*

(23) *Аксолотл је једна од најспектакуларнијих врста саламандера који се могу наћи на америчком пет тржишту. Због свог порекла овај саламандер је често (што је врло одговарајуће) познат и као мексички аксолотл.*

(24) *Афеландра расте у дивљем стању у Мексику, Колумбу и Бразилу. **Ова врло интересантна и декоративна биљка** има око 50 варијетета.*

(25) *Мада је предавао архитектуру, М. Валтровић је путовао по Србији као изасланик Српског ученог друштва ради прецртавања, описивања и снимања српских уметничких споменика и старина по манастирима. Његов успешан рад на овом послу омогућио је да 1881. године буде изабран за*

професора археологије на Великој школи и за чувара Народног музеја у Београду.

Within this segment of the sample we have found cases in which it is rather difficult to identify the antecedent to which the anaphor is linked precisely. The following examples can be considered:

(26) Ученица осмог разреда Мина Милошевић првак је Републике Србије са освојеним максималним бројем поена. За овај резултат заслужна је и професорка Драгица Јовановић.

(27) На крају би га пољубио у чело и тиме би аудијенција била завршена. Ова Кнежева суздржаност ни у ком случају није била знак небриге или недостатка осећања.

(28) Видари видарину нису тражили, давала им се драговољно. За лек се, зар не, не каже хвала. Ова врста традиције долазила је у сукоб с праксом великог света, у коме је лекар занатлија.

(29) Једино је војска представљала снагу која се често изражавала у војничким бунама и устанцима. Иако није потпуно отклонило ову опасност, напредовање појма о законитом праву на престо учинило ју је мање честом и мање погубљеном по династију.

(30) Са друге стране, то је недостатак личног искуства у стварима о којима се просуђује, а о сврсисходности интернета ваљда највише расправљају они који нису никада сели за тај чаробни сурферски пулт. Они који су кренули у ову авантуру немају времена да се баве расправом, већ се труде да што више заграбе из те земље чуда и слобода.

In instances (26) – (30) we underlined potential antecedents, which are actually implications on the basis of which the anaphor may be interpreted. These examples illustrate antecedents and anaphors which are not co-referential, as described in Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1458). Namely, this relation is common when the antecedent is not a referring expression so that it is not possible to identify a constituent of the preceding text which expresses the content of the anaphor precisely. We may also infer that the anaphors provide a label for the states of affairs and actions described in previous sentences which cannot be reduced to a single noun phrase antecedent. We believe that these cases may be more accurately reconsidered through a cognitive approach to anaphora, which would be out of scope of this study.

In the sample, there are also examples in which anaphors and antecedents are clearly identifiable and yet it is rather difficult to describe the lexical relation they form, beyond the anaphoric link. This is evident in the following:

(31) Бројност и разноврсност животињских врста такође карактерише Национални парк Ђердап. Карактеристичне животињске врсте за овај крај су јелен, срна, дивља свиња, зец, лисица, итд.

(32) Широм Европе сваке године *Europa Cantat* организује недеље певања на којима се промовише и унапређује вокална музика. Ови сусрети приближавају хорско певање Европљанима, али и Европљане међусобно.

(33) Ту, у том распону између позорнице и дворане, у тој комуникацији између говорења и слушања, кретања и посматрања, у том преплитању глумчевог израза и гледаочевог утиска - ту лежи функција и суштина композиције. Под овом речју, која можда и није најсрећније изабрана, не подразумевам само нешто што је чисто техничко.

To be precise, the context of the situation and the knowledge of the world can be here considered to provide the foundation for the interpretation of anaphora.

3. Discussion

We have analyzed anaphorically used demonstrative *овај/ова/ово* in Serbian. The sample contained examples in which the demonstrative is used to replace a section of previous text. When anaphora is considered an instrument of cohesion, the link between the antecedent and the anaphor is semantic as their interpretations are interdependent. This is apparent in cases in which a) there is a so called extended reference to fact, b) the antecedent and the anaphor are related through hyponymy or c) the co-text facilitates the construal of the anaphoric link.

Cohesion by the anaphoric demonstrative is occasionally paired with positive or negative evaluation, which leads us to associate it with semantic prosody. While semantic evaluation could not be considered the main goal of the use of demonstratives, it sometimes accompanies the demonstratives analyzed above, making certain sentences seem stylistically inadequate. Semantic prosody has not been discussed with function words or syntactic phrases and it may seem incongruous with them. However, if we consider semantic prosody to take effect when "the usage of a word gives an impression of an attitudinal or pragmatic meaning" (Sinclair 1999), it may be reasonable to discuss it in relation to the anaphoric demonstrative *овај/ова/ово*. The sample has indicated that the phrase *овај/ова/ово* + \emptyset is attitudinal when a) the antecedent which is a personal noun is linked to the anaphor which is a function word plus an empty slot for either the name or the corresponding noun

and b) the anaphor is the topic of the sentence with the context that allows for the possibility of negative associations with the co-referent of the anaphor.

The results also suggest that cohesion through anaphora does not involve a simple replacement of the antecedent. In the case of hyponymy, for example, cohesion in discourse is established through the relation of hierarchy or taxonomy since what is referred to by the anaphor is the superordinate class the antecedent belongs to. It does not even necessarily mean that antecedents and their anaphor have the same focus. The focus may shift, and it may be the case that the antecedent is not in focus while the anaphor regains the focus in the unfolding discourse.

4. Concluding remarks

In this paper, we presented our exploration of anaphoric referencing in Serbian with the demonstrative pronoun *ovaj/ova/ovo*, used pronominally or in a noun phrase. When consulting the literature for this study, we noted that it was suggested that the noun phrase with a proximal demonstrative typically refers to a less salient element of previous discourse (Poesio, Modjeska 2005, Fossard et al. 2012). Judging by the sample analyzed, this is not necessarily the case; furthermore, anaphor is not automatically the instrument for assigning prominence to the antecedent. Some of the examples, such as those which involve hyponymy, have demonstrated that an anaphoric noun phrase with a demonstrative does not mean the antecedent is less salient than the anaphor. Quite the contrary, they may be of equal status when cohesion between sentences is being established. The only clear cases of a less salient antecedent in the sample concern the repetition of the noun.

The literature has also suggested that anaphor as instrument of cohesion may be a form of reduction or a way to avoid redundancy by repeating (cf. Schmolz 2015). We noted that this is not the case in the sample explored. If we consider cohesion to be a semantic tie between the antecedent and its anaphor, then the anaphor appears also a) to convey attitude through semantic prosody, b) to indicate a class of what is referred to by the antecedent, c) in referring to facts, to indicate how beneficial in achieving a certain state of affairs the antecedent can be, or d) to shift the focus of attention to a non-thematic element from the previous sentence.

The examples above demonstrate that the antecedent of the phrase *ovaj/ova/ovo* + noun is not necessarily also a noun phrase, as in the case of reference to fact. We are not concerned here with the form

of antecedents, but will list the types of antecedents we have also come across in the sample to be explored further:

- a dependent clause:

(34) *Постоји чак претпоставка - заснована баш на овим речима - да је можда Константин писао своје читаво дело на пољском али грчким писменима. Још је Јагић изразио сумњу у ову могућност, као што смо већ показали;*

- a question:

(35) *Задивљен пред собом, човек треба да крене путем на којем ће га задивити свет. Где је тачка прелаза? Могу ли се наћи разлози за то? Љубав, када је има, ту помаже и разрешава ову тајну;*

- a complex sentence:

(36) *Она је створила нешто још значајније, мајсторски распоред украса, који је начинио од живописа поучно средство у служби цркве, и нову иконографију, веома разноврсну и богату, која стоји у вези са препорођајем извршеним у IX веку. Помоћу свега овога византијска уметност је моћно вршила свој утицај у целом свету, у Бугарској као и у Русији, у Јерменској као и у јужној Италији;*

- more than one sentence from previous discourse, particularly in narration:

(37) *Он стаде на страну Александра III (1161 г.), стави му у изглед обнављање црквене уније и понада се да ће га он, у замену, крунисати за западног цара. У исто време његови дипломатски чиновници су настојали да Барбароси створе непријатеље подржавајући ломбардску лигу и дајући новчану помоћ Анкони, Ђенови, Пизи, Млецима. С друге стране, док је правио смутње у Италији и Немачкој, Манојло је желео да ступи и у непосредан додир с немачким царем. Од ових заплетених и неостварљивих намера ништа стварнога није произишло.*

- a set of prepositional phrases:

(38) *Али је тачно да ме много више интересује збивање у самом средишту позоришта, у глумцу, у језику, покрету ... Ко једном продре у занимљивост ових светова - а сваки елемент театра је свет за себе - тај тешко потом излази опет напоље.*

We may revisit Krahmer and Piwek's (1997, 4–11) account of anaphora features, cited above. First, there are examples in the sample which illustrate that the interpretation of anaphors may depend on the context, especially in cases in which there is extended reference to fact or those in which the antecedent is hard to identify, so it is 'contextually given'. Second, we are concerned with anaphora proper, whose

interpretation is a matter of linguistic interpretation, which is available in all cases from the co-text, the unfolded text, or any kind of semantic relation between the referring expressions, as with cohesion in general. Moreover, the instances in which the antecedent is hard to isolate, verify the idea proposed in Halliday and Hasan (1976, 304) that reference is a semantic relation which rests upon the meanings of particular instances. In addition, we also believe that although sometimes the antecedent may be difficult to isolate, it is still easy to identify, which may be explored further from the cognitive point of view. Third, it is indeed the case that co-reference is not a necessary property of anaphora, as demonstrated with anaphors which refer to fact.

We assume that the results of this paper suggest that the proposition from the literature that the primary function of anaphoric demonstrative is to refer to a less prominent element of unfolded discourse is too general. Also, we cannot confirm that we observed any vagueness with antecedents that would require usage of demonstratives, as opposed to the personal pronouns, for example, even in cases in which the antecedents cannot be reduced to a noun phrase. The opacity, however, may be additionally tested from the cognitive viewpoint. Similarly, the reasons for using this demonstrative anaphorically do not have to relate to the change in sentence topic, and the motivation may lie in the attitudinal reference or in the need to provide additional information on the antecedent, which may require further exploration of semantic prosody with syntactic structures, theme and rheme with anaphor, abstractions and ideas as antecedents, etc.

Works cited:

- Ariel, Mira. *Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Cornish, Francis. "Indexicality by degrees: Deixis, "anadeixis", and (discourse) anaphora." hal-00960772. <https://hal-univ-tlse2.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00960772>, 2009 (accessed 16 October 2022).
- Dipper, Stefanie, Heike Zeinsmeister. "Annotating Discourse Anaphora". *Proceedings of the Workshop 'Third Linguistic Annotation Workshop'*. LAW III, ACL-IJCNLP. Suntec, Singapore, 2009. 166–169.
- Fossard, Mario, Alan Garnham, H. & Wind Cowles. "Between anaphora and deixis... The resolution of the demonstrative noun phrase that N". *Language and Cognitive Processes* 27 (9), 2012. 1385–1404.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Ruqaiya Hasan. *Cohesion in English*. London: Routledge, 1976.
- Huang, Yan. *Anaphora. A Cross-linguistic Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Huang, Yan. "Anaphora, cataphora, exophora, logophoricity". In Keith Brown (ed.) *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, New York: Elsevier, 2005. 231-238.
- Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: University Press, 2002.
- Klikovac, Duška. "O upotrebi pokaznih reči u srpskom jeziku". In: *Kognitivnolingvistička proučavanja srpskog jezika*, zbornik radova, 2006. 125–141.
- Klikovac, Duška. "Gramatička kategorija lica kod pokaznih reči u srpskom jeziku", *Zbornik matice srpske za slavistiku* 83, 2013. 269–286.
- Krahmer, Emiel & Paul Piwek. "Varieties of anaphora". *Proceedings of the 11th Amsterdam Colloquium, University of Amsterdam*, 1997. 5-20.
- Marx, Konstanze, Ina Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, Matthias Schlesewsky. "Resolving complex anaphors". In Schwarz-Friesel, Monika/Consten, Manfred/Knees, Mareile (eds.): *Anaphors in Text. Cognitive, formal and applied approaches to anaphoric reference*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 2007. 259–277.
- Molnar, Valeria, Hélène Vinckel-Roisin. "Discourse Topic vs. Sentence Topic. Exploiting the Peripheries of German Verb-Second Sentences". In: Molnár, Valeria / Winkler, Susanne / Egerland, Verner (eds.). *Architecture of Topic*. Berlin/Boston, de Gruyter, 2019. 293–333.
- Piper, Predrag, Ivana Antonić, Vladislava Ružić, Sreto Tanasić, Ljudmila Popović & Branko Tošović. *Sintaksa savremenoga srpskog jezika. Prosta rečenica* [Syntax of modern Serbian language. Simple sentence]. Novi Sad: Institut za srpski jezik SANU, Beogradska knjiga, Matica srpska, 2005.
- Sinclair, John. "The search for units of meaning". *Textus* 9: 1996. 75–106.
- Sinclair, John. Concordance tasks. *The Tuscan Word Centre*. <http://www.twc.it/happen.html> 1999 (accessed 7 January 2023).
- Schmolz, Helene. *Anaphora Resolution and Text Retrieval: A Linguistic Analysis of Hypertexts*. Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110416756>, 2015.
- Snider, Todd. "Introducing propositional discourse referents". *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 23. Vol. 2, 2019. 317–332.
- Talmy, Leonard. "Targeting in Language: Unifying Deixis and Anaphora". *Frontiers in Psychology* 11. 2016. <https://www.readcube.com/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02016>, 2020 (accessed 23 September 2022).
- Vieira, Renata, Susanne Salmon-Alt & Caroline Gasperin. "Coreference and anaphoric relations of demonstrative noun phrases in a multilingual corpus". In António Branco, Tony McEnery & Ruslan Mitkov (eds.), *Anaphora Processing: Linguistic, cognitive and computational modelling*, 2005. 385–402. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

**ZUSAMMENFASSUNG: ANAPHER MIT DEMONSTRATIVPRONOMEN
OBAJ/OBA/OBO IN SERBISCH**

Der Artikel untersucht die anaphorische Verwendung des Demonstrativpronomens *obaj/oba/obo* im serbischen Diskurs. Wir haben eine Auswahl aus dem elektronischen Korpus *Serbian Web Corpus* zusammengestellt, um die Koreferenz, die durch die anaphorische Verwendung des Demonstrativs entsteht, und die Kontexte, in denen es verwendet wird, zu untersuchen. Der Gebrauch von Anapher bei den Phrasen *obaj/oba/obo* + \emptyset und *obaj/oba/obo* + Substantiv werden sowohl zwischen den Sätzen und im einem Satz berücksichtigt. Wir betrachten auch die Interpretation, zusätzliche Assoziationen und die semantische Prosodie der Anapher in bestimmten Kontexten. Die Analyse hat gezeigt, dass das Demonstrativum in narrativen und informativen Texten anaphorisch verwendet wird, mit negativer semantischer Prosodie im ersteren und positiver Prosodie im letzteren, und dass die Anapher nicht nur ein Instrument zur Auflösung eines nicht hervorstechenden Bezugswort ist.

Schlagwörter: Anapher, demonstrativ, Pronomen, semantische Prosodie, serbisch